



<http://researchspace.auckland.ac.nz>

ResearchSpace@Auckland

Copyright Statement

The digital copy of this thesis is protected by the Copyright Act 1994 (New Zealand).

This thesis may be consulted by you, provided you comply with the provisions of the Act and the following conditions of use:

- Any use you make of these documents or images must be for research or private study purposes only, and you may not make them available to any other person.
- Authors control the copyright of their thesis. You will recognise the author's right to be identified as the author of this thesis, and due acknowledgement will be made to the author where appropriate.
- You will obtain the author's permission before publishing any material from their thesis.

To request permissions please use the Feedback form on our webpage.

<http://researchspace.auckland.ac.nz/feedback>

General copyright and disclaimer

In addition to the above conditions, authors give their consent for the digital copy of their work to be used subject to the conditions specified on the [Library Thesis Consent Form](#) and [Deposit Licence](#).

Note : Masters Theses

The digital copy of a masters thesis is as submitted for examination and contains no corrections. The print copy, usually available in the University Library, may contain corrections made by hand, which have been requested by the supervisor.

**Te Reo Māori and a New Zealand Language
Policy: Prospects and Possibilities.**

By

Raymond Nicholson

A thesis
submitted in fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of
Master of Education.

The University of Auckland

2012

Abstract

The Māori language is an indigenous language of New Zealand with official status. This thesis examines the Māori language and language policy. It traces important happenings concerning the Māori language from the first draft of a national language policy, *Aotearoa*, in 1992 to the present day. The Treaty of Waitangi and, later, the Waitangi Tribunal afforded protection for the Māori language. The Māori Language Act of 1987 outlined Government's commitment towards the language. Māori and Government began working together to protect an endangered language. Māori realised a language policy was necessary for its planned future. In 2003, the Māori Language Commission, set up in 1987, and the Ministry of Māori Development, established in 1992, drew up a Māori language policy, the Māori Language Strategy. The policies of this Strategy are analysed and situated in relation to language policy and planning. Key stakeholders were interviewed. While these key stakeholders acknowledged the protection a national language policy could afford, particularly from the point of view of human rights, they also showed a strong desire to keep pursuing the goals of present Māori language policy, with the idea of concentrating on what is working rather than spreading efforts too widely for a national language policy. Language policy in Australia is examined and some parallels are drawn with New Zealand for a national language policy. Similarly, Welsh in Wales is discussed as a model that New Zealand might follow, especially for the Māori language. The situation of te reo Māori in both Māori-medium education and mainstream education is described. Māori broadcasting, radio, television, and cyberspace, are seen as important aids in the revitalisation of the language as they all are able to be present in the home. Māori spoken in the home is the present-day emphasis for the language in the hope of ensuring intergenerational transmission. Such aspirations are also evident in the document, *Te Reo Mauriora*, the review of the Māori Language Strategy and Sector (2011). Whether a national Māori language policy will be sufficient to ensure its revitalisation or whether its position in a national language policy is worth pursuing is an ongoing question.

Dedication

To Janet, Kevin, and Daniel.

Tōku reo, tōku ohooho, tōku reo whakakai mārihi

tōku reo, tōku mapihi maurea.

“My language is like a precious ornament to be treasured.”

Acknowledgements

I wish to acknowledge the invaluable help and guidance of my supervisor, Professor Stephen May. He has truly understood the main message of my thesis and guided me accordingly.

I also acknowledge members of the Faculty of Education of the University of Auckland. So many people have helped and advised me in numerous ways, always ready to give their time and the benefit of their expertise.

CONTENTS

Abstract	ii
Dedication	iii
Acknowledgements	iv
Table of Contents	v
Glossary	vii
INTRODUCTION	1
CHAPTER ONE: LANGUAGE POLICY	4
Status Planning	8
Corpus Planning	10
Acquisition Planning Via Education	11
Languages in New Zealand	15
Language Policy and New Zealand	16
The document <i>Aotearoa</i>	17
The Australian Language Policy	22
Welsh and Wales	25
CHAPTER TWO: THE MĀORI LANGUAGE	
Pre-European Colonisation to the 21 st Century	28
Māori in Australia	49
The Māori Language Today	50
Learning Māori in New Zealand Today	53

CHAPTER THREE: METHODOLOGY AND ETHICS

Methodology 59

Ethics 64

CHAPTER FOUR: THE INTERVIEWS 66

The Findings 68

CHAPTER FIVE: CONCLUSIONS 91**REFERENCES** 93

Appendix I The Ethics Application Form 111

Appendix II The Consent Form 142

Appendix III The Participation Information Sheet 144

Appendix IV The Questionnaires 147

Glossary

Aotearoa	New Zealand
hapū	sub-tribe
hīkoi	walk, in modern idiom – a protest march
hui	meeting
iwi	tribe
kanohi ki te kanohi	face to face
karanga	call to the guests
kaumatua	elder
kaupapa Māori	the way Māori think and feel
koha	a gift
Kōhanga Reo	language nest
Kupu hou	new words
Kura Kaupapa Māori	Māori language immersion school
mā te reo	for the language
manuhiri	guest
Māori	original, natural, the indigenous people of New Zealand
marae	ancestral courtyard in front of the meeting house; meeting area of whānau or iwi
moteatea	chanted poems and laments
Ngā Tamatoa	the young warriors
Pākehā	white person with colonial ancestry
pōwhiri	welcome ceremony
rangahau	research
rangatira	chief
rangatiratanga	chieftanship,
reo	language
taha Māori	Māori dimension
tangata whenua	host people, people of the land
taonga	treasure
te ao	the world
te ara reo	the language path
te ataarangi	the rākau method of language learning

te Hīkoi Reo Māori	the Māori Language March
te rautaki	the strategy
te reo Māori	the Māori language
tikanga	culture
tohunga	expert
waiata	songs
wānanga	study, a Māori tertiary institute
whakatauki	proverbs
whaikōrero	ritualistic welcome
whakaata Māori	Māori television
whakamā	feeling embarrassed
whakapapa	genealogy, lineage
whānau	family
whare	house
wharenui	meeting house
wharekura	Māori-medium High Schools
whare wānanga	school of learning

Introduction

Te reo Māori, the Māori language, is an indigenous language of Aotearoa/ New Zealand with official status. This thesis examines the Māori language and language policy. It traces the history of the language from the beginning of the 19th century through to the present day with an emphasis on the last 20 years since the first attempt of a national language policy as seen in the discussion document, *Aotearoa*, (Waite, 1992). It also describes the relatively recent domain of language policy in the world (Spolsky, 2004) and how a New Zealand national language policy could support and protect the Māori language. Māori's own national language policy, the Māori Language Strategy, *Te Rautaki Reo Māori, 2003*, is analysed in detail and subsequent Māori language policies up to the present day, especially *Te Reo Mauriora*, the review of the Māori Language Sector and the Māori Language Strategy (April, 2011).

Commentaries are made on the desirability of te reo Māori being an intricate part of a national New Zealand language policy or whether there is a greater benefit for Māori to pursue its own language policy and concentrate its efforts and resources in this area. The situation of language policy in Australia is examined and parallels made for a New Zealand language policy. Similarly, Welsh in Wales is discussed and some possible models are seen as worthwhile adopting, especially for the Māori language, considering revitalisation of the Welsh language is going apace. Key stakeholders were interviewed and their views for and against a national language policy are aired.

Language policy in the world is defined as regulated language within a particular community (Spolsky, 2010). That community could be a country or even a group of minority speakers within a particular country. It can be viewed as having a variety of different functions, depending on the country and the reasons a national language policy was adopted. Where a major language is part of a national language policy it can be a method of control over its citizens (Parks, 2002). Where a minority language features in a national language policy, such a language can be shown to benefit a country from an economic point of view

(Bruthloux, 2003), show a recognition of minorities (May, 2003), or just as a matter of basic human rights (Parks, 2002). Where a minority language is concerned, there are some special situations, when that language is an indigenous language, such as Māori in New Zealand. When a language is considered endangered (Fishman, 2001), there is a debate as to whether a national language policy can be its saviour or whether the type of policy decided on could be detrimental to a particular language (Romaine, 2002).

Particular aspects of language policy: status planning, corpus planning, and acquisition planning, are examined with special attention to the Māori language. An historical review of the Māori language looks briefly at the 19th century and first half of the 20th century with a focus on the Treaty of Waitangi in 1840. From this Treaty is seen the agreement between the Crown and Māori that their language is a special treasure, a *taonga*, that has a right of protection by the Government, as attested by the Māori Language Act of 1987. The 1970s and 1980s see Māori strive to revitalise their language and a series of establishments and happenings underpin their efforts: the Māori Language Commission, *Te Taura Whiri i te Reo Māori*, was established in 1987; Māori was deemed to be an official language of New Zealand also in 1987; the Waitangi Tribunal, created in 1975, provided a platform for Māori to plead their causes; the Ministry of Māori Development, *Te Puni Kōkiri*, 1992, ensured Government commitment to the language. At the same time, Māori-medium education helped stem the tide of imminent danger to the language and Māori broadcasting, both radio and television, brought the Māori language into Māori homes. People who use cyberspace, particularly the computer with its software and internet access, continue to find opportunities to learn and/or consolidate the Māori language. Two documents are given special attention in the description of events of the last 20 years. One of these is *Aotearoa* (1992).

Aotearoa gave a comprehensive coverage of the various aspects of a national language policy. It described the Māori language as the indigenous language of the country, so having a special status and deserving of protection and support, but, still viewed in 1992, as an endangered language. However, the document

remained just a discussion document and with a change of Government, it was simply shelved.

The other document that is given particular attention is *The Māori Language Strategy* of 2003. This document was drawn up as a result of continuing Māori requests to the Government for an overarching Māori language policy that would plan for a protected and supported future. On behalf of the Government, both the Māori Language Commission and the Ministry of Māori Development drew up the document. The strategy looked 25 years ahead and put forward a series of policies to be audited every five years. Its aim was “to move the Māori language to the next stage of revitalisation” (The Māori Language Strategy, 2003, p. 5). The strategy envisaged a widening of the range of domains for the spoken language, with an emphasis on Māori spoken in the home and in Māori communities. It also saw the desirability of goodwill and support for the language by all New Zealanders.

Note is taken of the great number of Māori who have emigrated to Australia where the Māori language is not strong, one important reason being the spread of Māori communities (Hamer, 2010).

An examination of the Māori language today still sees the language as endangered (*Te Reo Mauriora*, April, 2011; *Wai 262*, July, 2011), but, from the viewpoint of the keystakeholders who were interviewed, the language is considered as still surviving, yet with a continued need for surveillance and protection. The question still remains whether it is more to Māori advantage to concentrate on the efforts and gains from the present Māori national language policies rather than hope for a national New Zealand language policy where there may or may not be more protection and security for the future.

CHAPTER ONE: LANGUAGE POLICY

This chapter deals with the nature of language policy internationally. The traditional aspects of language policy are explained: status planning, corpus planning, and acquisition planning via education. These aspects are defined and examples concerning the Māori language are given. The situation of language teaching and learning in New Zealand is viewed under the headings: ‘in the schools themselves’, and ‘languages in New Zealand’. In this context, the teaching and learning of the Māori language is touched on, with some mention of the revitalisation of the language. This is described in detail in Chapter Two. Language policy in New Zealand centres on the draft policy for New Zealand language policy, the document *Aotearoa*. The background and contents of the document are examined. The Māori language part of the document is described in Chapter Two.

For a comparison with a potential New Zealand language policy, the background to Australia’s language policy is outlined as it had been seen as an example to be followed for New Zealand. Finally, the background to Welsh in Wales is described. The revitalisation of Welsh has many parallels with the revitalisation of the Māori language. The long history of the Welsh language and the positive steps forward for Welsh in the first decade of the 21st century are outlined, with examples that potentially may be followed in the revitalisation of te reo Māori. The details of this can be found in Chapter Two.

The title of this thesis: ‘Te Reo Māori and a New Zealand Language Policy: Prospects and Possibilities’ is given a framework in Chapter One which is followed up in Chapter Two by a detailed description of the Māori language through history up to the present day.

What is “language policy”?

Language policy is a comparatively new field and “has been studied for at least 50 years...but no consensus has emerged about the scope and nature of the field its theories or its terminology” (Spolsky, 2004, p.ix). Language policy is seen as a part of sociolinguistics. Sociolinguistics concerns the relationship between language and

society. It is a study of language with reference to its social context. Trudgill describes sociolinguistics in this way:

Sociolinguistics, then, is that part of linguistics which is concerned with language as a social and cultural phenomenon. It investigates the field of language and society and has close connections with the social sciences, especially social psychology, anthropology, human geography, and sociology. (2000, p. 21)

Language policy is itself an interdisciplinary field, but “there is no overarching theory of language policy and planning, in large part because of the complexity of the issues which involve language in society” (Ricento, 2006, p.10). Spolsky, who is a leading scholar in the field of language policy, recently attempted a comprehensive definition:

Language policy, I argue, exists within all speech communities (and within each domain inside that community), consisting of three distinct but interrelated components: the regular language practices of the community (such as choice of varieties); the language beliefs or ideology of the community (such as the values assigned to each variety by various members of the community); and any language management activities, namely attempts by any individual or institution with or claiming authority to modify the language practices and language beliefs of other members of other members of the community. (2010, p. 2)

What language policy might comprise

Language policies differ from country to country, from society to society. But there are some universals applicable to all language policies. Language policies are made for people living together and for citizens of a country who have rights of citizenship. The actual concept of *citizenship* is a compelling reason for citizens in a particular society having some protection of their language (McBride, 2010). Language policies can provide both access and choice. As Waite outlines in the discussion document, *Aotearoa*, such access can be: access to information; access to justice; access to the labour market; access to social services (Waite, 1992). When a citizen, or even a

visitor to the country or society, has sufficient information, then choices can also be made (Kymlicka, 1989).

Why language policies might be necessary

For a person to be able to live a full life in a country, the different accesses mentioned above can be the means for this full life. For example, to earn money in order to be able to exist satisfactorily, access to the labour market is necessary (Grin, 2003). For so many things in daily life access to social services follows as a necessity for all.

Ricento comments that language policies

have a direct bearing on our place in society and what we might (or might not) be able to achieve. Schools, the workplace, the neighbourhood, families – all are sites where language policies determine or influence what language(s) we will speak.(2006, p. 21)

What language policies potentially offer

This can depend on the country and / or society. For example, Wales' languages policy can be seen as part of the Welsh Language Act, 1993. This Act reads “English and Welsh languages should be treated on a basis of equality” (p.1). Such a statement ensures access for citizens to services in the community in either language. In a country such as New Zealand, which has a growing linguistic diversity but a predominant monolingual citizenship, public services tend to be in English. The potential for a national language policy is very wide. As has been noted above, the discussion document on a possible New Zealand language policy in 1992, *Aotearoa*, outlined a series of situations where language policy in society could give access to a variety of services (as seen above) such as: access to information, access to justice, access to the labour market, access to social services (Waite, 1992, the Overview, pp. 16-17).

Usually, language policies in countries provide recognition for minorities. The dominant language of a majority of the population does not have the same need of protection that a language policy can provide. May (2008) gives a comprehensive

global description of the situation of minorities in the world where their languages are concerned, surrounded by a majority population speaking the dominant language of the country. He describes a world where minorities seek their own identity, trying to live by the dictates of their own culture, often enough striving for the very survival of their language, hoping for a revitalisation. Survival on their own is not always sufficient but there is need of the majority population to accept minorities, giving them recognition and appreciation of their struggle and offering support, especially at government level. Indigenous languages are seen to have potentially a special status, supported by universal indigenous rights, as detailed in the Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous People by the United Nations in 2007. However, recognition of the status of minority languages, whether heritage or indigenous, is seen as something not often enough given minority languages.

Besides recognition of minorities, language policies have a number of different functions. They are used by some governments to exert control over its citizens (Miller, 2003; Parks, 2002; Sharima, 1997); Governments resist adopting a national language policy, often because of fiscal restraint (Spence, 2004); or even the lack of importance the majority of its citizens place on them (Reising, 1997; Unks, 1983). Promoters of a language policy in a country see such a policy as having benefits for its citizens, ranging from a basic human right (Parks, 2002), recognition of minorities (May, 2003), cultural diversity (Konig, 1999) to a sense of sound economics (Ozolins, 2003; Bruthlax, 2003; Grin, 2003).

Linguistic diversity refers to the existence of different languages and ethnic cultural groups within the same society. In a truly linguistic diverse community, different ethnic groups feel free to speak their own languages to one another in public without recrimination from others around them who do not speak or understand their languages (Julia de Bres, 2008). In such a society, the citizen accepts this situation and does not require everyone to speak one particular language. But general acceptance is a relative situation and to ensure harmony and security of people, language policies can greatly help particularly minorities or indigenous peoples in a society dominated by one language group (May, 2008). A monolingual society is one that is transparent concerning the knowledge of the group. Everyone understands the same language and can have access to the stored knowledge of the group. But the

existence of linguistically diverse groups means there are sources of hidden knowledge within the whole societal group, knowledge that can benefit the whole group. This is especially so when the minority speaks an indigenous language and has knowledge stored up through generations, knowledge relative to the very environment of the society (Skutnabb-Kangas, 2002). In supranational contexts, such as in the European Community, now that agreed rules of trade, a common currency (the euro), and also agreed acceptance of particular languages within the Community exist, it is a benefit for the whole group, those many people within the European Community, to accept language diversity for its future development as a united group. So the Maastricht Treaty (signed on 7 February 1992 in Maastricht, the Netherlands) and its amended later treaties (Amsterdam in 1999, Nice in 2003, Lisbon in 2007) help to ensure the Community's future.

Status Planning

Spolsky defines status planning simply as “any attempt to set up laws or norms for when to use a language” (1998). Cooper (1989) had earlier detailed a whole set of “functions” that a language could have, e.g., as a medium of instruction, an official language, or a vehicle of mass communication. Some examples of status planning can be seen in the chosen language(s) for public signs, or the allowed form of a language for public broadcasts within a country. Whatever the “function” that is permitted there are results that are either positive or negative for the group who have to obey the language laws.

Some countries have designated particular languages as “official”, e.g., Māori in New Zealand, but these same countries sometimes do not have a formal languages policy. Other countries have a formal languages policy, e.g., Australia, but no official languages. Other countries again fiercely defend their monolingual status, e.g., France, and set up institutions to guard their language, e.g., the *Académie Française*. Sometimes the status of a language is shadowed or enshrined in a constitution or treaty (Jones, 2001). Even when there is a formal languages policy, this does not necessarily guarantee the prospering of a particular language or languages. Focusing on the status of a language being designated an “official” language, it can be seen there are many variations in the world of what “official” can mean.

When a government recognizes the language of a subordinate minority as a statutory language, as Arabic in Israel, rulers in effect grant symbolic recognition of that group's right to maintain its distinctiveness. Conversely, when a linguistically heterogeneous polity declares one language only as statutory, as the 1986 proposition which made English the official language of the State of California, the declaration in effect denies the legitimacy of diversity. (Cooper, 1989, pp.101-102)

When we turn our attention to New Zealand, we see that there are two official languages, te reo Māori and New Zealand Sign Language. English, by virtue of its being easily the majority spoken language of the country is really a *de facto* official language. A concern in the area of status is attitude. This concern is raised by May:

It also raises a wider issue of language status that has to be directly addressed in the development of any national languages policy. Language learning, it seems, is acceptable if it involves so-called 'European', 'international' or 'prestigious' languages, but less so if it involves so-called 'local', 'community' or 'low-status' languages. (2005b. p. 7)

This will take a major mind-shift in New Zealand schools and probably among the New Zealand public. It will need government support to publicise the worth of te reo Māori, Pasifika, community and heritage languages. In the case of te reo Māori, there continue to be voices calling for the raising of the status of the language. This is happening even at the level of editorials of major newspapers, for example, twice by "The Press" newspaper in Christchurch in 2011 and 2012, e.g., The "Press", November 14, 2011. It has been suggested by a well-known Government Minister in the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade, Tim Groser, that it is logical that the second language that English speakers in New Zealand should learn, should be Māori (Groser, 2012). Active as Mr Groser is in international trade for New Zealand, he sees the need for New Zealanders to know other languages than English. He points out that the Māori language is easily accessible to New Zealanders. They do not need to travel to another country. It is a part of the country itself. Of course he is mainly promoting Māori from a linguistic point of view. That is, learn another language other than your

own and other languages will be easier to learn. Even though his motivation differs from what other people to date have been using to persuade others to learn Māori, still it is another reason to learn Māori other than often put forward for learning language motivations. Some examples are: attitudes towards the indigenous language of the country, that is, the first language of the country; or, learning the language to understand the culture and the true meaning of a New Zealander. One private secondary school that has already made the Māori language compulsory to learn is Kings College in Auckland.

Corpus Planning

Going hand in hand with status planning is corpus planning. Again Spolsky concisely defines this concept: “Corpus planning refers to the choices to be made of specific linguistic elements whenever the language is used” (2004, p.11). Earlier Cooper wrote: “The traditional primary categories [of corpus planning] are graphization, standardization, and modernization” (1989. p.125).

In the case of te reo Māori, it is yet to be seen, when considering the different existing dialects, to what extent there will be standardisation in the language because of the existence now of two Māori television channels, where examples of different dialects can be heard daily. The recent report, *Te Reo Mauriora* (April, 2011), recommends a strengthening of the dialects by the different iwi. The other consideration is modernization within the language in defining new concepts of modern life by delving back into older existing words in Māori rather than persisting with borrowings, mainly from English. In the 1980s and 1990s the Māori Language Commission was very much the guardian of the coining of new words. But in the beginning of the 21st century this is mainly done by translators. When translators want neologisms, they request the Māori Language Commission to bank these with etymologies to justify the words in *kupu hou* (new words), that is, lists of words created by the Commission (Simcock Reweti, interview, May, 2012).

However, the Māori Language Commission does consider itself the guardian of the written language for which it is now giving guidelines to promote standardisation of Māori in its written form. These guidelines include short vowels, word division, capitalisation, verbs with irregular passive forms, names of the days and months in

Māori, and punctuation and typographical terms. The latest guidelines came out in September 2012, called “Guidelines for Māori Language Orthography”. Included was an addendum, additional points added in 2012. There is no major addition concerning spelling but just some minor details such as the use of “hia”, and place names with ‘O’ or ‘Ō’ as their initial word.

Acquisition Planning via Education

A third aspect of language planning is acquisition planning, which some writers prefer to call “language education policy” (Spolsky, 1998). Writers in the last 10 years or so have developed this aspect at length, e.g., Wright (2004), Tollefson (2002), Kaplan and Baldauf (1997), Spolsky (2004), and Ricento (2006). It is not surprising to see a flurry of such writings as it is acquisition planning that can determine the future of a language or languages. This planning is usually done at government level, and status planning, and corpus planning are the very elements of such plans. Education is usually the key vehicle. Spolsky again gives a straightforward definition of language acquisition planning: “The policy determining which language should be taught and learned” (1998. p. 74).

For a country, it is always the major language of that country that is firstly given pre-eminence, as it is the main one used for daily life, such as for education, the media, and public service. Citizens are encouraged to be literate in the majority language and governments try to set up opportunities that ensure this. Other languages spoken within a country are called by different names according to their history or situation within the country. There are those called indigenous languages, community languages, heritage languages, international languages, trade languages, sign languages. Other languages are sometimes learned as the languages of sacred texts of particular religions, e.g., Hebrew for Jews, Classical Arabic for Moslems, Sanskrit for Hindus. Whatever the language, there are always groups of people who strive for the maintenance and use of their language. This is where language policy becomes very important. A language policy within a country can ensure the continued strength of a language or can be very much responsible for a language even disappearing as vividly observed by Crystal (2000) in his book “Language Death”.

In the schools themselves: (Note that most of the observations on New Zealand schools that follow are personal to me, the researcher, after spending 43 years teaching languages mainly in New Zealand schools as well as some years teaching in New Caledonia, Germany, and China).

The overall guidelines for the teaching of languages in schools are found in *the New Zealand Curriculum 2007*. *Learning languages* is now an essential learning area and by 2010 all schools with classes Years 7 to 10 had to provide opportunities for students to learn another language. However, there is great independence in each school about the teaching of languages. Such issues as which language(s) to learn, the level students start their learning, and the duration of courses are all individual schools' decisions. The actual decision-makers vary from school to school. The following are all people or groups who influence language decisions: the principal of the school, the Board of Trustees, deputy principals, curriculum committees, deans, heads of departments, careers advisers, overseas marketers, parent-teacher associations. The availability of qualified teachers also has a bearing on language choice. The availability can depend on what is taught at the Colleges of Education, now part of local universities, and therefore, dependant on what languages the universities teach. From the point of view of having Māori as a compulsory language in schools, the Government would need to promote the language and set up a scheme to train many more teachers of Māori.

Although students can begin learning a language at Year 7, an obstacle to further learning is the lack of co-ordination between primary / intermediate and secondary schools. When students begin secondary school there is usually not much notice taken of their prior learning of languages in the primary/ intermediate schools. There are a number of reasons for this. These schools teach languages for a great variety of durations, from once a week for a term, to once a week for a year. The language learned in these schools may not be taught at the secondary school. A number of contributing schools provide the intake for a particular secondary school and there is often no combined language policy among contributing schools. When students go to a secondary school, the classes they are put into are often decided by what subjects they take and sometimes their ability in subjects such as Mathematics and English.

Commenting on this very aspect, McLauchlan, in his survey concerning attrition among language students at secondary schools, quotes a Head of Languages at a New Zealand school as saying that schools saw languages as secondary to subjects such as Mathematics and Science and adds: “This is where the principal’s own educational vision can be a decisive factor in whether L2s are vaunted or allowed to drift into obscurity” (2007.p. 110).

Continuation of learning languages to senior classes is not straightforward. Younger students are often tempted to give up a language to take another subject that may appeal to them. Older students can be advised by deans, parents, careers advisors, or other teachers to drop a language for another subject. Sometimes the structure of the school timetable eliminates the choice of certain languages. At other times it is the choice of the type of public examination a student takes. This can happen, for instance, when a school offers both NCEA and Cambridge examinations. This can complicate the timetable for choice of some subjects. As a language needs to be started at the beginning of secondary school and usually is not begun at higher levels, diminishing class size can mean the language is shelved or the students have to go into a combined class, e.g., Years 12 and 13 together. This pessimistic situation for learning languages at secondary school was commented on after a longitudinal study by Alastair McLauchlan, in his book: *The negative L2 climate: Understanding attrition among second language students*. Commenting mainly about why students give up languages, he writes:

A large percentage of those who did not choose an L2 were already victims of the negative L2 climate. The process can begin in something as casual as a throw-away line by a peer or parent, off-hand comments from teachers of non-L2 subjects, careers advisors and others, or from negative backlash. (2007. p.128)

Nationally, in the senior school, there are three different examinations that students may sit: NCEA, Cambridge, or the International Baccalauréat. This means that students of these different examinations are following three different curricula for languages. As for the NCEA itself, after almost a decade since it began, developments in its policy keep happening at what some teachers think is a haphazard rate.

Within language teaching itself, there are many aids not present in the past, especially because of technology. Most teachers are now issued with laptops and the data projector is becoming more and more a common classroom tool. This means that computer programmes are available for the classroom and the internet itself is now commonly used. Some language departments are now setting up wikis that teachers, students, and parents have access to. Classrooms are using email, skype, moodles, digital video recordings for oral assessment, magic boards, mobile phones, iPods, iPads, film making, YouTube, Twitter, Facebook, Second Life, and the like, not used even five or ten years ago. Barnett et al in *“Use of technology to improve learning outcomes evaluative report”* state:

Appropriate use of ICTs can help students make connections, overcome barriers of distance and time, learn about other cultures, and allows them to hear native speakers of the target language. These documents state that students learning is enhanced by effective pedagogy and effective use of ICTs is a key factor in creating an effective 21st Century learning environment for the learning of languages. (Barnett et al. 2009, p. 4)

The Ministry of Education is funding cluster groups of schools around the country for professional development for information technology. For international languages, native speakers, who act as language teaching “assistants”, come from China, Japan, France, Germany, and Spain to help out the language teacher both in the classroom and by taking small groups themselves. Numerous schools also take student trips to the countries where the language they are studying is spoken. The presence of international students, who are native speakers, in language classes has given students a taste of the immediate rather than some far off feeling of what a native speaker is really like. Not only teachers but also students have opportunities of exchanges in the countries where their chosen language is spoken. Such initiatives provide a lot more exposure to the languages than has been traditional in earlier years in New Zealand. Language teachers in schools are finding that spoken and listening skills have shown a marked improvement because of the exposure mentioned. Yet again the place of the Māori language in the country becomes important. The language is here. The culture is here. Opportunities can easily be taken to learn the language.

Languages in New Zealand

Before World War II, the main languages spoken in New Zealand were English and Māori. From the end of World War II until the present day, it has been the migration to New Zealand of a variety of peoples who speak languages other than English that has changed the largely monolingual demography of the country. Some of the migrants assimilated into the country, adopting English as their main language. One example is the Dutch:

The major migration of Dutch speakers to New Zealand took place from the early fifties to the mid sixties of the last century...the second generation are generally considered to be assimilated New Zealanders. (Kuiper, 2005, p. 232)

In the 1960s and 1970s New Zealand suffered a severe labour shortage. This shortage was taken up mainly by migrants from the Pacific Island. Generally these people strove to maintain their languages both in the community and in the homes (Roberts, 2005).

New Zealand Sign Language (NZSL) emerged in the early 1980s. For a good hundred years in New Zealand the oralist approach (speech articulation and lip-reading) was taught. But the oralist approach eventually meant that the majority of Deaf people had a poor level of education (Dugdale, 2000). To promote and maintain NZSL throughout the country, there was a concerted move to have it recognized as an official language of New Zealand (McKee & Kennedy, 2005). NZSL became an official language of New Zealand in 2006.

In 1987, a new Immigration Act passed into law. This ended the preference of migrants from Britain, Europe or Northern America based on race, and instead classified migrants on their skills, personal qualities, and potential contribution to the New Zealand economy and society. After this, a major push for migration came, especially from Asia (Bedford, 2003). The statistics for the 2006 census show that the Asian population of New Zealand was then just over 9%. The same census showed the indigenous population, Māori, were 14.6% of the population. The 1970s and 1980s witnessed Māori initiative to revitalise their endangered language. This

revitalisation was eventually shown real support by the New Zealand Government. In 1987, the Māori Language Act was passed, the Māori Language Commission was established, and the status of the Māori language was elevated by making it one of the official languages of New Zealand. Chapter Two sees further discussion on the Māori language and the Māori people.

Language Policy and New Zealand

In 1992, a language policy was developed for New Zealand. It was called *Aotearoa*. It had been mainly language interest groups (Peddie, 1993) that were the drivers of the movement towards formulating a national language policy. There had also been some interest in the Education Ministry shown by the National Languages Policy Taskforce set up in the late 1980s (May, 2005b) and by a few research contracts on aspects of language and language policy, such as by McPherson & Corson in 1989 and Peddie in 1988, when “financial support of the Ministry of Education for a longitudinal comparative study on language policy began” (Peddie, 1997, p.133). Peddie further commented:

These developments show clearly that the Ministry (NZ) has had an interest in language policy for several years, but there is no public evidence of comprehensive planning. (1997, p.133)

East et al. observed:

In August 1990 the Minister of Education announced that the government had agreed to develop and fund a national languages policy (Goff, 1990). The Minister publicly acknowledged that, until that time, issues associated with languages in New Zealand had been dealt with in an ad hoc way. (2007, p.15)

The New Zealand society itself-the Government, education, immigration, trade, tourism, justice, health, and other areas- has provided much of the motivation, that is, the need of all citizens to go about their daily lives successfully and wherever possible there to be some allowance for the ongoing use of their first language(s). In the preamble to the Australian national policy on languages, we read:

Language impinges on all aspects of public and private life and pervades all aspects of society. Individual, ethnic, racial, and national identification and allegiances are often inextricably bound up with language. (1987, p.1)

Among the language interest groups in New Zealand were: migrant languages; Pasifika languages; te reo Māori; New Zealand Sign Language; English for speakers of other languages (ESOL); the Ministry of Education; schools and universities; the Human Rights Commission. Representatives from these groups, and others, were part of the interdepartmental committees, the non-governmental organisations reference group, or were either consulted or sent in submissions for the *Aotearoa* report (Waite, 1992. The Issues, pp. 81-85).

The making of New Zealand's first attempted national language policy – the *Aotearoa* document.

The whole concept of a national languages policy for New Zealand had been under discussion during the 1980s and 1990s (Kaplan, 1994). As has been mentioned above, it had been mainly language interest groups that had been the drivers of the movement towards formulating a national language policy. One of these groups, the New Zealand Association of Language Teachers (NZALT) “had been interested in a comprehensive policy almost since its inception in 1974” (Peddie, 1997, p. 132). In the early 1980s, NZALT had written to a number of government ministries enquiring whether they had a policy on languages. In the mid-1980s, the then Māori and Islands Division of the Ministry in New Zealand had drawn up their own language policies with particular help from Christopher Hawley who was a member of the then Department of Education (Hilary Smith, 2004). May notes that “the *Aotearoa* Report emerged from a National Language Taskforce set up in the late 1980s” (2005b, p.1). In 1988, English as a Second Language group (ESL) and community languages met in Wellington for a national conference. A representative group from this conference drew up proposals for a national languages policy. “They released a bilingual document *Towards a National Languages Policy: Hei putake mo tetahi kaupapa reo mo Aotearoa*” (Hilary Smith, 2004, p. 14).

Late 1989 a delegation headed by Walter Hirsh, former Race Relations Conciliator and a long-time supporter of language policy development, met with both the (Labour) Minister and the Associate Minister of Education...a delegation again met with the Minister of Education early in 1990. (Peddie, 1997, p. 133)

The Minister of Education at the time, Phillip Goff, was supportive of the idea of a language policy and a contract with the Ministry of Education was taken up by Jeffrey Waite (Waite, 1992). Waite was a former member of the Māori Language Commission. However, in October 1990, there was a change of Government (from Labour to National) and Waite's discussion document, *Aotearoa*, was scheduled to be presented to the new Minister of Education, Lockwood Smith, by December 31, 1991. The actual report was published the next year in 1992.

The Document: *Aotearoa* Speaking for Ourselves

This discussion document was published in two parts: Part A, The Overview, and Part B, The Issues. The report made a range of key recommendations, highlighting the following key constituencies who would benefit from a language policy: Māori, Pasifika and other migrant groups; New Zealanders learning international languages, and the New Zealand Deaf Community. May sums up the contents of the document:

Aotearoa provides a considered, comprehensive and cohesive approach to language rights, language planning, and language education in New Zealand. (2007, p. 2)

With such accolades one wonders why this draft language policy did not become more than a discussion document. May observes:

Part of the reason for the failure of the *Aotearoa* Report to have any significant impact on policy (or, more simply, *any* impact) is that the final published document was shorn of any formal recommendations –ending up merely as a discussion document, with all that implies about likely further (in)action. This

occurred because of official reticence about targeting specific funding for such a project. (2005b, p. 3)

Peddie describes some background information given to him about the drawing up of the *Aotearoa* Report:

Informants have reported that there were three versions of the Waite Report in all. The first sometimes referred to as a working document, was circulated among a limited number of government organisations. This version reportedly contained a number of formal recommendations. [However] There were no recommendations in this version (the published report in 1992) released to the public. (1997, p. 134)

The report appeared at a time of political change and educational administrative reform, both of which militated against it being pursued further, let alone implemented. The demographic nature of New Zealand society at that time, in the early 1990s, still reflected a predominantly monolingual English speaking majority, thus further limiting interest in the concerns of a more inclusive, diverse and multilingual language policy. The result was that the Report was simply shelved and ignored (Peddie, 1993; May, 2005b).

However, the actual document itself, *Aotearoa*, remained as a stimulus for future language policy in New Zealand. In the education sector, important initiatives took place at the beginning of the new millennium that will have far-reaching repercussions for the future. The language education sector had a representative in the government ministry who helped progress the cause of language learning in the country. This was Gail Spence who was a contributor to languages education information and policy development and also worked in the Curriculum and Learning Division of the Ministry of Education with responsibility for languages as a curriculum learning area. With East and Shackleford, Spence, in *Promoting a Multilingual Future for Aotearoa/New Zealand* (2007), reiterated that although a national languages policy had not yet been accepted by the New Zealand

Government, the journey towards such a policy had beneficial results, especially for the language education sector:

The Ministry of Education claimed, however, that *Aotearoa* has been referred to from time to time during the curriculum stocktake project [see below], and it was apparent that Ministry support for languages other than English and Te Reo could be harnessed. (East et al. 2007. p. 23)

Even some funding was made available for some areas of language learning. The New Zealand Government's initial allocation for the Second Language Learning Project (SLLP) was \$4.8 million.

The decision to fund the SLLP was made as a means of supporting the New Zealand Curriculum Framework policy initiatives and exploring possible future directions. Its aims were to extend the teaching of second languages in schools and to improve the quality of programmes. (East, et al. 2007. p. 19)

Most importantly was the following:

From 2001 to 2003, however, significant dialogue took place within government that led, in 2003, to what is arguably the most significant strategic step forward in languages-in-education planning since *Aotearoa*- a curriculum recommendation, made as a result of a 'curriculum stocktake', that would make second language learning an entitlement for all public school pupils in Years Seven to Ten [11 to 14 years of age]. (ibid. p. 12)

This language recommendation is now part of *the New Zealand Curriculum 2007* and was put into effect in 2010. Even so, the Government hesitated to make the recommendation compulsory, despite it becoming one of the eight essential learning areas of the curriculum. Instead, schools must offer the opportunity for all students from Years 7-10 to learn a language but it is not compulsory for the pupils to choose a language. The one key stimulus that did come from *Aotearoa* then, was very much in the language education arena.

In New Zealand, 20 years after the draft national policy in languages was published in 1992, beyond some stimulus in the language education arena, there has been little momentum to revive even the draft policy. Just five years after the publication of *Aotearoa*, Peddie questioned the lack of momentum towards the development of a national languages policy in an aptly named article: “Why are we waiting? Languages Policy Development in New Zealand” (1997). He puts forward a number of reasons for the lack of momentum:

The reason for the current absence of a comprehensive New Zealand national languages policy can be examined under five headings: the shifting demographic context; *Te reo Māori*: the *tangata whenua*, “people of the land”; Government and its agencies; Business and wider society; and the economy. (p. 139)

His discussion of these five headings touch mainly on what was happening in New Zealand that tended to add to a negative climate for a national languages policy at that time. 13 and 15 years after *Aotearoa*, May reflects on the lack of momentum towards establishing a national languages policy. He points this out in two of his speeches concerning a New Zealand national language policy at the New Zealand Diversity Forums at Te Papa in Wellington in 2005 and at the Parnell Community Centre in Auckland in 2007 (see May 2005b and 2007). There has been active support for a national language policy by the Human Rights Commission over the years, in particular by its Race Relations Conciliator, Walter Hirsch, leading up to *Aotearoa*, and especially in the last ten years by the Race Relations Commissioner, Joris de Bres. The Human Rights Commission publishes a monthly newsletter, *Te Waka Reo*, National Language Policy Network. Its mission statement is as follows:

The National Language Policy Network is facilitated by the Human Rights Commission as part of the New Zealand Diversity Action Programme. It connects people and organizations with an interest or practical involvement in language issues, to keep them informed of initiatives and activities concerning languages, and to promote further development of national language policy. (Introduction to the *Te Waka Reo* Newsletter)

For the 20th anniversary of *Aotearoa*, as part of the New Zealand Diversity Forum in Auckland in August 2012, a consultation meeting on languages in Aotearoa was held at the AUT University in Auckland. The meeting was chaired by the Royal Society of New Zealand. Members of the meeting shared their apprehension that there was a lack of an on-going forum to plan for the establishment of a New Zealand national languages policy. At this same forum, there was a suggestion that perhaps it was worthwhile beginning a language policy at a regional level and that the Auckland Super Council would be a good place to start:

It was suggested that the new Auckland Council and Auckland Plan may provide an opportunity to develop a languages strategy for Auckland (in the absence of a national policy). (Te Waka Reo, October 2012)

Already work has been done to promote the Māori Language through the Council in *The Māori Plan* for Tamaki Makarau. In this document we read: “Auckland Council to advocate for, and grow community support for compulsory te reo Māori in all Auckland Schools” (2012, p. 32).

The Australian Languages Policy

Here it is worthwhile comparing the Australian National Policy on Languages launched in 1987. After all “it was seen as an example for New Zealand to follow” (Hoffmann, 1998, p. 48). It was also the first national policy on languages in the English-speaking world (Ingram, 2000). May comments on the policy:

A comparison with the Australian National Languages Policy, which was adopted, at least for a time, is also instructive here. In Australia, the NLP was clearly and overtly a cross-departmental initiative, situated within the Prime Minister’s Office. In New Zealand, it was seen primarily a Ministry of Education initiative, and so struggled to gain cross-departmental support. (2005, p. 3)

The existence of a language policy in Australia seemed an unlikely occurrence even in the early 20th Century of the country. Ozolins comments:

With a past history that ran from ruthless extermination to non-benign neglect of the small Aboriginal population, with a White Australian Policy to keep out Asians from the near north...Australia was in many ways a recluse among nations. (1993, p. 3)

This White Australian policy restricted non-white immigration to Australia from 1901 to 1973. In 1975, the Australian Government passed the Racial Discrimination Act, which made racially-based selection criteria illegal. In 1978, came the Galbally Review, which became the basis for government policies for migrant services for the next decade. It was a shift away from an integration policy towards multiculturalism. Ingram adds that the Review

comprehensively reviewed multicultural policies and advocated support for language maintenance programme and expanded community language learning in schools, encouraged language learning by professionals, and recommended the employment of bilinguals in public contact positions. (2000. p.5)

He then quotes from the Galbally Review, pointing out its essential position:

Every person should be able to maintain his or her culture without prejudice or disadvantage and should be encouraged to understand and embrace other cultures. (Galbally Review, 1978, p. 4)

The Review was all very well as an indicator of what the country ideally needed as far as multiculturalism was concerned, but it was not a structured language policy supported by recommendations and funding. So in 1978

the Australian Federation of Modern Language Teachers Associations and the Applied Linguistics Association of Australia, started advocating the development of a national policy on languages. (Ingram, 2000, p. 6)

Other organisations endorsed this call, but it took the acceptance of the Government for a pathway forward to establish a national policy:

Eventually, on 25 May 1982, the question of “The Development and Implementation of a Coordinated Language Policy for Australia” was referred by the Australian Senate to its Standing Committee on Education and the Arts with terms of reference that included guidelines for a national language policy. (Ingram, 2000, p. 6)

At the end of this decade, a National Australian Languages Policy was established (Lo Bianco, 1987). The Policy not only provided a comprehensive outline concerning languages and associated areas in society, but also added recommendations and suggestions for accompanying funding. Looking ahead to ongoing implementation of the Policy, it particularly recommended the setting up of an Advisory Council on Australia’s Language Policy (ACALP). This was to ensure a structured implementation of the Policy.

However, the progress of the Australia Languages Policy did not last in its original form. Hamer observed:

Before implementation of the recommendations had gathered momentum the Government began to steer in a different direction, viewing language policy in terms of short-term economic goals based upon trade and tourism links with Asia rather than the longer-term, nation-building aspirations articulated in the NPL. (Hamer, 2010, p. 12)

Hamer then quotes the linguist, Sally Boyd, who noted the shift that had taken place by 2007, 20 years after the national policy was drawn up:

From a comprehensive policy both in terms of languages and potential speakers, with several coalescing goals, Australia’s policy has gradually changed to a policy emphasizing a few languages which are believed to

provide economic benefits for individuals and for the country as a whole.
(Boyd, 2007, p. 168)

Welsh in Wales

While Australia is a guide for what New Zealand could do for its own aspiring language policy, Wales has a long history promoting Welsh and has many lessons that New Zealand could learn from. The progress of Welsh in Wales is sometimes compared to Māori in New Zealand. In writing about the Welsh Language Board, Julia de Bres, 2008, observes in a footnote:

New Zealand policymakers and researchers have looked to Wales for inspiration in relation to language marketing as early as Nicholson and Garland (1991) and the Welsh experience was noticed by policymakers in developing the Māori Language Information Programme [Te Puni Kōkiri, 2003, p. 11]. (p. 242, footnote 89)

In the following, I am indebted to Stephen May and his description of Welsh in Wales in the 2012 revision of his book: “Language and Minority Rights”.

According to the 2011 census, the population of Wales was then 3,006,400 and it listed about 20% of the population who said they could speak Welsh. However, Welsh in Wales has a long history. It has been a spoken language from at least the sixth century and there are written records as far back as the eighth century (May, 2012). In 1588, the Welsh translation of the Bible “allowed Welsh to remain a standardized literary language, with the capacity to be used in any domain” (May, 2012, p. 274).

The Welsh language experienced highs and lows through the centuries. It had been a majority language in Wales. In the 16th and 17th centuries Wales remained 90 percent Welsh-speaking but there was a rapid loss of those speaking the Welsh language in the 20th century:

It has been the diminution of the status of Welsh and its restriction to private, low status language domain which has proved to be more debilitating

historically. It is this more than anything else, which led to the rapid loss of the Welsh language over the course of the 20th century”. (May, 2012, p. 273)

Revitalisation of the language has been taking place in the 20th and 21st centuries. The movement of Welsh speakers to urban areas, Welsh-medium schools, Language Acts, Welsh in the media, and eventual greater self-government have all aided this revitalisation. Wales had passed the Welsh Language Act in 1967 and an updated Welsh Language Act in 1993. This Act put Welsh and English on an equal basis. The Act specifies three things: it places a duty on the public sector to treat Welsh and English on an equal basis, when providing services to the public in Wales; it gives Welsh speakers an absolute right to speak Welsh in court; it establishes the Welsh Language Board to oversee the delivery of these promises and to promote and facilitate the use of the Welsh language.

The Welsh Language Board produced a strategic plan for the future. This document listed 11 fields of work that the Board considers to be the main priority areas. The priority list was: Language transmission in the family; children aged 0-7; Welsh language and bilingual; use of Welsh by young people; promoting and facilitating the use of Welsh in the community; using Welsh in the private sector; Welsh language schemes and developing and providing services in the Welsh language; normalising bilingualism; promoting language rights as part of the equal opportunities field; information technology and corpus planning; research and data.

One of the primary drivers for the Act was the Welsh Language Society, active since 1962. The activities of the Welsh language Society

contributed, at least in some measure, to the normalization of bilingual public signs, the establishment of a Welsh language media, notably the Welsh language television channel, Sianel Pedwar Cymru [S4C] as well as a Welsh Language Board, and to an increasing demand for public services available in Welsh. (May, 2012, p. 271)

Wales is one of the countries of the United Kingdom and government control of much of its affairs had been conducted by the British Westminster Parliament. In 1964, the

Welsh Office was established, effectively creating the basis for territorial governance of Wales. The Welsh Office had limited powers. In 1998, the National Assembly of Wales came into existence. This is a devolved assembly with power to make legislation in Wales. Yet the devolved government in Wales initially had limited functions which were greatly enhanced in the first decade of the 21st century. Eventually a referendum held in Wales in March 2011 provided the Welsh Assembly Government “with the authority to enact *primary* legislation in the areas in which it has devolved responsibilities” (May, 2012, p. 272).

By far the most significant development has been the replacement of the Welsh Language Board with an Official Language Commission in February 2011, via the 2011 Welsh Language (Wales) Measure. The Commissioner’s role will be precisely to address the longstanding weaknesses of statutory compliance in relation to the provision of Welsh language services to the public. (May, 2012, pp. 281-282)

Returning to the New Zealand scene, we can see one of the recommendations of a recent report for the Māori language, *Te Reo Mauriora* (May, 2011), to be for a Minister of the Māori language. This recommendation, together with another initiative in the country to make Māori a core subject, at least for primary schools, can take Wales as a precedent for what could happen in New Zealand.

Whether or not New Zealand will adopt a national language policy is a matter of speculation at the present time. But, what is certain, is the existence of a Māori language policy, especially since 2003 with the Māori Language Strategy. This is explored in the following chapter.

CHAPTER TWO: THE MĀORI LANGUAGE

In this chapter, the history of the Māori language in Aotearoa/New Zealand is described in detail from pre-European times to the present day. This historical description of the language serves as a framework for the section dealing with the revitalisation of the language, especially in the last 30 years. Pivotal points are the Māori Language Act in 1987 and the Māori Language Strategy in 2003. Some comparisons are made with the situation of the Australian Language Policy and especially the ongoing revitalisation of the Welsh language in Wales. Māori in Australia gets a mention as “this has been raised as an issue for language maintenance in research from Paul Hamer of the Institute of Policy Studies” (Human Rights Commission, 2011).

From pre-European Colonisation to the 21st Century

The Māori language is the most southerly member of the Austronesian language family (Harlow, 2007). Within this language family, Māori is a Polynesian language. Around 1000 years ago, the early ancestors of the Māori migrated from the Eastern Pacific (Sutton, 1994). From today’s different tribal groups in Aotearoa/ New Zealand, it seems a number of different canoes brought Māori to the country (Taonui, 2009). For example, the tribes of Waikato claim the “Tainui” canoe, those from the East Coast of the North Island claim the “Takitimu” canoe and so on. Be that as it may, the Māori language today is easily understood throughout the country with few regional differences. These differences are minor, mainly being in pronunciation and some vocabulary. It has been suggested that these regional dialects originate from the different villages or islands the canoes came from (Benton, 1981).

The Māori people inhabited New Zealand a good 800 years before the Europeans, mainly British, arrived in the country. 800 years of history in Britain witnessed much change and development for the people and their language. This period of history saw Britain progress from the medieval period, to the Reformation, the Age of Empire and the industrial revolution up to modern times. Literature and the Arts flourished and works were written in English from the time of the religious monks continuing on to the printing press.

During this same period, the Māori people experienced their own development of rich traditions. Unlike the British, Māori did not have any written tradition but a very extensive oral tradition. Māori had their own religion, their own gods. Their view of the world was essentially a religious one. Their gods stem from their own creation stories (Best, 1934). The oral tradition was not just a haphazard handing on of tales from the past. In pre-European times Māori had their own school of learning known as the *whare wānanga*. Each tribe of importance contained certain men skilled in tribal history, in long-conserved myth and ritual (Best, op.cit.). The men who passed on the wisdom of the ancestors were called *tohunga*. The *tohunga* was an expert practitioner of any skill or art, religious or otherwise. *Tohunga* may include expert priests, healers, navigators, carvers, builders, teachers and advisors (Best, 1924). However, the *tohunga* were under the authority of the head person of the Māori tribe, *iwi*, and he was called the *rangatira* or “chief”. So these two offices, the *tohunga* and the *rangatira*, passed on much knowledge to their people. Learning was by committing stories and information to memory and passing these on to others orally. Exact rituals have been maintained to modern times. These rituals are especially observed in the *marae*. The welcoming ceremony, the *pōwhiri*, is of special significance as it contains a glimpse into the very oral tradition of Māori. Those being welcomed on to the *marae*, the *manuhiri*, needed to be aware of the expected rituals. Chosen women were taught how to call the guests on to the *marae*, the *karanga*. Different parts of the *pōwhiri* ceremony require singing, *waiata*. These songs are appropriate to the people being welcomed and the particular occasion. Once on the *marae*, the guests are addressed by a man whose task is to use a ritualistic welcome, *whaikōrero*, built on ancient tradition. The speaker often relates a long genealogy, a *whakapapa*, which tells of the ancestors of the people of the *marae*. This part of the welcome usually takes place in a meeting house, the *whareniui*. All around the guests will see carvings learnt from ancient times and evidence both of ancestors and religious gods.

The *waiata* are not only songs but often poems set to music. There are a great number of *waiata* in existence today, witness of an extensive oral tradition. In addition there are *moteatea* which are poems and laments, a selection of tribal chants utilizing song poetry and melodies of limited range. Also handed down from the ancestors were

wise sayings, proverbs, *whakatauki*, that encapsulated much meaning in a few words, for example:

Ko taku reo taku ohōho, ko taku reo taku mapihi mauria –

“My language is my awakening, my language is the window to my soul.”

This is a proverb closely associated with language revitalisation, a struggle which is very important in maintaining culture.

As has been mentioned, another source of oral tradition that handed down knowledge from the past were the formal speeches, *whaikōrero*, given on the marae (Rewi, 2010). These speeches followed a set format and often enough related some of the history both of the local iwi and the visiting tribes. Traditional rituals, *waiata*, *moteatea*, *whakatauki*, and *whaikōrero* make up much of Māori “literature”, a literature that is oral rather than written.

However, “Māori first encountered writing on the earliest European ships to anchor in their harbours” (Jones & Jenkins, 2011, p. 9). Māori became fascinated with the written word, especially when they discovered the European visitors had lists of their own [Māori] words that they had collected from other seafarers:

It is hard to imagine the shock experienced by Māori who first heard written words speak in the local language. The startling fact about writing was that Pākehā marks could “say” Māori words; Pākehā texts could have Māori meaning. (Jones & Jenkins, 2011, p. 9)

These same two authors relate how Māori wanted to learn to read and write and eventually they became prolific writers producing their own newspapers (See *Niupepa: Māori newspapers (1842-1933)* Alexander Turnbull Library-a microfiche collection. Wellington).

In the late 18th century and early 19th century, a variety of types of British people came to New Zealand: explorers, missionaries whalers, sealers, traders, settlers, convicts. This was over a period of about 70 years before 1840 (Orange, 2011). Māori

could see the advantage of trading a variety of goods with the newcomers to their land. But without an agreed way of behavior between Māori and the Europeans, the lack of law governing behavior witnessed a deteriorating state in society and both Māori and new European authorities saw the need of a significant agreement to achieve acceptable behavior, whether it be such aspects as relationships one to the other or such issues as land sales. This led to the Treaty of Waitangi, ratified in 1840. It was an agreement between Māori and the British. However, many problems have stemmed from the signing of the Treaty as two versions were signed at the time (Mullholland & Tawhai, 2010; Graham, 1997). The Māori version is what most Māori chiefs signed, a good 500 of them. Only 39 chiefs signed the English version (Orange, op.cit.). From the viewpoint of te reo Māori, this thesis focuses on the Māori version of the Treaty, particularly on the words in the second article: *tino rangatiratanga* - Chieftanship/sovereignty/self-determination- and *taonga* -treasures. Māori saw their language as a treasure. They were accustomed for centuries to the authority of their chiefs, the *rangatira*, and saw the treaty giving them chiefly authority, *rangatiratanga*, over their own language. This aspect of the language being a “treasure”, a *taonga*, was recognized subsequently by the Waitangi Tribunal under the Te Reo Māori Claim (WAI 11) and explicitly stated in the Māori Language Act of 1987.

A worrying factor for Māori in the 19th century was their decrease in population and the increase in the population of the Europeans. At the turn of the century in 1800, there were reported to be about 100,000 Māori in New Zealand. By 1840 the Māori population had decreased to about 70,000, although the number of Europeans in 1840 was only about 2000 people (Durie, 1999). 15 years after the signing the Treaty, in 1858, the Māori population was just 56,049, (census figures 1858). In 1858, the first official census to collect data about Māori took place. Just 38 years later the 1896 census revealed an all time low of 42,113 for the Māori population, whereas the European population climbed to 777,000 by 1900. This radical changing of the population numbers saw, at the same time, the Europeans quickly taking over control of the country and, little by little, their ignoring of much of the Treaty agreements.

Among the early Europeans to arrive in New Zealand were missionaries. They saw one of their tasks to be educating the local people, the Māori people. For this

education they began their missionary Māori schools. The first one was established in 1816. The early missionaries learnt the Māori language and all teaching was done in the Māori language. In 1847, the settler government issued the Education Ordinance. This moved control over the education of Māori children from the missionaries to the settler government. Māori schools that accepted this situation also had to agree to their children being educated in English. In 1867, the Native Schools Act was promulgated. This brought about the beginning of colonial secular schooling for Māori.

The development of mission schools meant that schooling for Māori commenced 61 years before the establishment of schooling for the wider settler community, which was formalised through the 1877 Education Act and introduced a national, free, secular and compulsory state system of Primary schools. (Pihama et al, 2004, p. 29)

In 1879, the administration of the Native Affairs Department was transferred to the Education Department (Barrington, 2008). Social control of Māori and their assimilation was gradually being manipulated, especially through education of their children. Along with this was the shift from the Māori language to English by Māori people, especially outside the home as children were forbidden to speak Māori at their schools. Furthermore, some Māori perceived benefits to themselves and their children in learning English, so as to take more advantage for what was on offer from Europeans. Indeed, in the 1920s, Sir Āpirana Ngata began lecturing Māori communities about the need to promote English language education for Māori in schools (Barrington & Beaglehole, 1974).

During the 1860s, while the settler government was attempting to set up the education system, a series of wars, the “New Zealand Wars” or “Land Wars” took place between the British and the Māori. In the 1870s, after these wars, society was divided into two distinct zones (Te Taura Whiri, 2012b), one for Māori and one for the Europeans, the *Pākehā*, as they came to be known among Māori. The Māori language was the predominant language of the Māori zone and in the 1890s many Māori language newspapers published national and international news (see Niupepa: Māori newspapers 1842-1933). This zoning contrasts sharply with the New Zealand

Government's 1950s policy during the time of much Māori urbanisation when Māori families were "pepper-potted" in predominantly non-Māori suburbs, preventing the reproduction of Māori community and speech patterns (Te Puni Kōkiri, 2004). At this time, Māori families chose to speak English and Māori children were raised as English speakers. The 1951 census recorded the Māori population as 134,097 people. Contrasting with the 1896 census, which recorded the low of 42,113 people, the Māori population was now a lot more healthy in numbers but had changed very much from a Māori speaking people to mainly an English speaking one. The shift from the country to the city, urbanisation, played an important part in the life of Māori, not least their decreased opportunities to speak Māori. The language domains where Māori could traditionally speak together about many of their concerns in Māori were no longer available (Winitana, 2011). In the urban setting, Māori children were being raised as monolingual speakers of English (Chrisp, 1997b). This meant that intergenerational language transmission would no longer continue in the Māori language. In 1956, 66 per cent of Māori still lived in the country regions (Statistics New Zealand, 2007) compared with the 84 percent of all Māori in 2006 who lived in cities, according to the 2006 census.

From the late 19th century through to the Second World War, the New Zealand Government had employed an assimilationist approach in regard to Māori. New Zealand was one people and English was the language of communication. This assimilationist approach continued right through to 1960 with the introduction of the Hunn Report. This report promoted a new policy of integration. Māori and Pākehā could learn from each other and share their cultures. This integration could be structured within the formal education system. Although this report was a welcome change of direction for Māori people, it did not effect much real change in people's attitude generally. Promotion of the Māori language did not take place and the result was a "continued perception of Māori as an educational problem" (May, 2008, p.296). Among Māori themselves, there was no real sign of revitalisation of their language. English continued to be the main means of communication for both Māori and Pākehā.

A major research survey on the health of the Māori language was undertaken by Richard Benton over a six-year period from 1973. Benton carried out this survey as

part of the Māori Unit of the New Zealand Council for Educational Research. He interviewed 6,915 household heads (Benton, 1997). The survey showed that, by that time only 70,000 Māori, or 18-20 per cent of Māori, were fluent speakers and that most were elderly. The major conclusion was that the Māori language was dying.

Even before Benton undertook his survey, some Māori were becoming concerned about the very survival of their language. In the early 1970s, a group of Māori academics under the leadership of Ranginui Walker of Auckland University, formed themselves into an activist group called Ngā Tamatoa, “The Warriors”. Their concerns were not only about their language but the perceived violations of the Treaty of Waitangi by the New Zealand Government. Similar activities were happening in Wellington at Victoria University where the Te Reo Māori Society were canvassing the province for support for the teaching of the Māori language (Te Rito, 2008). In September 1972, Ngā Tamatoa, together with supporters of the Te Reo Māori Society, presented a petition with more than 30,000 signatures to the Government to have Māori taught in schools. Such action was an example of Māori themselves initiating the revitalisation of te reo Māori.

The Ngā Tamatoa initiative to present so many signatures to the Government was a precedent for a series of other important happenings that have had lasting beneficial effects for the revitalisation of the Māori Language. To commemorate the day of petition on September 14 1972, the first Māori Language Day was celebrated and the one day of commemoration was increased to a whole week, the Māori Language Week, to be celebrated annually from 1975 onwards. The actual week was later on moved back from September to July to fit in better with the school year. Just three years after the petition, the Government established the Waitangi Tribunal in 1975. This tribunal is a permanent commission of inquiry. It is charged with making recommendations on claims brought by Māori relating to actions or omissions of the Crown that breach the promises made in the Treaty of Waitangi. Usually the Tribunal has authority only to make recommendations which do not bind the Crown. But it is a platform for Māori to air their grievances and so giving them a better opportunity of the Government listening to them compared to earlier times when the Tribunal did not exist. Certainly the next 10 years saw unprecedented initiatives for the teaching and learning of the Māori language.

In 1977, the first officially sanctioned English/Māori bilingual primary school was established at Ruatoki. In 1979, a course in te reo Māori for Māori adults, Te Ātaarangi, was established. By 1981, the Māori population had risen to 385,000 people. The initiative by Māori to revitalise their own language now had a growing population to help this out. In 1982, there began a total immersion Māori language family programme for young children from birth to six years of age. This was called Te Kōhanga Reo, the “language nest”. Originally the Te Kōhanga Reo pre-schools were taught and administered by parents and whānau (family). Parents had to pay so much a week, for example some paid \$25 a week (Te Reo Māori Claim, 1986) and the number of Kōhanga Reo mushroomed. In the first three years, the number of Kōhanga Reo increased to 416 and the number of children in them to 6000 (op.cit).

In 1983, the first Māori medium radio station, *Te Upoko o te Ika*, was established. 1985 saw the beginning of the first Māori medium primary school, *te kura kaupapa Māori*. In 1986, the Te Reo Māori Claim Wai 11, (of the Waitangi tribunal), was considered. This Claim provided the impetus for much to happen in the next 26 years, from 1986 until 2012. Much was achieved in the very next year under the Māori Language Act. In 1987 the Māori Language Act was passed. The Māori language was recognized as a *taonga* (treasure) under the Treaty.

The Māori Language Commission, Te Taura Whiri i te Reo Māori, was set up as a Crown entity under the Act. It is an autonomous group and has a similar administrative arrangement as the Waitangi Tribunal. The Māori Language Commission has a national overview. It is not iwi affiliated. It has a single mandate to provide everyday language as an ordinary means of communication. The promotional role of Te Taura Whiri is social marketing of te reo Māori, to keep up the momentum created by Māori Language Week. It also declared the Māori Language to be an official language of New Zealand. Furthermore in Courts of Law, Commissions of inquiry and Tribunals, it conferred the right to speak Māori to any member of the Court, any party, witness or counsel (Te Taura Whiri, 2012b).

The Māori Language Act also drew on a number of international precedents, primarily the Irish Bord Na Gaelige Act 1978, which is cited several times in the

legislation, but also the United Kingdom's Welsh Language Act 1967, which enabled the use of the Welsh language in Welsh court proceedings. The revision of the Welsh Language Act in 1993 and the passing of a new Welsh language law by the Welsh Assembly in 2010 has given those drivers of Māori language revitalisation new impetus. The measure makes Welsh an official language in Wales and obliges public bodies and some private companies to provide services in it. It also created a new Welsh language commissioner with enforcement powers in order to protect the rights of Welsh speakers to access services in Welsh. In New Zealand, the document, *Te Reo Mauriora* (April 2011), suggests that a Minister of the Māori Language should be created in the New Zealand Parliament (for a discussion of this document, see pages 50-52). The creation of the Welsh language commissioner gives a precedent for such a move.

Although the Māori Language Act was passed in 1987, Māori still made an appeal to the Privy Council to ensure that their claim for the preservation of their language would be honoured. The Privy Council concluded that the Crown had an obligation to protect and preserve Māori property, including the Māori language, as a *taonga*. From 1840 to 2003, the final superior court of New Zealand had been the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council. Indeed Professor Winiata Whatarangi commented on the need for Māori to have recourse to the Privy Council in view of the New Zealand Government's inconsistent honoring of its promises over the years. The professor said:

Given the way in which the colonial government over the years have behaved, it is important for Māori people to have external bodies like the Privy Council ...to turn to. (Tunks, 1996, p. 123)

The Privy Council acting for New Zealand was abolished in 2003 and was replaced by New Zealand's own Supreme Court. However, the revitalisation of the Māori language, that was largely initiated by Māori themselves, was at last receiving Government support. In 1988, the State Sector Act

required public sector management to recognize the aims and aspirations of Māori people, the employment requirements of Māori people in the Public

Service, and the need for greater involvement of Māori people in the Public Service. (Durie, 2004, p. 12)

In 1991, the Māori Language Amendment Act further strengthened policies set out in the Māori Language Act. The 1989 Education Act required Boards of Trustees to ensure that the school charters embraced Māori concerns. In this same year, 1989, *Kura Kaupapa Māori*, Māori-medium primary schools, first established in 1985, and *Wānanga*, Māori tertiary institutions, were given formal government recognition. The guiding philosophy for the Kura Kaupapa was set out in a government gazette, entitled *Te Aho Matua*. An amendment to the 1989 Broadcasting Act set up *Te Mangai Paho*, the Māori Broadcast Funding Agency, which was formally established in 1993. *Te Mangai Paho* is a Crown Entity. Its statutory role is

to promote Māori language and culture by making funds available, on such terms and conditions as Te Mangai Paho thinks fit, for broadcasting and the production of programmes to be broadcast. (Irirangi.net. 2012)

By 2012, there were 21 Māori radio stations broadcasting. In 1990, the Te Kōhanga Reo gained state funding. The New Zealand Government were now showing they were taking their obligation seriously to protect the Māori language. Because of all these developments related to Māori life, the Government wanted to centralise its Māori activities and so established the Ministry of Māori Development, Te Puni Kōkiri.

Te Puni Kōkiri (TPK) was established by the Ministry of Māori Development Act 1991. The Act sets out three sets of functions: to promote achievement by Māori in employment, economic development, health, and housing; to monitor the performance of other government departments and agencies who are providing services to Māori. This essentially means all of them; to undertake such functions that will be allocated from time to time.

TPK is a Ministry, a government agency, bound by a directive of the Government and its Minister. TPK has some money for research. The prime responsibility concerning

what happens with the Māori language is with the Minister of Māori Affairs and Te Puni Kōkiri reports to him as the person responsible for one of a number of things. The Hon John Luxton, who was Minister of Māori Affairs from 1993-1996, wrote a report called “A Study of Māori Economic and Social Progress” as part of a working paper for Te Puni Kōkiri. In this paper he comments that the possibility of Māori purchasing mainstream services previously supplied by government departments has seen Māori business sectors grow significantly. He then adds:

It has done much to enhance Māori development over the last 20 years. It has also made relevant the need to acquire knowledge of and the means to revive Māori culture, language and mana. (Luxton, 2008, p. 140)

This illustrates the progress made in Māoridom since the initial efforts of revitalisation of language and culture in the 1970s. It is particularly seen in the different iwi, such as Ngāi Tahu (see Ngāi Tahu Education Strategy, 2006) and Tainui, for example, the many grants available to study at university where proceeds from business have been often used for efforts within the iwi for their own revitalization (see Waikato Tainui, 2012).

Meanwhile, in the late 1980s, a number of ethnic groups in New Zealand were requesting the Government to establish a national New Zealand languages policy. Eventually the Government commissioned a report to be done and Dr Jeffrey Waite (see Chapter One) accepted a contract with the Ministry of Education to undertake the project. The resulting discussion document was called *Aotearoa* “Speaking for Ourselves”, which was published in two parts: Part A: The Overview, and Part B: The Issues. For discussion of the background and content of *Aotearoa*, see Chapter One, pp. 17-21).The following concerns the Māori language references in the document.

In this *Aotearoa* document, te reo Māori held a prominent position. In the executive summary, it states that the document “identifies the need for more urgent effort to sustain and revitalise the Māori language” (The Overview, p. 5).

When the focus is on the Māori language in the document, the important position of te reo Māori within New Zealand is made clear:

As the language of the tangata whenua and an official language (since 1987), Māori will occupy a central place in any language policy framework. More than any other language in New Zealand, Māori faces a serious threat to its future as the distinctive vehicle of a distinctive culture. (The Issues, p. 30)

A broad section of society had contributed to the document, both governmental representatives and non-governmental organisations. Although the document remained just a discussion document, different sections of it were actioned, particularly in education and broadcasting. From the Māori point of view, a momentum was building from the different spheres of action and discussion from the late 1980s and early 1990s.

In 1993, *Te Māngai Pāho*, the Māori Broadcasting Funding Agency, was established. *Te Māngai Pāho* is a Crown Entity established to make funding available to the national network of Māori radio stations and for the production of Māori language television programmes, radio programmes and music CDs. This was a significant development in the continuum of Māori language revitalisation. The vision statement of *Te Māngai Pāho* is:

Ahakoā kei whea, Ahakoā āwheā, Ahakoā pēwheā, Kōrero Māori!

“ Māori language-everyday, everyway, everywhere.”

In *Te Māngai Pāho's Statement of Intent 2011-2016*, a priority goal is for Māori language revitalisation. This document is not only descriptive of what is now available from Māori radio and television, but looks to the future of its broadcasting and even its narrowcasting where, in the e-Media section, it describes the possibilities of people interacting with the media when they wish to. This Māori broadcasting and narrowcasting give homes innumerable opportunities to be exposed to te reo Māori. This exposure is in contrast to the shrinking of domains for hearing and speaking the Māori language, as noted earlier, after widespread urbanisation of Māori people.

Besides broadcasting, education is another domain where revitalisation continued to happen. In the 1984 Review of the Core Curriculum, a concept called *taha Māori* was incorporated into the curriculum. Teachers in mainstream schools were encouraged to foster the knowledge of Māori culture and, to some extent, Māori language. For a time, the Ministry of Education partially funded teachers of Māori, via the *Te Atakura* scheme, to be an aid for taha Māori for teachers in mainstream schools. In primary schools another scheme was *Te Ata Hāpara*. Published between 1990 and 1994 by Learning Media for the New Zealand Ministry of Education, a resource, called *Matariki*, provided teachers of Years one to eight students with material for teaching te reo Māori in English-medium schools. *Te Ata Hāpara* supported the material, providing teachers themselves with a course in the language. There were situations where the teachers themselves were only slightly ahead of the level of their students. Such schemes were only partially successful and did not last. However, there was consolidated progress happening in Māori-medium schools.

In Māori-medium education, the pupils who graduated from the *Te Kōhanga Reo*, begun in 1982, to the *Kura Kaupapa Māori*, Māori-medium primary schools, begun in 1985, were given further opportunity in 1993 when Māori-medium High Schools, *wharekura*, were created. In addition, adults were given their opportunity to learn Māori with the establishment of the first Māori tertiary institutes, *wānanga*, for example the *Te Wānanga o Aotearoa*.

Many of the examples mentioned above were largely confined to the various educational establishments and did not reach out noticeably into the wider society of the country. To fulfill this need, the Māori Language Commission promoted 1995 as a year for the celebration of the Māori Language (Chrisp, 1997a, Nicholson, 1997). The articles written by these two writers very much summed up the purpose of the theme year. Nicholson's article was entitled: "Marketing the Māori Language" and Chrisp's: "He Taonga Te Reo: The Use of a Theme Year to Promote a Minority Language." Revitalisation of the language needed to go beyond Māori people themselves and gain an acceptance in society when there might be occasions for people to speak that language and feel natural to be doing so. For often enough the *whakamā*, feeling embarrassed, factor is very real for Māori people. Chrisp summed up the rationale for the theme year:

The [Māori Language] Commission's decision was based on the premise that a theme year would facilitate a concerted promotional effort to raise the status of the Māori language among the Māori population, and throughout New Zealand society.(op.cit. p. 100)

Even before the Theme Year, Māori had shown their unrest concerning the lack of planning for the future of the Māori language. In October 1994, a Māori Language March to Parliament, *Te Hikoī Reo Māori*, took place. In 1972, there had been the Māori Language Petition to Parliament and, in 1987, the Māori Language Act was enacted. But there appeared to be very little subsequent progress in the revitalisation of the language. Māori requested the adoption of a comprehensive strategic plan for the language. Julia de Bres, in her Appendix: "Background on the Māori language situation" to her PhD thesis: *Planning for tolerability: promoting positive attitudes and behaviours towards the Māori language among non-Māori New Zealanders*, details the happenings from the language march in 1994 through to the adoption of a comprehensive Māori language strategy in 2003. She writes:

Government language planning up until the mid 1990s was uncoordinated and largely reactive, developing in specific sectors in response to initiatives by Māori or the findings of the courts. (p. 10)

The people on the *Te Hikoī Reo Māori* in 1994 requested the Government to adopt a comprehensive strategic plan for te reo Māori. In 1995, the Government directed the Māori Language Commission, under contract to Te Puni Kōkiri, to prepare a long term Māori language strategic plan. The resulting consultation document was called *Toitu te Reo*. This was a significant document. It constituted "the first official attempt by the Government towards developing a comprehensive Māori Language Strategy" (p. 12).

Always with an eye to cost, in 1998, the Government Treasury commissioned international planners, Francois Grin and Francois Vaillancourt, to explore the feasibility of Māori language regeneration (Grin & Vaillancourt, 1998). Their report did indicate there was potential for effective revitalisation of the language but

suggested that on-going monitoring was essential (Keegan, 2011). In 1999, Te Puni Kōkiri released its own document, a stocktake of Māori language efforts called *Te Tūaoma Te Reo*: “The Steps that have been taken”. This document was released by the then Minister of Māori Affairs, the Hon. Tau Henare. Mr Henare realised the challenge ahead and, in a press release, said: “Keeping the Māori language alive into the 21st century will require a gigantic effort from both Māori and the Government” (1999).

What was becoming clear now compared to earlier years was that Māori had Government support. However, the document emphasized the necessity for Māori themselves to develop their own ways of revitalisation in their iwi, hapū, and whānau. Te Puni Kōkiri continued their own vigorous research and produced their own surveys: 2001 *Survey of the Health of the Māori Language* (TPK 2002a) and the 2001 *Survey of Attitudes, Values and Beliefs about the Māori Language* (TPK 2002b.)

All this work culminated in the release in 2003 of *Te Rautaki Reo Māori* “The Māori Language Strategy”. This Strategy has a vision towards the future. Its goal was: “To move the Māori language to the next stage in revitalisation over the next 25 years, by focusing on greater Māori language use in communities” (p. 5). 2028 was the year the goal was set for. The hope was that the domains where the language would be spoken, especially in homes and in communities, would be the everyday occurrence, not just official marae visits. It envisaged all New Zealanders appreciating the value of this revitalisation.

The emphasis of the Strategy is spoken Māori. This is noted on the title page of the document: “*He Reo e kōrerotia ana, he reo ka ora* A spoken language is a living language” (p.1). The Strategy takes a long view of revitalisation. It muses over the last 25 years and looks ahead to the next 25 years:

A twenty-five year vision has been developed as it reflects a generation of change. Over the last twenty-five years, the emphasis has been on Māori language teaching and learning and rebuilding a critical mass of speakers, particularly through formal education. While this work must continue, this strategy sets out to move the Māori language to the next stage of revitalisation over the next twenty-five years, by focusing on greater Māori language use in

communities. This work is particularly important in the whānau environment. By normalising the use of Māori language in whānau settings, language acquisition by future generations will become an accepted feature of everyday life and this will see the language flourish. (p. 5)

I have quoted this paragraph in full as it sums up the whole gist of the Strategy. The Strategy does not rely on mere words of aspiration but sets out five goals to support the achievement of the vision. These are strengthening language skills, language use, education opportunities in the Māori language, community leadership for the Māori language, and recognition of the Māori language by the wider New Zealand society. A good proportion of the Strategy outlines details for these five goals. As has been done in this thesis, the Strategy is set within the framework of the history of the Māori language. It also describes the health of the Māori language at the time the Strategy was drawn up. Six agencies lead the Strategy: Te Puni Kōkiri, Te Taura Whiri, Te Mangai Pāho (the Māori Broadcasting Funding Agency), the Ministry of Culture and Heritage, The Ministry of Education, and the National Library of New Zealand. The Strategy acknowledges the partnership of Māori with the Government in Māori language revitalisation. The document of the Strategy was produced by both the Ministry of Māori Development *Te Puni Kōkiri*, and the Māori Language Commission *Te Taura Whiri i te Reo Māori*. The separate roles that both Māori and Government are expected to undertake are spelled out in detail. The planning and implementation of the five goals within the Māori Language Strategy were allocated to *Te Puni Kōkiri*. Over the next few years, *Te Puni Kōkiri* published reviews on various aspects of the Māori language, e.g., 2004- *Te Reo Māori i te hāpori: Māori language in the community*; 2006- *The Health of the Māori Language*; and 2007 *Statement of Intent-2007-2010*. In 2006 the Auditor-General carried out an audit: "Implementing the Māori Language Strategy". The findings indicated that "by the 30 June 2004 deadline set by Cabinet, no agency had completed and finalized a plan that fully met the Strategy's requirements" (p. 28). But the audit added:

In our view, Te Puni Kōkiri had properly monitored the health of the Māori language through surveying the health of the Māori language and attitudes to the Māori language. It had not yet evaluated the effectiveness and efficiency of the Government's Māori language activities. This was partly because

Strategy planning by the lead agencies had not progressed far enough to provide a basis to assess progress in each area by 2005/2006, when the initial evaluations were scheduled to begin. (p. 29)

Other reviews followed. In 2010, the Waitangi Tribunal released its chapter on te reo Māori from its report on the Wai 262 claim. In 2011, the *Te Reo Mauriora* report was published. This was a comprehensive review led by the Minister of Māori Affairs, the Hon. Pita Sharples. This review was by language experts of the strategy and infrastructure for the Māori language sector (for further discussion of this document, see pages 50-51). And yet, in spite of all these reviews, in July 2012 Human Rights Commission monthly newsletter, *Te Waka Reo*, the Race Relations Commissioner, Joris de Bres, asserted: “The need for a co-ordinated and measurable approach to promoting te reo Māori through a new national strategy is becoming increasingly urgent”. My comments at this stage are that at least there is a strategy and it continues to be worked on. The Human Rights Commission 2011 report on the Māori Language Strategy put it this way: “The current Māori Language Strategy continues to provide direction for work in the Māori language sector” (2011, p. 24).

A measure of how Māori were actually speaking the language can be glimpsed in both the 2001 and 2006 census data. (More up to date census data are not yet available as the 2011 scheduled census did not take place because of the Christchurch earthquakes). Although the census is a self-reporting exercise, it does give some idea of what is happening. The results need to be contextualised in relation to the graphs of population growth. This is because, although the numbers reported to be speaking Māori are down between the two censuses, this does not take into account that the Māori population was continuing to grow. An interesting change is noted in the age range of those who said they could speak Māori. For a long time it had always been the older aged people who continued to speak the language, but in the 2006 census “the level of proficiency in Māori had more than doubled between 2001 and 2006 in the 15-24 and 25-34 age groups” (Julia De Bres, 2008, p. 25).

De Bres noted that by 2006 it was a good 25 years since the first Kōhanga Reo began and the resulting growth in the ability to speak Māori among younger people was

beginning to be manifest. However, the increase was not widespread. Still, it could be said that the language was saved from the extinction yet still remained brittle.

In 2007, *the New Zealand Curriculum* for schools was published. Compared to earlier versions of the New Zealand Curriculum, this one had some major changes of focus. The Treaty of Waitangi, diversity, official languages, the prominent place of te reo Māori—all these aspects were highlighted. At the same time as the English version of the curriculum was published, so was the version for Māori-medium schools: *Te Marautanga o Aotearoa*. In an introductory statement, both documents were signaled as ones of partnership:

Together, the two documents will help schools give effect to the partnership that is the core of our nation's founding document, Te Tiriti o Waitangi / The treaty of Waitangi. (The New Zealand Curriculum, 200, p. 6)

This aspiration is reinforced in the VISION section:

Our vision is for young people who will work to create an Aotearoa New Zealand in which Māori and Pakehā recognise each other as full Treaty partners, and in which all cultures are valued for the contributions they bring. (p. 8)

This Ministry of Education document is a far cry from so many of the assimilationist forces of previous years. In the PRINCIPLES section is stated the expressed opportunity for all students to learn the Māori language and to become aware of its culture:

The curriculum acknowledges the principles of the Treaty of Waitangi, and the bicultural foundations of Aotearoa New Zealand. All students have the opportunity to acquire knowledge of te reo Māori me ōna tikanga. (p. 9)

Te reo Māori is further singled out as one of the official languages of New Zealand. Along with New Zealand Sign Language and English, the Māori Language may be a vehicle for delivering the whole curriculum:” All three (languages) may be studied as

first or additional languages. They may also be the medium of instruction across all learning areas” (p.14).

In the section of the curriculum devoted specifically to te reo Māori, the language is described as follows:

Te reo Māori is indigenous to Aotearoa New Zealand. It is a taonga recognized under the Treaty of Waitangi, a primary source of our nation’s self-knowledge and identity, and an official language. By understanding and using te reo Māori, New Zealanders become more aware of the role played by the indigenous language and culture in defining and asserting our point of difference in the wider world. (p. 14)

This paragraph highlights just how far the Government’s admission of the place and status te reo Māori has progressed in New Zealand. Even more emphasis is placed on the actual aspect of learning a language for a country renowned for many years as being primarily monolingual in English. Another learning area was added to the curriculum, Learning Languages. This learning area does not quite call for particular languages to be compulsory, but does promote the availability of learning languages: “All schools with students in years 7-10 should be working towards offering students the opportunities for learning a second or subsequent language” (p. 44).

In the past, Māori have often enough complained about the lack of consultation with them concerning education. The *2007 New Zealand Curriculum* places an onus of duty on Boards of Trustees:

Each board of trustees, through the principal and staff, is required in consultation with the school’s Māori community, to develop and make its plans and targets for improving the achievement of Māori students. (p. 44)

The Ministry of Education did not leave action concerning Māori achievement to chance, but established a programme called *Ka Hikitia*, “*Managing for Success*”. This meant stepping up the performance of the education system to ensure Māori are enjoying educational success as Māori. This programme was a strategy that set out

specific outcomes, priorities for action and targets over the five-year period of 2008-2012 (Ministry of Education, 2012). One of the principal four focus areas was Māori Language in Education.

In 2009, the Ministry of Education published the Curriculum Guidelines for teaching and Learning Te reo Māori in English-medium Schools: Years 1-13 *Te Aho Arataki Marau mō te Ako i Te Reo Māori- Kura Auraki*. In the foreword of this document, the then Secretary for Education, Karen Sewell, highlighted the importance of the Māori language curriculum:

It is an important milestone in New Zealand education. These guidelines support the Māori Education Strategy Ka Hikitia –Managing for Success. For the first time, we have curriculum guidelines designed specifically to support the teaching and learning of te reo Māori in English-medium schools. Te reo Māori has a special place in The New Zealand Curriculum. (Curriculum Guidelines for Teaching and Learning Te Reo Māori in English-medium Schools: Years 1-13, p. 4)

Parallel with these many movements within education, Māori broadcasting witnessed its own progress. From its first Māori-medium radio station in 1983, 20 years later there were 21 iwi radio stations. With the establishment of *Te Mangai Paho* in 1993 Māori had looked forward to having its own Māori television. In 2004 *Māori Television* was launched. In 1993, the Māori Television Act (*Te Aratuku Whakaata Irirangi Māori*) was passed. In describing the main service of Māori Television, the Act reads:

The principal function of the Service is to promote te reo Māori me ngā tikanga Māori through the provision of a high quality, cost effective Māori television service, in both Māori and English, that informs, educates, and entertains a broad viewing audience, and, in doing so, enriches New Zealand society, culture and heritage. (The Māori Television Act, 1993, p. 10)

The inclusion of some English in Māori Television ensured a following of not only Māori speakers but also those who spoke only English. However, in 2008, the Māori

Television Service launched a second digital channel broadcasting entirely in Māori. The Māori Television chief executive, Jim Mather, said the launch of Te Reo was another milestone in language revitalisation initiatives:” Te Reo builds on the values established with the birth of New Zealand’s indigenous channel” (Kōkiri, 2008).

Not resting with both channels, Māori Television and Te Reo, Jim Mather looks towards the future. In the article: “Māori Television: Restructuring for the Future” Mather comments:

Māori Television’s Board endorsed plans to augment our traditional broadcasting role with a new digital strategy, on the basis that it will increase access to our content via online, mobile, social media, and other emerging technologies. (April, 2012)

This vision was earlier outlined in Te Māngai Pāho’s *Statement of Intent 2011-2016* (see page 39). From broadcasting to narrowcasting, Māori Television is showing itself an active player in today’s society. In 2012, most homes in New Zealand would have ready access to Iwi Radio and Māori Television. The sheltered domain of the marae now broadens to homes where the sound of te reo Māori is possible at the turning of a switch. Already for many people, te reo Māori is also easily accessible using computers and internet and even mobile phones. Those homes that do not have access to internet or mobile phones would generally have at least television access.

From the offices of the Māori Language Commission, the Government, through a programme called *Mā Te Reo*, funds Māori revitalisation projects. Over the 10 year period from 2001 –2010 this programme funded 174 Māori language revitalisation projects. Over \$2.7 million was provided (Ma Te Reo Fact Sheet, 2011). The programmes that are funded are those in the community, such as the various wānanga and iwi te reo Māori revitalisation projects.

Māori in Australia

Since the 1970s, during much of the time the revitalisation of the Māori language has been taking place in New Zealand, a comparatively large number of Māori have emigrated to Australia. In fact, one in six, that is, over 100,000 Māori have made this move over that time (Hamer, 2009). It seems that most commentators on the revitalisation of te reo Māori have not taken into account this emigration of Māori to Australia. A specialist in writing and researching Māori emigrating to Australia, Paul Hamer, notes that just a couple of linguists have taken some note of the emigration of Māori (Hamer, 2010). Benton makes mention of it when writing about the loss of fluent Māori speakers: “taking into account death and emigration to a foreign country” (Benton, 1991, p. 29).

and Waite in his *Aotearoa* document:

It is doubtful that the 3,000 children who currently leave Kōhanga Reo each year speaking Māori are enough to replace those speakers being lost through death or emigration. (1992, p. 18, *Aotearoa-The Overview*)

Hamer (2010) makes many observations about Māori in Australia. Those who move to Australia are not considered *tangata whenua* there, so they cannot claim the same benefits as in New Zealand. The money allocated to the Māori Language Commission in New Zealand may benefit only Māori living in New Zealand. In Australia, the Māori language is deemed a community language but even that is not often taken into account when Māori people seek recognition. Māori move to Australia for a number of reasons, often for higher wages, and, hopefully a better lifestyle. But in so doing, they live in scattered communities and do not have the ties of whānau, hapū, and iwi, as in New Zealand. Among other things this results in a loss of the Māori language as the opportunities to speak Māori are greatly diminished.

The Māori Language Today

The Māori language has had a long history. Before the European colonisers arrived in Aotearoa / New Zealand, Māori was the only language spoken. With the arrival of English speaking migrants in the nineteenth century, initially every one had to speak Māori to converse with the indigenous people and, after a short time, many people became bilingual by necessity in Māori and English. Because of a continued influx of numerous English speaking migrants, very soon English became the main language of communication in the country, even for Māori people. By the 1960s, the Māori language was in danger of dying. The main thrust of revitalisation of the Māori language by the Māori people themselves from the 1970s, as we have seen, eventually witnessed Government recognition for their own input into aiding the revitalisation of the language.

Māori initiatives, together with Government action, have witnessed the setting up of a number of structures that continue to support the revitalisation process. Among these initiatives were: in 1975, the establishment of the Waitangi Tribunal; in 1987, the Māori Language Act; the Māori Language Commission, *Te Taura Whiri i te Reo Māori*; the Māori language becoming an official language of New Zealand; Māori radio stations (21 by 2012); Māori Television (two channels by 2008); the Ministry of Māori Development, *Te Puni Kōkiri*; Māori medium education – *Te Kōhanga Reo*, pre-school, *kura kaupapa Māori*, primary, *wharekura*, secondary, and *wānanga*, tertiary; 2003 The Māori Language Strategy, *Te Rautaki Reo Māori*.

With all of the above infrastructure for revitalisation of the Māori language, it could be easily thought that there would be a rapid impetus in the revitalisation process. However, this impetus is not so easily perceived. A main problem is the still few domains where the language is spoken: at Māori medium schools; at the marae; Māori radio stations and television. For the language to survive it needs to be spoken daily in the home.

Māori spoken in the home was a dominant theme running through a recent discussion paper: *Te Reo Mauriora*- a review of the Māori Language Sector and the Māori Language Strategy, April 2011. This report was commissioned by the Minister of

Māori Affairs, the Hon. Dr Pita Sharples. An independent panel of seven language experts was appointed to identify and support opportunities for enhanced Māori language outcomes as well as better coordination and structuring of the whole government focus so that government can provide the best services and programmes as effectively and efficiently as possible. In the executive summary of this document, the lack of solid revitalisation of the language is highlighted: “The results of 25 to 30 years of Government spend on revitalisation strategies could only be termed ‘patchy’” (p.15). The two main outcomes of the report are focused on the reestablishment of te reo Māori in the home and a new infrastructure for governance. From the Government’s point of view there is the proposal for the creation of a Minister of te reo Māori. There was a call for iwi to lead the revitalisation process. However at the different *hui* (meetings) of a number of the iwi visited for this report, it was noted that te Reo revitalisation had not often enough been a priority after Crown-Treaty settlements. There was a need to convince Māori that the impetus for successful revitalisation rested very much with them, in iwi, hapū, and whānau. The report gives Māori a warning not to rely on government intervention and top-down policies, citing Fishman in Wright’s book (2004. p.232) entitled *Language Policy and Language Planning*:

Endangered languages become such because of the lack of informal intergenerational transmission and informal daily life support, not because they are being taught in schools. (1997, p. 190)

Within the document there are a series of recommendations: Māori hoped to sustain an authentic language, speaking it in all places and at all times; iwi dialects should be sustained; those who know the language should speak it and those who want to learn must have access to places of learning and, most important, is facilitating the transmission to younger generations; the language should be valued as a treasure of the nation; each iwi must be supported to lead their own language initiatives; technology should be embraced as modern tools in the revitalisation of the Māori language; teachers of the Māori language should be trained to achieve high levels of proficiency; the skills of proficient speakers should be strengthened to lead the revitalisation process; there is a need to raise critical awareness amongst Māori, other New Zealanders, and the global community to believe in the value of the Māori

language; evaluation and research at all levels will be built in to the new strategic plan and outcomes; by 2050 the aim is for 80% of Māori homes to be Māori language homes.

The 2003, Māori Language Strategy highlighted education and broadcasting as two key areas to be supported for te Reo Māori. *Te Reo Mauriora* adjusts the focus to Māori spoken in the home. One iwi that is trying to implement speaking Māori in the home is Ngai Tahu. In 2000, Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu launched a 25-year language strategy, driven by the vision of having te reo o Ngai Tahu spoken in 1000 homes by 2025.

[The strategy] drew heavily from the theories of Joshua Fishman, particularly around his graded intergenerational disruption scale of GIDS...[they] invited Professor Fishman...to attend a Ngāi Tahu Reo hui. Fishman's visit in 2000 helped establish the focus and priorities". (Skerrett, 2010, pp. 4-5).

This strategy was called *Kotahi Mano Kāika, Kotahi Mano Wawata*, which means "One thousand homes, one thousand aspirations". The concept is to achieve 1000 homes speaking Māori. Dr Skerrett, in her 10 year review, comments that progress is slow within the iwi of Ngai Tahu to achieve 1000 homes, but that after only 10 years into a 25 project the impetus is there, yet small but with the potential to grow (2010).

A major report, called Wai 262 –*Ko Aotearoa Tenei*—"This is Aotearoa", came out in July 2011. It was a claim to the Waitangi Tribunal, hence "WAI 262", and is also known as the "Native Flora and Fauna Claim". This claim was lodged as far back as October 1991. So it was 20 years in the making. For the Waitangi Tribunal it was a landmark claim, as it was the Tribunal's first whole-of-government report, addressing the work of more than 20 Government departments and agencies. The report found that the Government had failed to comply with its obligations, under the Treaty of Waitangi, to ensure that guardian relationships between Māori and their *taonga* (their traditional knowledge and artistic works, and their culturally significant species of flora and fauna) were acknowledged and protected. As such it recommends that future laws, policies and practices do explicitly acknowledge and respect those relationships.

Although the full report was released in July 2011, a pre-publication of the Te Reo Māori section was released in September 2010 so that the panel of experts working on the *Te Reo Mauriora* report (see above pp. 50-52) could have access to the research already undertaken in the WAI 262 claim. In a letter to the Hon. Dr. Pita Sharples, the Presiding Officer, Justice Williams, wrote:

We are therefore releasing now the sections of our report relating to te Reo Māori so that they can be considered both by you and by the review panel, if it is their wish to take our views into account in the course of their own inquiry. (2010, WAI 262, Pre-Publication, p. ix).

In the te reo Māori section, this report also emphasized that the impetus must come from Māori to preserve their own language, especially by speaking Māori in the home.

Learning Māori in New Zealand Today.

There are many opportunities for people to learn Māori in New Zealand today. For children, there are the Māori-medium schools, bilingual education, and Māori taught in mainstream schools. For adults, there are a variety of tertiary institutes-universities, polytechnics, and wānanga. The wānanga are free, there are no fees and all books are supplied. The Wānanga o Aotearoa is an example of teaching and learning in a modern context of e-learning, yet still very much in a Māori cultural setting. The potential of teaching and learning are as follows- the use of data projectors, internet connection to a moodle, MP4s for recording, CDs and DVDs with material that is in workbooks. Students are encouraged to create their own study groups outside of class time. Some of these study groups use Facebook for their communication. On graduation, the graduate enters the graduate community called “Kapuia” and is linked to other graduates throughout Aotearoa/New Zealand. Classes at the same level are held on different nights of the week and, if a student is unable to be present at his or her designated evening, then he/she can go to another evening in the same week. Tutorials are readily available for the asking. If a student is travelling through New Zealand, that student may attend a wānanga in a different city from where the student lives while the student is in that other city. On designated weekends, “wānanga days”

are held where study is consolidated. Each year there is also a stay at a marae. If the student puts in the required effort, learning is readily available.

Māori television provides lessons in Māori daily during the week. The programme *Toku Reo* is a 30 minute lesson, based on Professor John Moorfield's books- the *Te Whānake* series. There is also access to these broadcasts through the internet, where podcasts are available, and to tests and quizzes on the material covered in the podcasts. In addition to these Māori lessons, the very nature of Māori television provides viewers with continued exposure to spoken Māori.

The internet provides access to numerous learning opportunities for te reo Māori. For example, the connection *kaitiaki@kupu.Māori* provides on-going testing and learning of words and phrases in sentence contexts, sent daily to one's email. *Language Perfect* is a programme based on NCEA vocabulary and grammar. NCEA, the National Certificate of Educational Achievement, is the certificate available to secondary school students in years 11, 12, and 13 in New Zealand. Students can test themselves and extend their knowledge of te reo Māori at their own leisure.

Microsoft New Zealand has released a te reo Māori language pack for Microsoft Windows Vista that is available as a no-cost download. Google may be used in the Māori language. There is a widespread use of e-learning possible for Māori in today's world. To aid this learning a dictionary has been compiled entitled: *A Dictionary of Māori Computer related terms. English-Māori (2006)*. (See Taiuru, K. 2006).

In addition to the use of the computer, the iPad has a number of programmes available to it. These programmes come in the form of applications usually called *apps*. Here are some examples of *apps* available in the Māori language: *Language Perfect* as explained for the computer; *eWai*- a programme of waiata from Te Wānanga o Raukawa; *irirangi*-access to the live on air programmes of the 21 main Māori radio stations in New Zealand; *Māori*- a programme of vocabulary, games and quizzes; *TeReoMāori*-more lessons in Māori; *TeReoMāori*- the same name as the former app, but this one is a Māori dictionary; *uTalk Māori*-yet more Māori lessons; *Hika*- both language and history of te Reo; *Te Pataka*-children's books in Māori, both the text and voices recorded; *Waatea*-Waatea News, one of the Māori radio stations. More

apps continue to be produced and they are also available on Mac computers, the iPhone and the iPod.

Some aspects of daily life now see the use of the Māori language in areas never before witnessed. One of these is the use of ATMs to withdraw cash. Te reo Māori options for withdrawing cash are now available from BNZ automatic teller machines. Another aspect is the use of text messaging on mobile phones-*he pato kupu*. Some examples are:

Text word	Māori	English
Hyre	haere	go
4re	whare	house
10a	tēnā	that
py	pai	good
k	kei	at, on, in
t	te	the

A lesson on texting in Māori can be found on the Ministry of Education website *Te Kete Ipurangi*, in the section Te Reo Māori in English-medium schools, achievement objective 5.1. In addition, Telecom now includes common te reo Māori words in the dictionary for the predictive text message function.

All living languages evolve to cope with new inventions, to cope with other cultures they come in contact with. So it has been for the Māori language. Before the 1980s, words were mainly borrowed from English. But since the late 1980s, most new words in Māori have been created or approved by the New Zealand Māori Language Commission, *Te Taura Whiri*, which have developed their own guidelines. When it comes to written Māori today, the Commission recommends standardization (a feature of corpus language planning, see Chapter One). In its guidelines under “Māori Orthographic Conventions”, it states:

The following is a set of writing conventions that the Māori Language Commission recommends to be observed by writers and editors of Māori

language texts. The Commission believes it is essential for the survival of the language that a standardised written form be adopted by all those involved in the production of material in Māori, in order that a high quality literary base may be built up as a resource for the Māori language learners of today and of the future.

As a result of the Commission's stand, it sometimes happens that the vocabulary of older Māori can, in certain areas, differ from that of younger people. For example, some older Māori today will use forms of days of the week and months of the year borrowed from English- *Mane*, "Monday", *Hanuere*, "January", while younger speakers, especially those educated in the kura (Māori immersion schools), will use the original forms : *Rahina*, "Monday", *Kohi-tātea*, "January". Māori television uses the original forms.

The focus in the above section is mainly on Māori people learning Māori. But there has been a recent call for all New Zealanders to learn Māori, particularly at primary school level. When young people learn a new language they tend to absorb the new vocabulary, the new grammatical structures. But when adults learn a new language, especially if they are monolingual, their initial progress can very much depend on the relationship of the new language to their own one. When it comes to monolingual English speakers learning Māori, there are some difficulties. As Kārena-Holmes observes:

Māori and English are not closely related languages, and the ways in which phrases and sentences are constructed in Māori are often quite different from those in English. (2009, p. 12)

People who speak tonal languages, such as Chinese, Thai and Lao people would find the long and short vowel distinctions in Māori easy to follow. Speakers of languages like Japanese, which share similar vowel sounds to Māori, and also employs the use of particles, would find both the vowel sounds and particle use a natural existence in language. Spanish speakers learning French finds so many words similar to their own. Word order in English is quite different to word order in Māori. Some grammatical constructions may seem similar but can have different functions or a different

emphasis. This is the case with the passive. In English, the passive is used where the action is done to the subject. In Māori, this is also true but in Māori the emphasis is on the action rather than the subject. The use of the passive is more usual in Māori than in English and it can have functions English does not have, for example, the wide use of the passive in Māori to give commands. Adult monolingual English speakers learning Māori can tend to use English as the guide to how a language works and, until it is realized that Māori is significantly different to English, progress can be difficult.

Language Domains for the Māori Language

As has been noted above, the language domains for Māori are few today compared with the past. But gradually the domains are slowly widening. In most public libraries and many of the universities in New Zealand, signage is often bilingual in English and Māori. National Radio announcers often begin and end their programmes with greetings or farewells in Māori. Māori Language Week brings out other domains, for example, the Countdown Supermarket chain that employs bilingual signage during the week. However, it also leaves up some of this bilingual signage all year long.

A development in the use of Māori in a bilingual document can be seen in relation to the New Zealand passports. The New Zealand passport is an evolving document which is now an overtly bilingual document in Māori and English. Māori were granted “all the Rights and Privileges of British Subjects” under Article Three of the Treaty of Waitangi. Their status as British subjects was re-affirmed by the Native Rights Act 1865. In 1948, following the creation of New Zealand citizenship with the passing of the British Nationality and New Zealand Citizenship Act, the Department of Internal Affairs began issuing New Zealand passports for the first time. Between 1948 and 1977, New Zealand passports bore the words “New Zealand citizens and British subjects” (Green, 2011). In 2000, French was removed from the biodata page and replaced with Māori. This change was brought about by the Department of Internal Affairs in order to reflect the status of te reo Māori as an official language of New Zealand and to give “New Zealanders travelling abroad a passport that more accurately reflects their national identity” (Department of Internal Affairs Annual Report 2000-2001, p. 43). In 2008, the passport was further upgraded to exhibit a

story in English and Māori that develops with each turn of the page. The page numbers are shown both by Arabic numerals and Māori alphabetic names, for example, 10 and *tekau*.

The Māori language in New Zealand has a respected status today. Gradually, more domains are being re-established where Māori is spoken. In the home itself, the Māori language can easily be heard on television or the radio and access to many Māori language programmes are available on the internet. In addition, for those who wish to speak Māori in the home, if they have the ability, often enough it is a matter of intent. For those who wish to learn Māori or just improve their ability, there are many educational opportunities for people to do so. If there is a positive will among the people, revitalisation of the Māori language is possible.

CHAPTER THREE: Methodology and Ethics.

Methodology

My own research mainly follows the qualitative method, typical of social research. What follows are some examples from the literature dealing with research and methods of going about it.

“Research methodology” refers to the research plan, the style of research or how the research is organized, e.g., case studies, action research, and “research methods” refer to the ways and techniques of gathering evidence / data, e.g., interviews, diaries, observations.

Some terms and definitions are essential to the understanding of educational research. Often used among these terms is the word “paradigm”. A *paradigm*-when a group of researchers (a community of practice) has a systematic consistent pattern of thinking about: *ontology*- what you believe about how things exist in the world; *epistemology*- how claims to know are justified; the stance of the researcher / knower; and what counts as the truth. What ontology and epistemology is adopted, determines what paradigm the research will be done in. The concept of the term “paradigm” is often used in educational research. Donmoyer gives a comprehensive definition of the term, as he sees it as a legacy of Thomas Kuhn. Donmoyer writes:

Kuhn indicated that paradigm shifts...involve replacing one way of thinking about knowledge and research (and also the world the researcher is studying) with another incommensurable view. (Donmoyer, 2006, p. 12)

However, Donmoyer is at pains to say he thinks academics should “move beyond paradigm talk” and embrace “multiple perspectives”(op.cit.:30). Fitness for purpose must be the guiding principle: different research paradigms for different research purposes.

For social research there are some quite different paradigms. For example, there is the objective positivist versus the subjective interpretive paradigms. I see my own

research coming under the heading of the subjectivist approach:

Investigators adopting an objectivist (or positivist) approach to the social world and who treat it like the world of natural phenomena as being hard, real and external to the individual will choose from a range of traditional options-surveys, experiments, and the like. Others favouring the more subjectivist (or anti-positivist) approach and who view the social world as being of a much softer, personal and humanly created kind will select from a comparable range of recent and emerging techniques-accounts, participant observation and personal constructs, for example. (Cohen et al. p. 8)

The choice of either of the perspectives has implications for the researcher. For example:

Anti-positivists would argue that individuals' behaviour can only be understood by the researcher sharing the frame *of reference: understanding of individuals' interpretations* of the world around them has to come from the inside, not the outside. (Cohen et al. p. 19)

This way of thinking could be compared to the concept of *kaupapa Māori* (See Smith, L. 1999). I see this reference to *kaupapa Māori* as referring both to the point of view taken by the researcher when doing research, e.g., interviews with people associated with the Māori sector, where the interviewer is aware of Māori protocol. It incorporates the initial approach to participants where procedure is followed, e.g., where people are in positions of responsibility and a respectful approach is made as towards kaumātua; the manner of interviewing, the formulation of questions and the bearing the interviewer has during the interviews, such as during Māori *hui* where protocol demands a respectful procedure as on the *marae* rather than a more direct approach as, say, European to European in an office situation.

It could be said that mixed methods research is the most appropriate type of research today. This is what Johnson and Onwugbuzie promote in their document: *A Research Paradigm Whose Time Has Come*. They state that a more eclectic approach has more validity than a single paradigmatic approach, being based on methodological

pluralism:

We hope the field will move beyond quantitative versus qualitative research arguments because, as recognized by mixed methods research, both quantitative and qualitative research are important and useful. (Johnson and Onwugbuzie, 2004, p. 14)

Then they recommend that

all researchers need a solid understanding of multiple methods used by other scholars to facilitate communication, to promote collaboration, and to provide superior research. (op.cit. p.15)

Whatever the approach taken, there is need for an overall perspective. My own perspective is to follow as closely as possible the way of *kaupapa* Māori, as described above. This can be seen in Cohen et al.'s description of the stages of educational research from planning and design, through data collection to data analysis and reporting (Cohen et al. op.cit. p.1).

The main method of data collecting for this thesis was by interview. This respected the face-to face procedure favoured in research in the Māori sector (see Cram, 2001). The method of research by interviews was chosen by me rather than more remote connection with participants by phone, email, or questionnaires. Exactly who was to be interviewed was decided by my supervisor and myself. Criteria for choosing potential participants were that the people concerned had been and continued to be active in the area of the revitalisation of te reo Māori. Two institutions were also chosen: the Māori Language Commission, *Te Taura Whiri i te Reo Māori*, and the Ministry of Māori Development, *Te Puni Kōkiri*, given their importance to the development of Māori language policy. (For a detailed description of both the Māori Language Commission and the Ministry of Māori development, refer to Chapter Two, pages 35-38). Both these institutions represent channels used by the Government either to work in the Māori area of society or organisations that gave advice to the Government. The four participants for this research were: Tipene Chrisp, Mere-Heeni Simcock Reweti, Joris de Bres, and Hana O'Regan. Tipence Chrisp currently works

for Te Puni Kōkiri as a policy advisor. He has been active for some years in the area of Māori language revitalisation and has written often on the subject. He has also had experience on the Waitangi Tribunal. Mere-Heeni Simcock Reweti works for the Māori Language Commission and has experience also both with the Ministry of Education and Te Puni Kōkiri. Joris de Bres has been the Race Relations Commissioner for the Human Rights Commission since 2002. He advocates a national languages policy with te reo Māori very much part of it. Hana O'Regan is in charge of te reo Māori for Christchurch Polytechnic (CPIT), a contributor to Māori revitalisation in a variety of areas, most recently as a chosen member by the Minister of Māori Affairs, the hon Dr Pita Sharples, to work on the *Te Reo Mauriora Report* (April 2011). She is also well known as an activist in the revitalisation of the Māori language for the Ngai Tahu iwi. The two institutions and the four participants thus represent sources of information and thinking that cover many aspects of te reo Māori.

Considering the nature of this thesis, the qualitative interview was most appropriate as the key means of data collection:

The qualitative interview is a construction site of knowledge. An interview is literally an inter view, an exchange between two persons conversing about a theme of mutual interest. (Kvale, 199, p. 2)

Cohen et al. give a range of the different type of interviews such as: the formal interview, the less formal interview, a completely informal interview.

The issue here is of “fitness for purpose”; the more one wishes to gain comparable data-across people, across sites- the more standardized and quantitative one’s interview tends to become; the more one wishes to acquire unique, non-standardized, personalized information about how individuals view the world, the more one veers towards qualitative, open-ended, unstructured interviewing. (Cohen et al. p. 354)

These same authors quote Kvale (1996, p. 88)

Kvale sets out seven stages of an interview investigation that can be used to plan this type of research: thematizing, designing, interviewing, transcribing, analyzing, verifying and reporting. (Cohen et al. p. 356)

The description then given for each part of the plan provides a convenient template when a researcher is preparing for and undertaking interviews. However, there is the need to be wary of the type of approach researchers take in different cultural settings. Linda Smith (1999) elaborates on this in *Decolonising methodologies: Research and indigenous peoples*. In the Māori culture, *kaupapa Māori*, the way Māori people think, is a paradigm in itself. She states that Māori have a strong oral tradition through which knowledge was used “appropriately, and transmitted with accuracy” (p.152). She describes how in the past some non-indigenous researchers did not understand *kaupapa Māori* and so came to false conclusions. She advocates for cross-cultural research that research methodology is based on the skill of matching the problem with an

“appropriate” set of investigative strategies. It is concerned with ensuring that information is accessed in such a way as to guarantee validity and reliability. (op.cit. p. 173)

Bishop also advises caution when researching in the Māori domain:

Qualitative researchers have been slow to acknowledge the importance of culture and cultural differences as key components in successful research practice and understandings. (1997, p. 41)

Just as Smith (1999) advises, there needs to be an awareness of *kaupapa Māori*, the way Māori think, the Māori paradigm. Bishop likens the Māori *hui* to a type of extended interview: “The aim of a hui is to reach consensus, to arrive at a jointly constructed meaning” (Bishop, 1997, p. 44).

This concept of the *hui* as the actual interview is further explored by Fiona Cram

(2001) in her article: “*Rangahau Māori: tona tika, tonono pono*: the validity and integrity of Māori research.” Cramm writes:

An important part of any research process is actually fronting up, face-to-face to the community where the research is being conducted. This might happen, for example, in an office, at a school or on a marae. (2001, p. 43)

In the case of this research, all interviews were conducted in offices. Adhering to the spirit of *kaupapa Māori* for interviews, the following is how the interviews were eventually described: The initial approach-as to a *kaumatua*- was through Professor May’s suggestions and personal contacts, that is, it was through his initiative as a person with national and international status in the area of language policy and not just via the researcher’s individual approach. The *koha*- sending the participant information sheet and consent form to participants- their acceptance is taking up the *koha*. Conversations (interviews) begin – this is the *hui*. Face to face interviews: *kanohi ki te kanohi*. The Māori Nominee also suggested that the researcher add his own *whakapapa*, that is, his connection to the iwi, Ngati Kahungunu.

ETHICS

Wilkinson (200, pp. 14-15) gives the background of ethical research, showing how it is really a modern domain, developing from the 1970s onwards. Cohen et al. (2007) state the boundaries of this research:

The research community and those using the findings have a right to expect that research be conducted rigorously, scrupulously, and in an ethical defensible manner. (Cohen et al. 2007, p. 48)

These authors give a succinct summary of the field of the ethics of educational and social research (op.cit. pp. 51-77). All parts of research have always to be measured by any necessary ethical considerations applicable at the time. Methods, informed consent, gaining access to and acceptance in the research setting, confidentiality, the

use of data- so many considerations are possible issues of ethical considerations.

Cohen et al. again state:

Ethical considerations pervade the whole process of research; these will be no more so than at the stage of access and acceptance, where appropriateness of topic, design, methods, guarantees of confidentiality, analysis and dissemination of findings must be negotiated with relative openness, sensitivity, honesty, accuracy and scientific impartiality. (2007, p. 57)

The mention of “relative openness” has to be a matter of judgement and can be measured by “costs/benefits ratio”, the definition of which Cohen et. al. cite (p.52) Frankfort-Nachmias and Nachmias (1992) “The costs/benefits ratio” is a fundamental concept expressing the primary ethical dilemma in social research. In planning their proposed research, social scientists have to consider the likely social benefits of their endeavours against the personal costs to the individuals taking part. An issue is how far research can go in deciding this costs/benefits ratio. Wilkinson suggests:

The well-being of subjects, then, provides a reason for the positive duties we identified in the requirement of informed consent. (2001, p. 18)

For theses under the auspices of the Faculty of Education of Auckland University, the student presenting his ethics application has to firstly fulfill the requirements of the Faculty. This involved an initial discussion with the Supervisor. Possible research methods in the field were: interviews, focus groups, observations, and questionnaires. The overarching approach was one of *kaupapa Māori*, that is, behaving in a way that is traditionally a Māori approach.

It was not known before the institutions were approached whether their potential representative would also be the mouthpiece for the institution. When eventually the two potential participants from these institutions accepted to be interviewed, they signaled that they would also answer on behalf of their institutions. When this was known the researcher amalgamated the institution’s interview questions with the participants’ interview questions. Eventually all potential participants signed the consent forms, agreeing to be interviewed.

CHAPTER FOUR: THE INTERVIEWS

The first interview took place in Christchurch on the 26 April 2012. Three more interviews took place in Wellington on the 3rd of May 2012. Three Institutions were involved: the Māori Language Commission *Te Taura Whiri i te reo Māori* (see page 35 for discussion on TTW), the Ministry of Māori Development *Te Puni Kōkiri* (see pages 37-38 for discussion on TPK) and the Human Rights Commission (see page 68). Four people were interviewed: Mere-Heeni Simcock Reweti of the Māori Language Commission, Tipene Chrisp of the Ministry of Māori Development, Joris de Bres of the Human Rights Commission, and Hana O'Regan in charge of Māori and Pacific Studies at Christchurch Polytechnic (CPIT). Each of the four participants had extensive experiences and expertise in areas related to te reo Māori that gave them a background to speak both with confidence and weighed opinion.

Hana O'Regan has been personally involved with the revitalisation of te Re Māori in the Ngai Tahu iwi, especially in the 1000 Homes Project, *Kotahi Mano Kaika*, (see page 52 for a description of this project). She has also worked in other areas of Māori revitalisation nationally, whether in research for Te Puni Kōkiri or especially recently as one of the independent panel of language experts working on the health of the Māori language report, *te Reo Mauriora*, for the Hon. Pita Sharples, Minister of Māori Affairs (for a discussion on this document, refer to pages 50-52). This document was released in April 2011. Research for this document took her around the country to 14 *hui*, 12 in the North Island and two in the South Island. This gave her recent experience listening to a representative group of Māori in Aotearoa.

Mere-Heeni Simcock Reweti spoke both on her own behalf and also on behalf of the Māori Language Commission. Prior to working for the Commission she had worked for the Ministry of Education and Te Puni Kōkiri. Her children have gone through Māori-medium education and her husband teaches at a *wharekura*. So she can also thus speak with personal experience of the Māori-medium institutions.

Tipene Chrisp is the Policy Director at Te Puni Kōkiri with responsibility for the cultural directorate: the Māori language, broadcasting, Māori and ICT, Mātauranga

Māori, and marae development. He has also served on the Waitangi Tribunal and is currently a Government advisor on Māori policy. Like Hana O'Regan his home is often a Māori speaking home. Over the years he has written extensively on Māori language revitalisation.

Joris de Bres has been the Race Relations Commissioner for the Human Rights Commission. He has held this position for 10 years. His involvement in the Māori language goes back to 1971 when he was a member of Ngā Tamatoa (see page 34) and his father was a tutor in Māori at Otago University. The Human Rights Commission is an independent Crown Entity. It is accountable to the Minister of Justice for its funding but the minister cannot tell the Human Rights Commission what to do. This gives the Commission some independence. The Human Rights Commission's role is

to advocate and promote respect for human rights in New Zealand, encourage harmonious relations between individuals and among diverse groups in New Zealand, lead, evaluate, monitor and advise on equal employment opportunities, provide information on equal employment opportunities, and provide information to the public about discrimination and to help resolve complaints about discrimination. (HRC, 2008b)

These four participants represent a wide section of Māori interests today and could be said very much to have an awareness of the pulse of Māoridom, especially in relation to te reo Māori.

THE FINDINGS

The findings are presented under a set of headings. Where there is general agreement by the participants, no personal reference is attributed. Where the observation is specific to one participant, an appropriate identifying reference is shown.

The Status of te Reo Māori Today

The status of te Reo Māori derives from the Treaty of Waitangi from which it is a *taonga* and has protection rights. The present status is better than colonial times, but as an official language and as a result of the Māori Language Act, there is room for some improvements, for example from the point of the language's mana. O'Regan states:

As an official language there is need of legal, political, and social aspects together to motivate those with control of the purse strings to really invest sufficiently.

Public attitude towards the language is more positive than the past, but there is a very great lack of understanding of language and language revitalisation among the general public as a result of New Zealand being a very monolingually based country.

O'Regan takes the point of view that revitalisation is a long term process. She recalls the opinion of Fishman in his book *Reversing Language Shift* (1991) that:

it takes just one generation to lose a language but at least three generations for a language to be revitalised, so that means three generations of investment to regain what was lost in just one generation.

Indeed Fishman came out to New Zealand at the invitation of the Ngai Tahu iwi to which O'Regan belongs and helped Ngai Tahu with advice on how to go about revitalisation of the Ngai Tahu dialect, which resulted in the 1000 Homes Strategy (see page 52).

In New Zealand today the health of the Māori language, shown by Te Puni Kōkiri research, is “critical but off life support” (Chrisp). In the late 1970s when the Māori language revitalisation began in earnest, 18% of Māori considered they could speak Māori (Benton, 1997) all concentrated in the 45 years and 45 years plus people. Less than 100 children under five were reported to be able to speak Māori. In the 2006 census, which was the last set of available data, 25% of the Māori people said that they could speak Māori, with a much broader spread across the Māori population. 17,000 in 1979 to 131,000 in 2006. So the health of the Māori language has improved since the 1970s but this does not mean it is healthy. Taking the health analogy, Chrisp comments:

The self- priming aspects of language revitalisation are in place. But it is still in intensive care and will need lots of careful attention from Māori and the Government for the foreseeable future.

Minority languages generally all require perpetual vigilance. In 1900 100% of the Māori population spoke Māori. That did not stop the Māori language decline in the next 70 years. So, for the present with 25% looking forward, it is difficult to know what to predict. Chrisp has been involved in a few surveys on the health of the Māori language and in his considered opinion he states:

In New Zealand there is a poor understanding of the dynamics of language revitalisation. It will probably take four or five generations and even then there will need to be perpetual vigilance.

Chrisp states the criteria *Te Puni Kōkiri* use in their health of the Māori language surveys:

The five matrices measuring the health of te reo Māori are: language acquisition, use, status, critical awareness, and corpus development.

An example of these criteria headings can be seen are in the *Te Puni Kōkiri* publication: “The Health of the Māori Language in 2006 *Te Oranga o te Reo Māori*

2006. As a representative of *Te Puni Kōkiri*, Chrisp described how the organization went about its surveys and a summary of what he said is as follows. *Te Puni Kōkiri* examined use in the five yearly cycles censuses: 2001, 2006, and the next look is in 2013. *Te Puni Kōkiri* looks at acquisition in a three yearly cycle because the logic is that that is more susceptible to change. For this they run a survey that is a sample survey of 1500 respondents: 750 Māori and 750 non-Māori. It is a telephone survey throughout the country. Television reaches about 97% of the New Zealand population and most homes have television. In the 2013 census the Māori social survey in the census will provide more information. The Māori social survey will repeat the relevant questions used in the 2001 and 2006 censuses. With this information, *Te Puni Kōkiri* can look at how many people are acquiring various levels of proficiency in Māori, the frequency of use, and the availability of Māori under the heading of use and status.

Chrisp goes to the heart of the problem concerning intergenerational transmission of the language. It needs to start in the home:

The heart of te reo Māori revitalisation lies with the Māori people to speak Māori in their homes and communities on a regular consistent basis. That is at the fatherest reach for the Government. *Te Puni Kōkiri* cannot go into people's homes. But it can only encourage and make services available.

Fishman came to a similar conclusion when comparing the function of school education to teach an endangered language to the initial impetus of the language in the home. Without the language in the home, the taught school language cannot usually gain much traction:

A very commonly adopted functional goal of threatened languages is to offer education in which those languages can operate as sole or, at least as co-media. If the same threatened languages are not first acquired as ethnic mother tongues at home, before children arrive at school, and if, in addition, they are not used out of school, after school and even after schooling as a whole is over, then the school has a much more difficult task on its hands. (200, p. 14)

Te Puni Kōkiri have made resources and information available pretty consistently to all normal channels of providing information to New Zealanders. The Government can use exhortation. In 2004, Te Puni Kōkiri secured one million dollars annually for the Māori Language Commission to promote the Māori language and this is a social marketing campaign. Together with this, the Māori Television Service has a function to promote te reo Māori.

Social marketing of the Māori language was discussed on page 40 where the Māori Language Commission promoted 1995 as a year for the celebration of the Māori Language (Chrisp, 1997b; Nicholson, 1997). The articles written by these two writers very much summed up the purpose of the theme year. Nicholson's article was entitled: "Marketing the Māori Language" and Chrisp's "He Taonga Te Reo: The Use of a Theme Year to Promote a Minority Language." Likewise in the Human Rights Commission's review in its newsletter *Te Waka Reo: Languages in Aotearoa 2004-2011* of eight years of Languages in New Zealand, we read:

The use of Māori in the public domain increased significantly, particularly as a result of the annual Māori Language Week promoting wider use of Māori in public and community life. Increased use was evident in business, internet applications, place names, and in the media. (p. 3)

Revitalisation of te Reo Māori: Actions of the different iwi

The whole metaphor of "life" and "health" follows naturally from the word "revitalisation" = "putting life back into". Fishman's GIDS are used as a measurement of such revitalisation. GIDS is an abbreviation of "Graded Intergenerational Disruption Scale", which is a graded typology of threatened statuses of languages (Fishman, 1991). The most dangerous stage, stage eight, is as follows:

Most vestigial users of Xish are socially isolated old folks and Xish needs to be re-assembled from their mouths and memories and taught to demographically unconcentrated adults. (Fishman, 1991, p. 88)

Hana O'Regan, representing the Ngai Tahu iwi, places the iwi's present situation even below Stage eight. Often enough one hears that there are no native speakers left in this iwi. But the strength of revitalisation differs throughout the country and Te Puni

Kōkiri's five yearly sounding of the health of the Māori language, along with the censuses, do show some improvement. But even Te Puni Kōkiri, with the backing of their surveys, deem the situation of the language as "critical but off life support" (Chrisp), in a state requiring continuous surveillance both by Māori themselves in partnership with the Government.

The participants generally agreed that the impetus for a national revitalisation of te reo Māori began in the early 1970s with Ngā Tamatoa, the hikoī and petition to parliament, the Māori Language Act, Māori as an official language and all that followed. O'Regan comments that revitalisation starts when life is threatened and health is sought. Ngai Tahu, she says, lost much of their land very early on in colonial history and subsequently much of the life of their language. Few places to exist as Māori meant a huge diminution of the domains where Māori used to be spoken. Consequently, those who spoke the language lived very much in isolation. The need for revitalisation was an awareness the ancestors had but the means to achieve this were scarce. Only in recent history, with such schemes as *kotahi mano kaika* (the 1000 homes strategy, see page 52), does there seem some semblance of revitalisation.

Looking at the different iwi, the first big instigator was Ngati Raukawa with the Whakatupuranga Rua Mano "Generation 2000" programme, which gave rise to the immersion wānanga, Te Wānanga o Raukawa. Te Wānanga-o-Raukawa arose from a joint effort of Te Āti Awa, Ngāti Raukawa and Ngāti Toa Rangatira, known also as the ART Confederation. The ART Confederation have been involved in many past joint ventures. In August 1975, the Raukawa Marae Trustees began a 25-year tribal development experiment, known as Whakatupuranga Rua Mano - Generation 2000. Te Wānanga-o-Raukawa was born out of this revival to assist the ART Confederation to achieve its educational aspirations. Probably "Kotahi Mano Kaika" was the next one.

In 1999, Te Puni Kōkiri procured money from the Ministry of Education for a programme called "Community Based Language Initiative". In the TPK survey "The Health of the Māori Language in 2006", there is mention of the Māori Language Summit Conference in December 1995 to mark the end of the Māori Language Year. Referred to as a *hui*, the document continues:

Following this hui, Māori and other academics began thinking and writing in earnest about home and community language development to provide a robust and coherent framework for language revitalisation in the New Zealand context. A number of initiatives were launched by Māori and Government to support home and community Māori language development, including the Community Based Language Initiative administered by the Ministry of Education (1999), and the Mā te Reo fund administered by Te Taura Whiri. (2000, p. 5)

An example of one iwi's use of the Community Based Language Initiative is found in The Strategic Plan for the Revitalisation of Te Reo o Ngāti Kahungunu 2006-2027:

The Community Based Language Initiative programme (funded by the Ministry of Education) is a significant, but short term resource to assist our larger plans of strengthening the development of language and cultural capacity. (p. 5)

The Mā te Reo Fund, administered by Te Taura Whiri, is administered to Māori communities under five categories: language planning; language resources; events/promotions; Wānanga Reo; and Kura Reo ā-iwi, that is iwi based total immersion reo Māori wānanga targeting intermediate to proficient speakers of te reo Māori.

The Community Based Language Initiative programmes together with Ma Te Reo, have been a catalyst for iwi for language plans. Some have been successful, some have fallen by the wayside and some only lasted while the funding lasted. Other initiatives were Ngāti Tūwharetoa, and Central North Island iwi. A perusal of their websites reveal a variety of different plans, for example Tainui, Ngai Tahu, Ngati Kahungunu.

A training guide by TTW, TPK and at the Ministry emphasized home and community language development. Everyone wanted to do their own dictionary. All have their language plans. Some have survived, some have not.

Māori is a tribal society. Every tribe wants its own plan, their own radio station and TPK has responded to the demand. In 2003 the Māori Language Strategy emphasized home and community, balanced with education. (Chrisp)

Simcock Reweti of Te Taura Whiri, commenting on the revitalisation of te reo Māori, adds:

There is not a critical mass of people active in the revitalisation of te reo Māori but the pockets that do exist are worthwhile. Māori need to be motivated themselves- a “use it or lose it” awareness.

With the uneven progress of revitalisation in New Zealand, the question that comes to mind is: Are there countries in the world where revitalisation of a language has been successful? One language that has been pointed out as having a successful revitalisation is Hebrew.

Chrisp comments that Hebrew in Israel has a particular setting. Hebrew was not a dead language as it was used on a weekly basis for religious ceremonies.

It was being re-vernacularised rather than revitalised. In revernacularising it there was a rare combination of a new society that was filled with religious fervor. Hebrew is a successful revernacularised language. (Chrisp)

Looking at international comparisons can be helpful. In Wales 20% of the Welsh population speak Welsh, a good 500,000 people, whereas 20% of Māori people is about 100,000 people. But Māori is a minority population. They do not live in enclaves generally. Tuhoē do, but no one else does and that mitigates against building speech communities. In Wales there are still Welsh speaking communities. These can provide the base for inter-generational language transmission reasonably readily.

Some other successful examples of revitalisation can be seen in the Basque for the Basque areas, Catalan for Catalonia and French in Quebec. But there are few examples. Most languages do not stand much chance. So what does this mean for the Māori language?

Probably there will be an enduring Māori culture that has strong Māori-English running through it. “Māori-English” meaning the way Māori speak

English. (Chrisp)

Does this mean that Māori will last through to 2100? After much experience and ongoing observation in the area of Māori language revitalisation, Chrisp muses:

I don't know. So there will be an enduring Māori culture with their unique language that may be Māori-English. I'm not sure that it will be Māori. I think that Māori revitalisation as it is probably lacks a true appreciation of the nature of language revitalisation as a discipline.

Chrisp, as an official working for Te Puni Kōkiri, after viewing a number of revitalisation plans by different iwi, concludes:

Iwi have gone off and developed language plans. All want to build their own dictionary but this means repeating what others have already done. For language revitalisation there are a finite number of resources. Some things work out, others do not. The expertise of Māori language planners would benefit from being expanded and there is a lot of room to grow.

This last comment refers to the perceived need of language planners to have an overall awareness of the nature of language and language development.

Standardisation of Māori and dialects

There is a question about the nature of dialects and te reo Māori. There is not a great difference between the type of Māori spoken among the different iwi. But there does exist a fierce pride of the different iwi to maintain their particular differences in the language, mainly in pronunciation and vocabulary.

O'Regan, as one of the contributors of the *te Reo Mauriora* report, says the result of the different *hui* to help make up the report supported the maintenance of dialects (for a discussion of this report, see pages 50-52). There are dialectical differences in vocabulary and pronunciation, some colloquial terms, but they are not barriers to communication.

From the technical global definition of a dialect, that definition is probably not met in New Zealand when different dialects are mentioned, but more apt when referring to such areas as Cook Island Māori, where there are definite dialectical differences. (Simcock Reweti)

There have been moves for standardisation of the language, for simplification of the language, but “the result was not of a quality with depth”(O’Regan). So now there is a move to strengthen the dialects to get back to how the language was. Māori television has given exposure to the different dialects. Consequently, the oral aspect of Māori continues but there has been a move to create a standard written language, supervised by the Māori Language Commission (TTW).

Māori were prolific story tellers in relating history and genealogy. TTW promotes the production of Māori literature. TTW has a corpus database-a good 15 million language forms. The database goes back to the 1700s. Another source of written Māori can be found in the Lindauer Collection. Lindauer, like Goldie, did portraits of Māori. Māori chiefs left some of their writings with the portraits. The Lindauer Collection is kept in the Auckland Public Library.

Te Mātāpuna is the tool used to create the monolingual Māori dictionary. It refers to a variety of Māori writings, e.g., Māori newspapers of the 1870s, Governor George Grey collection of writings. These writings also are now in the Auckland Public Library.

TTW in the 1980s and 1990s looked at the coining of new words but does not do so now. Today this is mainly done by translators. When these translators want neologisms they are asked to bank them in the *Kupu Hou* created by TTW with etymologies to justify their words. (Simcock Reweti)

The Māori Language Commission (TTW), The Ministry of Māori Development (TPK), and the Human Rights Commission (HRC):

For more information on the above three groups, refer back to the pages indicated in brackets:

The Māori Language Commission [TTW] (see p. 35)

The Ministry of Māori Development [TPK] (see pp. 37-38)

The Human Rights Commission [HRC] (see p. 67)

The Māori Language Commission (TTW)

As a representative of TTW, Simcock Reweti comments: "The base line funding for the Māori Language Commission is very small". The Commission is dependent on its funding. It has a statutory role to certify interpreters and has a role in promoting Māori. The dictionary (see above) is an extension of this. The *Te Matapuna* Māori dictionary is the first monolingual Māori dictionary. It plays a pivotal role in enriching the language, ensuring that diversity and dialect are recorded and maintained.

TTW is a national body with some independence- the promotion and protection, regeneration of Māori is a joint Māori Crown enterprise. TTW funds home and community initiatives in learning te Reo. "Marae, hapū iwi based classes are most popular among Māori" (Simcock Reweti).

Ministry of Māori Development, *Te Puni Kōkiri*

As a Government Ministry, TPK is bound by a directive of the Government and its Minister. TTW is a Crown Entity, one step removed from TPK. It is an autonomous group more independent than TPK.

O'Regan makes the comment that there is some conflict between TPK and TTW. TTW's core business is the Māori language but TPK have taken over quite a lot of this role. TPK, the Ministry of Māori Development, has a wide role concerning Māori and Māori life generally. The Māori language is certainly part of Māori life for TPK, yet this Ministry often has a major role in different aspects of the language such as the regular surveys of the health of the Māori language and attitudes of citizens towards the language.

The Human Rights Commission had a very strong partnership both with TPK and TTW in the last seven years on Māori Language Week and the whole aim of that has been to win over wider public opinion. This has taken years to happen. “The Human Rights Commission does not get many complaints about Māori” (de Bres). “The Human Rights Commission have been very supportive of te reo Māori in all its aspects” (O’Regan).

The Domains of the Māori Language Today:

Domains for speaking Māori are mainly in the marae and education, and maybe also, to a certain extent, religion. Broadcasting is designed to take the Māori language into homes. It is available to take up if people so choose. There are possibilities within the Government Departments, but not much in the commercial arena. All the four interviewed participants commented on the domains. O’Regan reflects on her own experience:

The social domains are increasing. However it is has not always been acceptable by the general public to hear Māori spoken openly, but more often than not, it is more acceptable now than in the past.

Chrisp also speaks of his own situation:

The domestic domain is a state of mind rather than a location, for example, when a couple is shopping in a supermarket, they may speak Māori to each other. One of the most important domains is not one of location but one of relationship in a one to one situation. Whakamā (embarrassment) does exist and exhortation campaigns can do something about that but can only go so far. The irony is we hear how languages are tied up so closely to identity.

Simcock Reweti agrees with the above two participants, but sees room for improvement:

The domains of Justice and Health could improve attitudes to the Māori language.

De Bres reflects on the last ten years:

On the whole the Government itself is an active supporter of te reo Māori. For a lot of people, learning of Māori is accessible to some degree. The cyberarena is another domain. A multifaceted strategy is the way to go these days. Recently, the Ministry of Education set up a task force to recruit more and better teachers of Māori. There is certainly a need for a lot more teachers of Māori.

Māori-Medium Education:

Participants give their opinions:

There are issues around just who controls Māori education. However it is a significant factor in that the drivers of Māori-medium education were the Māori people themselves. They have run up against the issues of standards and bureaucracy. The momentum has slowed as it came up against the machine. (de Bres)

Māori-medium education is a pathway for Māori education but there is a lack of teachers with quality Māori language. There is a need in the Colleges of Education for quality training in te reo Māori learning and teaching. (O'Regan)

For the Kōhanga Reo, a number of aspects were originally important, such as the language and the culture but this developed into mainly a language focus. However the Kōhanga Reo are very much whānau oriented and have invested interest by families, especially since urbanisation.

Māori-medium schools are good for children to have at least six to eight years in the system up to the end of the Kaupapa Māori schools. There is really no need for Māori with the ability to comment with mathematics and science, using Māori terminology. (Chrisp)

Simcock Reweti comments about wharekura

Wharekura are good for linguistic and cultural reasons. In the wharekura some subjects such as mathematics and science are taught remotely by television.

The whole Māori-medium education situation has had an impact a lot wider than just language. However, the majority of Māori still send their children to mainstream schools.

Māori in mainstream schools

O'Regan commented that the status of te reo Māori in mainstream schools is low compared to that held by international languages:

The tragedy in New Zealand education is the lack of education on New Zealand history, the Treaty of Waitangi and the claims based on breaches of the Treaty, especially the confiscation of lands. If people were truly more aware of all of this, most probably there would be greater support for the language.

O'Regan maintains that the Māori language in mainstream schools is not always easy to access.

A good 75% of Māori students are in mainstream schools. There is lack of access because there are not enough teachers of Māori to deliver the language. Schools do not prioritise the language and it has been considered a second rate subject, a poor relation to international languages. There is a legacy of not valuing te reo Māori within our education system. The status of Māori is similar to Home Economics and Sewing.

In many schools there is not enough support for the teaching of Māori so students learn Māori from the Correspondance School which is not the ideal way of learning a living language.

De Bres looks at examples around the country:

Teachers' expectations for Māori students make a big difference to the eventual progress, as evident in the Te Kotahitanga scheme of Waikato University. What

also determines progress is the attitude of the public. Education is a critical domain for the Māori language. Recently a community Institute was set up at Porirua College. Here adult classes started with adults who wanted to learn what the children are learning at school. These languages are: Tokelauan, Niuean, Cook Island Māori, and Māori. Parents and children could use the language at home. This is an example where Māori in the home is really most important to support Māori at school.

In addition to the teaching in mainstream schools, De Bres sees positive trends in the Wānanga (Māori tertiary institutes):

The Wānanga have contributed to the number of Māori people entering tertiary education. It is gradually developing qualifications that are more widely recognised. Often it provides a platform for getting another degree or moving from a diploma to a degree. It is now a fixed part of the scene.

O'Regan also finds positive trends in the wānanga:

Wānanga are able to engage the greatest masses, especially for second language learning. The Ara Reo programme of the Wānanga o Aotearoa needs to be recognized for its reengagement for the learning and teaching of Māori.

Māori as a compulsory subject:

Opinions concerning Māori as a compulsory subject in education differed quite markedly, so what follows are the thoughts of each participant:

O'Regan:

There should be compulsory learning of Māori in schools, but this must come from the Government who hold the purse strings. There is need for an allowance for more places for teaching Māori. A suggestion is that all employees should have some level of the Māori language to be permitted to work in Government Departments. Compare the situation for Gaelic in Ireland and Welsh in Wales

for eligibility to work in Government Departments.

Simcock Reweti

Making the learning of Māori compulsory in primary schools is not possible at present, with insufficient teachers and funding. Perhaps it is better to concentrate funds in a smaller area rather than expand everywhere with little.

De Bres

Tim Groser's article on my Facebook page drew a large number of responses with some diffidence about the need for compulsion to learn the Māori language, but most people were positive about the article. I personally think that every child should be taught Māori at primary school, that is, Māori as a core subject. Don't call it compulsory but a core subject. The article on Tim Groser's interview was generally well received in a very positive way around the country. The problem is why New Zealanders generally are blindly monolingual. A government minister making such comments and yet there was no real outcry. Perhaps this is because many people hear Māori everyday on national radio. .

Chrisp

His comments are mainly about attitude.

Attitudes of non-Māori New Zealander towards the Māori language have become more positive since 2000 when TPK began monitoring attitudes. Attitude has become progressively more positive. The normalisation of Māori in the atmosphere is apparent. There is now a generation of people who have come through primary schools with at least some exposure to the Māori language and Māori culture. This shows tolerance of each other as citizens. Maybe New Zealanders are developing some level of appreciation of bilingualism.

In this final section the participants often had contrasting points of view. These different points of view are outlined, followed by a summary:

The Constitutional Review-

O'Regan cites the Treaty of Waitangi as an important historical right:

There has to be protection, support and development for te reo Māori and culture by right of the Treaty of Waitangi and as an indigenous heritage- a place in a Constitution for the compulsory learning of the Māori language as just one of the strategies.

De Bres sees uncertainty:

The Constitutional Review is uncertain. We don't have a written constitution.

Simcock Reweti is also uncertain about a future constitutional review but is pleased about the United Nations Declaration of the Rights of Indigenous Peoples. The Declaration was adopted by the United Nations 13th September 2007.

The endorsement of the Declaration of the Rights of Indigenous Peoples is a bonus, but Māori is sure the Government is aware of its commitment to the language in terms of the Treaty.

However, it took three years before New Zealand endorsed the Declaration in April 2010.

It is a great shame for our country that it took so long for our Government to sign the Declaration. The Government's endorsement of the Declaration of the Rights of Indigenous People can affect lines of thinking on policy. (De Bres)

Some relevant clauses in the Declaration concerning the language can be found in Article 13:

Indigenous peoples have the right to revitalize, use, develop and transmit to future generations their histories, languages, oral traditions

And in Article 14:

Indigenous peoples have the right to establish and control their educational systems and institutions providing education in their own languages, in a manner appropriate to their cultural methods of teaching and learning.

However, the Prime Minister of New Zealand, the Hon. John Key, replying to a question from the Leader of the Opposition in 2010, the Hon. Phil Goff, when he asked whether there were any articles in the text (of the Declaration) that the New Zealand Government was not able or was unwilling to implement, stated:

I think it is important to understand that the Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples is just that- it is a declaration. It is not a treaty, it is not a covenant, and one does not actually sign up to it. It is an expression of aspiration; it will have no impact on New Zealand law and no impact on the constitutional framework. (Parliamentary Debates [Hansard] for Tuesday, 20 April 2010)

Still, although the New Zealand Government considers the Declaration as just aspirational rather than binding, it is worth remembering De Bres's words earlier:

But on the whole the Government itself is an active supporter of te reo Māori.

Concerning a **Minister of the Māori language**:

A recommendation of the report, *Te Reo Mauriora*, the ministerial review of the Māori Language Strategy and Sector (see pp. 50-52) was that a Minister of the Māori Language be established. In this regard O'Regan commented:

Maybe it is not a good idea isolating the language. Te reo Māori is really a part of Whānau Ora in spirit.

De Bres is wary of the recommendation but can see some benefits if the potential Minister is given real responsibility:

A Minister of Te reo Māori is feasible but needs to go with a ministry not a Commission. It needs to have all the trappings of a Ministry. At present the prime responsibility concerning what happens with the Māori language is with the Minister of Māori Affairs and Te Puni Kōkiri reports to him as the person responsible for one of a number of things. By making it a ministerial responsibility as such, it gives the minister a reach into other departments and by that it has some force. And there is definitely a need to have communication and coordination and accountability between different government agencies.

The Māori language in the long term

O'Regan gives a considered personal view of her long term aspiration for the language:

The future hope for te reo Māori-my aspirational vision- that the Māori language be normalised as part of our New Zealand identity and upheld, respected, and spoken, that it be celebrated and supported by all, a multi-faceted approach to Māori revitalisation that ensures it is driven by the Community, which it has to be and that that vision is supported politically. Ngai Tahu had the longest claim of any claim in the country- 150 years- It takes time, but we are not even on Fishman's chart. I propose a ninth level. We have not yet reached Level eight but clinging on for our lives to stay on. Looking at international language death, I am under no illusion what commitment is required but I'm not prepared to give up the fight. I will do what I can to ensure my grandchildren are first language speakers, so there is a need for optimism as without such a hope, I would probably give up, but I am not prepared to give up.

Simcock Reweti is conscious of funding to put aspirations into practice:

In the wider society the acquisition possibilities do meet the needs –the need to consolidate the effective pockets where success in revitalisation is happening. The Government needs to keep focusing its funding in these areas.

Māori was in serious decline. There was a feeling that the decline had been halted but that there still was a very low percentage of speakers that needed to get larger. Since then, various statistics have been thrown around, for example, the WAI 262 report, which is already having an influence. (For a discussion on WAI 262, see pp. 52-53).

People realise the need to go a great deal further for the language to survive as a living language. In the ten years that Joris de Bres has been at the Human Rights Commission there has been a shift in Pākehā attitudes towards te reo Māori. He comments:

This is important. There needs to be a positive climate for the language to survive, to recover. People who are learning need to see it is a good thing that they are learning. Even in the last year we see supermarkets with permanent signage and Māori in terms of brands you never used to see. If you go to the wine offerings, you will see a number of Māori brands which you never used to see.

But all this is just one part of the picture. There are major issues in terms of resources, in terms of policy that need to be addressed and have needed to be addressed since the last Māori language strategy ran out.

De Bres gives us the benefit of his decade of experience in the human rights sector. He adds:

Māori and the Government are facing some broad issues about which way to go. For example, issues of control- what is the role of the Crown, what is the role of the iwi, what is the role of national Māori organisations , what is the role of local Māori organisations.

De Bres reflects on his own experience with government and how it governs, on

relations between Māori and Pākehā and he expresses what he sees as how governing is happening in this area:

The Ministry of Education is a player but predominantly a Pākehā player that cannot drive Māori language yet still a great deal has to be delivered through the public education system. So when you look at how to develop relationships between government ministry and iwi, hapū and whānau in a way that works, there is a lot of grappling to do about governance. It is easy to say you need to have someone in charge but that is quite hard to deliver as well, for example, what happens in education compared to what happens in housing is quite a difference.

A national language policy

The interviewed participants took two different views in considering whether te reo Māori should be part of a New Zealand national language policy. The three participants who work in the Māori sector – O'Regan, Simcock Reweti, and Chrisp- are influenced by the work that has been done already for a Māori language strategy, from the 1978 Māori Language Act to the 2003 Māori Language Strategy, to the 2011 ministerial review of Māori language strategy. They also consider the support shown by the Māori Language Commission (TTW) and the Ministry of Māori Development (TPK). Māori language strategy already exists, supported both by Government funding and the likes of TTW and TPK. However, De Bres, as the Race Relations Commissioner in charge of the Human Rights Commission, sees te reo Māori as part of the whole country picture where there are a variety of languages, the language of the indigenous group, Māori, but also the languages of the other minority groups in the country. He looks at a national language policy as a means of human rights protection and support. In addition, a national language policy is one of the platforms continually promoted by the Human Rights Commission:

We advocate for this. Government are not showing a willingness to commit to an overall policy. It costs a lot of money. The Human Rights Commission promotes language policy. It makes public aware of policy. In the annual race relations report, there is always a chapter on language. Money is now the

problem. It used to be attitude.

Chrisp, who is the Policy Director at Te Puni Kōkiri, is obviously conscious of moves in the policy area. He comments:

New Zealand already has a language policy. Two official languages, English as a de facto official language. We respond to other language communities when issues arise. But like our Constitution, generally in New Zealand the policy environment is enabling rather than restrictive. Should we formalise a language policy more, is there are compelling reason for doing so? In 2009 the New Zealand Government endorsed the Declaration of the Rights of Indigenous Peoples. This is great but it is second to the Treaty of Waitangi.

Chrisp reflects on the different polices that do exist in New Zealand. He suggests that perhaps it is better not to have a written constitution, a written language policy. Once written there is a chance of stagnation. With what is already in place there is more chance of development. He muses:

Our present constitution is diffuse and it can reflect emerging practice. It is one of the strengths of our nation. Māori is already an official language of New Zealand. It may be used in Parliament, in the courts, in engaging with the public service and other aspects of relationships between the government and citizens. Māori can also be used in broadcasting. In non-government areas we see examples of Māori in supermarkets and libraries.

Chrisp then summarises how he sees the situation at present without a national language policy. In so doing, he reflects the feelings of his other two colleagues in the Māori sector, O'Regan and Simcock Reweti:

The Government already has a lot of policy around the place of the Māori language in the nation. One of the dilemmas of promoting Māori in government departments is that there is no demand for it. As for the question of a language policy, there is already a language policy. It is incorporated into our Constitution. It does not pick up every language that is spoken in New Zealand, but it does take in New Zealand official languages. It is a question of

balance and how far one takes those things. The Māori Language Strategy in 2003 stated several things appropriate for the Government to do at a macro level. It seems we are doing the right things. The Government can do minority language education, broadcasting, public service, community development. Ideally, we need to do more of those things, but it comes down to supply and demand. The Government is doing the right things and it must continue to do so and at appropriate levels of volume.

Summing up: Many resources for learning Māori, for supporting revitalisation, do now exist. For Māori people it is a matter firstly of speaking the language in the home. For New Zealanders generally there has been a positive shift in attitude by non-Māori towards the Māori language. But there still exists a lack of basic knowledge of what revitalisation means and an often monolingual point of view that is a barrier to understanding the situation properly.

Māori is a tribal society. There is no real effective central point where revitalisation is managed and controlled. Government agencies such as TTW and TPK can help and provide resources but these agencies cannot really control revitalisation. TTW has a promotional role in its social marketing of te reo Māori.

Examples of countries where some revitalisation have been successful, for example, Wales, Catalonia, and Quebec, have large populations of speakers living in communities. Māori are widespread, tribal, and not generally in speech communities. So despite all the help and resources available, comprehensive, successful revitalisation does seem difficult over the longer term.

The domains for speaking Māori are few but are gradually growing. Māori television and the cyberarena are playing increasingly important parts in revitalisation. They are a means of bringing the Māori language into homes.

Māori-medium education is seen as a positive support for the revitalisation of te reo Māori. But there is a lack of qualified teachers. In addition, the majority of Māori students attend mainstream schools where often the status of the language is poor.

The question of making the learning of Māori compulsory in primary schools has a variety of answers. There is general support with the suggestion that Māori could be a

core subject in the primary school system rather than being called “compulsory”.

Considering the areas of the Constitutional Review, the signing by the New Zealand Government of the Declaration of the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, and a Minister of the Māori language, participants had a variety of opinions. There seemed to be a general consensus that it is better to continue with the success in revitalisation that is happening rather than pushing for more changes.

To have Māori as a part of a national language policy was explicitly supported only by the Human Rights Commission which has an aim to achieve such a policy. But the other participants commented that there already is a national Māori language policy, the 2003 *Te Rautaki Reo Māori*- the Māori Language Strategy, and it keeps being revised, for example *Te Reo Mauriora* (2011). What is happening is positive. It is better to concentrate resources on more of the same rather than spreading into areas with unknown consequences. The growing positive attitude of Pākehā towards the Māori language, the gradual normalisation of the language in New Zealand society- these are areas that need to be consolidated, rather than spreading resources too thinly and perhaps end up with strictly mandated areas, rather than allowing the continued development of positive trends.

CHAPTER FIVE: CONCLUSIONS

The title of this thesis is: “Te Reo Māori and a New Zealand Language Policy: Prospects and possibilities.”

The early part of this thesis describes the situation for te reo Māori from pre-European colonisation in New Zealand up to the 21st century. This description reveals how the Māori language was the only language spoken in New Zealand before the Europeans arrived. Gradually, as more and more English speakers arrived in New Zealand, many Māori became bilingual speaking both Māori and English. With the continued influx of more English speakers and a fairly quick diminution of the Māori population, Māori lost many of the domains where they could speak Māori and soon even Māori people themselves were speaking mainly English. By the 1950s the language was in danger of dying out. The early 1970s saw Māori people themselves as the initiators of a revitalisation of their language. From the 1990s to the present day the revitalisation has had Government support. Still commentators even today deem the state of the health of the language as brittle needing constant, supportive attention.

For a really successful revitalisation it was noted that Māori needs to be spoken consistently in the home to ensure intergenerational transmission of the language. Many iwi are now adopting different plans to aid in the revitalisation. They are helped in their planning by Government agencies, especially the Māori Language Commission (TTW) and the Māori Development Ministry (TPK) with financial help from the Government.

A problem still remains with the reduced domains where Māori is spoken. Education helps, especially Māori –medium education, broadcasting too, but it is always the home and community where the consolidation occurs. However, what is helping is the more positive attitude the general public of New Zealand has towards the Māori language. Māori is now frequently heard on National Radio and is especially to the fore on Māori Television. The whole cyberarena gives Māori access to their own language not experienced since early New Zealand. Māori themselves will now probably decide the fate of their language on a “use it or lose it” basis.

Language Policy was examined both concerning its very nature and also how it has been implemented in other countries. In 1992, the *Aotearoa* report suggested the need for a New Zealand Language Policy with Māori as one of its priorities. 20 years later in 2012 much of what was suggested for te reo Māori in the report has been established. As a result, there is not a general demand for a New Zealand language policy today, besides a few drivers such as the Human Rights Commission. However, the Human Rights Commission's agenda in pushing for a New Zealand language policy is not motivated by a dominant concern for the Māori language but rather for all the minority languages in the country as part of a wider human rights framework.

A type of evolving New Zealand language policy can be seen in such areas as official languages and the the Government's coming to the aid of minority language communities when the needs arise. As for the Māori language, the 2003 *Māori Language Strategy* is a national Māori language policy which continues to be developed with the supervision of the Māori Language Commission, the Ministry of Māori Development, the Ministry of Education, the Government, and ongoing reports such as *WAI 262* (April 2011) and *Te Reo Mauriora* (July 2011).

The prospects suggested are that the present revitalisation efforts are working, given the need for continued surveillance, and the resources needed to support these efforts rather than be spread too thinly. The evolving development of what is happening is better to continue rather than codifying what can happen in a national language policy. An eventual revitalisation is seen as possible, but not without huge Māori effort and continued Government support.

REFERENCES

- The Australian National Policy on Languages (1987)
www.multiculturalaustralia.edu.au/doc/lobianco_2.pdf
- Baldauf, R. B., & Kaplan, R. B. (2006). *Language planning and policy in the Pacific*. Clevedon, United Kingdom: Multilingual Matters.
- Barnett, Ham, Mackereth, & Winter (2009). *Use of technology to improve language learning outcomes evaluative report*. Ministry of Education milestone report 6, contract 317-3232. Wellington.
- Barrington, J. (2008). *Separate but equal? Māori Schools and the Crown 1867-1969*. Wellington: Victoria University Press.
- Barrington, J. & Beaglehole, T. (1974). *Māori schools in a changing society. A historical review*. In New Zealand. Council for Educational Research. Wellington.
- Bedford, R. (2003). *New Zealand: The Politicisation of Immigration*. Convenor of the Migration Research Group University of Waikato .
- Bell, A., Harlow, R., & Starks, D. (2005). *Languages of New Zealand*. Wellington, N.Z.: Victoria University Press
- Benton, N., & Benton, R. (1999). *Revitalising the Māori language*. The Māori Development Education Commission
- Benton, R. A. (1981). *The flight of the Amokura : Oceanic languages and formal education in the South Pacific*. New Zealand Council for Educational Research. Wellington.
- Benton, Richard A. (1991). *The Māori Language: Dying or Reviving?* Honolulu: East West Centre Association (reprinted 1997, NZCER: Wellington).

- Best, E. (1924). *Māori Religion and Mythology*. Dominion Museum. Wellington.
- Best, E. (1934). *The Māori as he was: A Brief account of life as it was in Pre-European Days*. Dominion Museum. Wellington.
- Bishop, R. (1997). *Interviewing as collaborative storytelling*. *Education research and perspective*, 24(1).
- Bishop, R. & Glynn T. (1999a). *Culture counts: Changing power relations in education*. Palmerston North, New Zealand: Dunmore Press.
- Boyd, S. (2007) *Communication and community: Perspectives on language policy in Sweden and Australia since the Mid-1970s* in Pauwels, Anne, Winter, Joanne and Lo Bianco (Eds.), *Maintaining Minority Languages in Transnational Contexts*, Palgrave Macmillan, Basingstroke.
- Bruthlax, P. (2003). *21st Century trends in language and economics*. *Current issues in language planning*, 4(1), 84-90.
- Chrisp, S. (1997a). *He taonga te reo, the use of a theme year to promote a minority language*. *Journal of multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 18(2), 100-106.
- Chrisp, S. (1997b). *Home and community language revitalisation*. *New Zealand Studies in Applied Linguistics*, 3, 1-20.
- Chrisp, S. (2005). *Māori intergenerational language transmission*. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, 172, 149-181.
- Cohen, L., Manion, L., & Morrison, K. (2007). *Research methods in education* (6th. ed.). London ; New York: RoutledgeFalmer
- Controller and Auditor-General(2007). *Performance audits from 2007: Follow-up*

Report [on the Māori Language Strategy]. Parliamentary paper. Office of the Auditor-General. Wellington.

Cooper, R. (1989). *Language planning and social change*: Cambridge University Press.

Cram, F. (2001) *Rangahau Māori: tona tika, tona pono: the validity and integrity of Māori*. In Martin Tolich (Ed.) *Research Ethics in Aotearoa New Zealand*, 35-52. Longman, Auckland

Crystal, D. (2000). *Language Death*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

De Bres, Joris (2009). *Renewed Call for a national languages policy in New Zealand* [Letter to Ministers of Parliament].

De Bres, Julia (2008). *Planning for tolerability: promoting positive attitudes and behaviours towards the Māori language among non-Māori New Zealanders*. PhD thesis. Victoria University of Wellington.

Department of Internal Affairs Report 2000-1001. (2000-2001) (p. 43). Wellington. www.dia.govt.nz/

Desimone, L. and Le Floch, K. (2004). *Are we asking the right questions? Using cognitive interviews to improve surveys in education research*. *Education Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 26(1), 1-22.

Donmoyer, R. (2006). *Take my paradigm...please!* [The legacy of Kuhn's construct in educational research]. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, 19(1), 11-34.

Dugdale, P (2000) *Being deaf in New Zealand: a case study of the Wellington Deaf Community*. Unpublished PhD dissertation. Wellington:Victoria University.

Durie, A. (1999). *Emancipatory Māori Education: Speaking from the Heart*. In S.May

(Ed.), Indigenous community-based education. (67-78).

Durie, M. (2004). *Public sector reform, indigeneity, and the goals of Māori development*. Paper presented at the Commonwealth Advanced Seminar, Massey University

East, M. Shackleton. N. & Spence, G. (2007). *Promoting a multilingual future for Aotearoa/New Zealand: Initiatives for change from 1989 to 2003*. Journal of Asian and Pacific Communication.

The Education Ordinance (1847) *The Wānanga Capital Establishment Report*
<http://www.waitangi-tribunal.govt.nz/reports/>

The Education Act (1877). http://nzetc.victoria.ac.nz/tm/scholarly/tei-GriBook-_div3-N12E47.html

Fishman, J. (1991). *Reversing language shift: Theoretical and empirical foundations of assistance to threatened languages*. Clevedon, England. Multilingual Matters.

Fishman, J. A. (Ed.) (2001). *Can threatened languages be saved? : Multilingual Matters Ltd. Clevedon.*

Frankfort-Nachmias, C., & Nachmias, D. (1992). *Research methods in the social sciences*. London: Edward Arnold.

Galbally Review. 1978. – see Review of Post-Arrival Programs and Services for Migrants (Galbally Review). 1978.

Goff, Hon. P. (1990). Speech to “*Living languages in Aotearoa*”. Speech notes for an address given at the Wellington College of Education, Tuesday, 28 August.

- Graham, D. (1997). *Trick or treaty*. Wellington: Institute of Policy Studies.
- Green, D. (2011). *Citizenship*. Te -Ara- The Encyclopedia of New Zealand.
- Grin, F. (2003). *Language Planning and Economics*. Current Issues in Language Planning, 4(1), 1-661.
- Grin, F. & Vaillancourt. F. (1998). *Language Revitalisation Policy: An Analytical Survey- theoretical framework, policy experience and application to Te Reo Māori*. (Report to The Treasury, Wellington, New Zealand / Aotearoa; released under the Official Education Act).
- Groser, T. (2012) Radio interview with Duncan Garner. (April 28).
- Hamer, P. (2004). *Māori In Australia*. Te Puni Kokiri.
- Hamer, P (2009) . *Measuring Māori in Australia: Insights and Obstacles*. Social Policy Journal of New Zealand, 36: 77-81.
- Hamer, P. (2010) *The impact on te reo Māori of trans- Tasman migration*. Institute of Policy Studies Working Paper 10/11. Wellington
- Harlow, R. (2007). *Māori: a linguistic introduction*. Cambridge, UK: New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Hawley, Christopher 1987. *Towards a language policy*. In Walter Hirsh (ed.).1987. *Living languages: Bilingualism and community languages in New Zealand*. Auckland: Heinemann
- Henare, T. (1999). Government Press Release Tues, 5 October 1999: *A Stocktake of Māori Language Efforts*. Wellington.
- Hoffmann, Alison 1998. *The contribution of applied linguists to recent language*

policy initiatives in New Zealand: An argument for greater involvement.
TESOLANZ Journal, 6: 1-11.

Holmes, J. (2005). *Using Māori English in New Zealand*. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, 172, 91-115.

The Human Ethics Application Form (2012) Auckland University.

Human Rights Commission (2008a) Statement on Language Policy.

Human Rights Commission (2008b). The Human Rights Commission information leaflet
<http://www.hrc.co.nz/human-rights-environment/about-the-human-rights-commission>

The Human Rights Commission (2011). *Te Waka Reo: Languages in Aotearoa 2004-2011* as reviewed in the Human Rights Commission's annual Race Relations Reports 2004-2011.

Hunn, J. (1960) Report on Department of Māori Affairs: with statistical supplement, 24 August 1960. Wellington: Government Printer, 1961.

The Independent Māori Statutory Board (2012). *The Māori Plan for Tamaki Makaurau*. <http://www.imsb.Māori.nz/English/The+M257ori+Plan.html>

Ingram, D. (2000). *Language Policy and Language Education in Australia*. Invited paper to students and staff of Akita University, Japan 18 August, 2000.

Irirangi.net Home Page (www.irirangi.net)

Irish Bord Na Gaelige Act 1978.

www.irishstatutebook.ie/1978/en/act/pub/0014/index.html

- Jenkins, W. and Williams (Eds) (2000). *Let's do our best for the ancient tongue. A social history of the Welsh Language.*
- Johnson, L. and Onwuegbuzie, A. (2004). *Mixed methods research: a research paradigm whose time has come.* Educational Researcher, 32(4), 13-22.
- Jones, J. (2001) Constitution Finder
<http://confinder.richmond.edu/confinder.html>.
- Jones, A. & Jenkins, K. (2011). *He korero: Words between us. First Māori-Pākehā conversations on paper.* Huia Publishers. Wellington. New Zealand.
- Ka Hikitia -*Managing for success The Māori Education Strategy 2008-2012.*
 (Updated 2009). Wellington.
kaitiaki@kupu.Māori kupu.Māori.nz/Show.aspx?page=11
- Kaplan, R. (1994). *Language Policy and Planning in New Zealand.* Annual Review of Applied Linguistics, 14, pp. 156-176.
- Kaplan, R. & Bauldauf R. (1997). *Language planning from practice to theory:* Multilingual Matters Ltd.
- Kārena-Holmes, D. (2009). *Māori Language Understanding the Grammar* (Revised ed.). Auckland: Pearson.
- Keegan, P. (2011). Annotated Working Bibliography on Māori Revitalisation. *9th Version.*
- Kōkiri (2008) Kōkiri magazine :The April- May edition. Te Puni Kōkiri. Wellington.
- Konig, M. (1999). *Cultural Diversity and Language Policy.* International School Science Journal, 51(161), 401-408.

Kotahi Mano Kaika The 1000 homes Project- Ngai Tahu

Kuiper, K. (2005). *Invisible immigrants, inaudible language: Nederlands en Nederlanders in Nieuw Zeeland* in Bell, A., Harlow, R., & Starks, D. (2005). *Languages of New Zealand*. Wellington, N.Z.: Victoria University Press

Kvale, S. (1996). *Interviews*. London: Sage.

Kymlicka, W. (1989). *Liberalism, community, and culture*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Language Perfect www.languageperfect.com

Lo Bianco, Joseph. 1987. *National Policy on Languages*. Canberra: Australian Government Publishing Service.

Luxton, J. (2008). *A Study of Māori Economic and Social Progress*. A Working Paper for Te Puni Kōkiri

McBride, T. (2010). *The NZ Department of Internal Affairs First Official Citizenship Education Website 2009*.

McKee & Kennedy (2005). *New Zealand Sign Language*. In Bell, A., Harlow, R., & Starks, D. (2005). *Languages of New Zealand*. Wellington, N.Z.: Victoria University Press

McLauchlan, A. (2007) *The Negative L2 Climate: Understanding Attrition Among Second Language Students*. The Sasakawa Fellowship Fund for Japanese Language Education. Palmerston North.

McPherson, J. & Corson, D. (1989) *Language across the curriculum: Eight case*

studies of school based policy development. Report to the Department of Education. Palmerston North: Massey University.

Ma te Reo Fact Sheet TTW 2011. Wellington.

Māori Language Act 1987. (1987). Wellington.

www.legislation.govt.nz/act/public/1987/.../096be8ed8075051c.pdf

Māori Language Strategy (2003) Te Puni Kōkiri and Te Taura Whiri i te Reo Māori

The Māori Plan (2012). Auckland City Council

<http://www.imsb.Māori.nz/English/The+M257ori+Plan.html>

Māori Television Act 1993

www.legislation.govt.nz/act/public/2003/0021/latest/whole.html

Māori Television Policy- *Kaupapa Pouaka Whakaata Māori*. (1997). Wellington: Ministry of Commerce.

Mather, J. (2012). *Maori Television: Restructuting for the Future*.

<http://www.witbn.org/index.php/newsletter/feature/cover-story/item/159-restructure-for-the-future>.

May, S. (2000). *Accommodating and resisting minority language policy: the case of Wales*. International Journal of Bilingual education and bilingualism, 3(2).

May, S. (2003). *Rearticulating the case for Minority Language Rights*. Current Issues in Language Planning, 4(2), 95-125.

May, S. (2005a). *Bilingual/immersion Education in Aotearoa/New Zealand: Setting the Context*. The International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism, 8(5), 365-376.

May, S. (2005b). *Developing a National Languages Policy*. Paper presented at the

N.Z. Diversity Forum, Te Papa.

May, S. (2007) *Developing a NZ Languages Policy: Where to Next?*- NZ Diversity Forum in Auckland August 27, 2007

May, S. (2008). *Language and minority rights: ethnicity, nationalism, and the politics of language*. New York: Routledge.

May, S. (2012). Revised. *Language and minority rights: ethnicity, nationalism, and the politics of language*, (2nd ed.) New York: Routledge.

Miller, A. P. (2003). *Language and Power*. *Multilingual Perspectives*, 5(3), 33.

Ministry of Education Website- Te Kete Ipurangi

Ministry of Education. (1990a). *Education Amendment Act 1990*. Wellington.

Ministry of Education. (1990b). *Te Ata Hāpara A starter Māori language course for teachers*. Wellington.

Ministry of Education. (2007). *The New Zealand Curriculum*. Wellington: Learning Media.

Ministry of Education. (2007). *Te Marautanga o Aotearoa New Zealand Curriculum for Māori-medium Schools*. Wellington: Learning Media.

Ministry of Education. (2009). *Te Aho Arataki Marau mō te Ako I Te Reo Māori-Kura Auraki*. Curriculum Guidelines for Teaching and Learning Te Reo Māori in English-Medium Schools: Years 1-13. Wellington: Learning Media.

Ministry of Education homepage (2012) . www.minedu.govt.nz/.

Ministry of Māori Affairs. (1991). *Māori Language Amendment Act 1991*. Wellington.

Ministry of Māori Development Act 1991

www.legislation.govt.nz/act/public/1991/0145/.../DLM257770.html

Moorfield, J. (Ed.) (2006) *Te Whanake Te Aka Māori-English, English-Māori Dictionary and Index*. Auckland: Pearson Education Ltd.

Moorfield, C. (2008). *Te Whanake I Te Kākano* (Second ed.). Auckland: Pearson Education New Zealand.

Mullholland, M. & Tawhai., V. (Eds.). (2010). *Weeping Waters : The Treaty of Waitangi and Constitutional Change*. Wellington: Huia.

National language policy network. (2009). *Te Waka Reo Newsletter*(September). (National language policy network, 2009)

The Native Schools Act (1867). <http://nzetc.victoria.ac.nz/tm/scholarly/tei-BIM873TeHa-t1-g1-t2.html>

The New Zealand Association of Language Teachers (NZALT) (1995). *Policy on Language Teaching and Learning in Secondary Schools*.

The New Zealand Association of Language Teachers (NZALT) 2008-2012 Strategic Plan.

The New Zealand Curriculum, 2007. www.nzcurriculum.tki.org.nz/Curriculum-Documents.

Ngāi Tahu *Education Strategy, 2006*. www.ngaitahu.iwi.nz/Ngai-Tahu.../Ngai-Tahu-Education/EducationS...

Nicholson, R. (1997). *Marketing the Māori Language*. In J. Reyhner (Ed.), *Teaching Indigenous Languages* (206-213). Northern Arizona University.

Nicholson, R. & Garland, R. (1991). *New Zealanders attitudes to the revitalisation of*

the Māori language. Journal of multilingual and Multicultural Development, 12(5), 393-410.

Niupepa: *Māori newspapers* (1842-1933) Alexander Turnbull Library-a microfiche collection. Wellington

Orange, C. (2011). *The Treaty of Waitangi* (2nd ed.). Wellington: Bridget Williams Books.

Ozolins, U. (1993). *The politics of language in Australia*. Melbourne: Cambridge University Press.

Parliamentary Debates (Hansard) for Tuesday , 20 April 2010. The New Zealand Parliament, Wellington. New Zealand.

Parks, S. (Summer 2002). *Language Rights and Political Change* JAC. A Journal of Composition Theory, 22(3), 358-667.

Peddie, R., & University of Auckland. (1991). *One, two, or many? : the development and implementation of languages policy in New Zealand*. Auckland [N.Z.]: University of Auckland

Peddie, R. & Centre for Continuing Education (Auckland N.Z.). (1993). *From policy to practice: the implementation of languages policies in Victoria, Australia, and New Zealand*. [Auckland, N.Z.]: Centre for Continuing Education University of Auckland.

Peddie, R. (1997) *Why are we waiting? Language policy development in New Zealand*.

In Eggington, W. & Wren, H. (Eds.) (1997) *Language policy Dominant English, Pluralist Challenges*. John Benjamins Publishing Company. Language Australia Ltd. (7. pp. 121-148).

Peddie, R. (2005). *Planning for the future? Languages policy in New Zealand*. In

A. Bell, R. Harlow, & D. Starks (Eds.), *Languages of New Zealand* (pp. 30-55).
Wellington, N.Z.: Victoria University Press

Pihama, L. Smith. K. Taki, M. Lee, J. (2004). *A Literature Review on Kaupapa Māori. and Māori Education Pedagogy* The International Research Institute for Māori and Indigenous Education

Roberts, M. (2005). *Immigrants' attitudes to language maintenance in New Zealand*.
In Bell, A., Harlow, R., & Starks, D. (2005). *Languages of New Zealand*.
Wellington, N.Z.: Victoria University Press

The "Press". Christchurch (2011) Editorial advocating compulsory Māori in schools.
Monday, November 14, 2011. A p.12.

Reising, B. (1997). *Do we need a national language policy?* Clearing House, 70(5),
21.

Rewi, P. (2010). *Whaikōrero: The world of Māori oratory*. Auckland University
Press.

Ricento, T. (Ed.) (2006). *An introduction to language policy theory and method*.
Oxford, UK: Blackwell.

Roberts, M. (2005) *Immigrants' attitudes to language maintenance in New Zealand*.
In Bell, A., Harlow, R., & Starks, D. (2005). *Languages of New Zealand*.
Wellington, N.Z.: Victoria University Press

Romaine, S. (2002) *The impact of language policy on endangered languages in New Zealand*. *International Journal on Multicultural Societies*, 4(2).

Sharima, Y (1997) *China cuts lessons in mother tongue*. Times Educational
Supplement. 06/06/97, Issue 4223, p20, 1/2p, 1 bw

Sharples, P. (2011). Launch of Māori Language Week 2011. Te Waka Reo
Newsletter.

- Skerrett, M. (2010) *Kotahi Mano Kāika-Kotahi Mano Wawata*. Ngai Tahu Iwi Language Revitalisation. 10 Year Review of Language Strategy.
- Skutnabb-Kangas, Tove (2002). *Why should linguistic diversity be maintained and supported in Europe? Some arguments*. In Guide for the development of language education policies in Europe: from linguistic diversity to plurilingual education. Reference study. Strasbourg: Council of Europe, Language Policy Division, DG IV. www.coe.int/T/E/Cultural_Co-operation/education/Languages/Language_Policy/Policy_development_activities/Studies/Skutnabb-KangasEN.pdf.
- Smith, H. (2004). *Attitude of teacher educators in Aotearoa New Zealand towards Bilingualism and Language Diversity*. Victoria University, Wellington.
- Smith, L. (1999). *Decolonising methodologies: research and indigenous people*. Dunedin: London and University of Otago Press.
- Spence, G. (2004). *The practice of policy in New Zealand*. *Current Issues in Language Planning*, 5 (4), 389-406.
- Spolsky, B. (1998). *Sociolinguistics*: Oxford University Press.
- Spolsky, B. (2004). *Language Policy*: Cambridge University Press.
- Spolsky, B. (2010). *Introduction: What is Educational Linguistics?* In B.Spolsky, & F. Hult, (Eds.), *The Handbook of Educational Linguistics*. Hong Kong: Blackwell.
- Statistics New Zealand (2007) www.stats.govt.nz/publications/.../innovation-in-new-zealand-2007.a...
- Strategic Directions Te Taura Whiri I te Reo Māori 2009-2011

Sutton, D. (ed). (1994). *The Origin of the First New Zealanders*. Auckland: Auckland University Press.

Taiuru, K. (2006) *A Dictionary of Māori Computer related terms. English – Māori*.

Taonui, R. (2009). *Canoe traditions- the meaning of canoe traditions* Te Ara- the Encyclopedia of New Zealand.

Te Aho Arataki Marau mō te Ako i Te Reo Māori- Kura Auraki.

tereomāori.tki.org.nz/content/.../762/.../Curriculum%20guidelines.PD...

Te Kete Ipurangi homepage. www.tki.org.nz/

Te Maire Tau, R. (2003). *The Oral Traditions of Ngāi Tahu*. Dunedin: University of Otago Press.

Te Māngai Pāho, (2011). Statement of Intent 2011-2016.

www.tmp.govt.nz/about.html

Te Puni Kōkiri, (1999). *Te Tūāoma :The Māori Language The Steps that Have Been Taken*. Te Puni Kōkiri. Wellington.

Te Puni Kōkiri (2002a). *2001 Survey of the Health of the Māori Language*. Te Puni Kōkiri. Wellington.

Te Puni Kōkiri. (2002b) *Survey Of Attitudes, Values and Beliefs about the Māori Language*. Te Puni Kōkiri. Wellington.

Te Puni Kōkiri, (2003). *He Reo e Kōrerotia Ana, He Reo Ora- a shared future for the future of the Māori language*. Te Puni Kōkiri. Wellington.

Te Puni Kōkiri, (2004) *Te Reo Māori I te hapori: Māori language in the community*. Māori Language Team, Te Puni Kōkiri. Wellington

Te Puni Kōkiri, (2006). *The Health of the Māori Language*. TePuni Kōkiri.
Wellington.

Te Puni Kōkiri (2007). Statement of Intent-2007-2010. Te Puni Kōkiri. Wellington.

Te Rautaki Reo Māori 2003. *The Māori Language Strategy*. www.tpk.govt.nz/in-print/our.../the-Māori-language-strategy/

Te Reo Mauriora (2011) a review of the Māori Language Strategy.
www.tpk.govt.nz/en/newsevents/news/launch-of-te-reo-mauriora/

Te Reo o Ngāti Kahungunu 2006-2027: Strategic Plan.

www.kahungunu.iwi.nz/sections/.../AGENDAPLANNINGPack.doc

Te Rito, J. (2008). *Struggles for the Māori language: He whawhai mo te reo Māori*
[Article 6]. Mai Review.

Te Taura Whiri i te Reo Māori website www.tetaurawhiri.govt.nz/english/

Te Taura Whiri I te Reo Māori Strategic Directions 2009-2011.

Te Taura Whiri i te Reo Māori (2012a) Guidelines for language orthography.

Te Taura Whiri i te Reo Māori (2012b). Homepage – [www,tetaurawhiri.govt.nz](http://www.tetaurawhiri.govt.nz)

Te Waka Reo (2009, September edition) Newsletter of the Human Rights
Commission.

Te Waka Reo (2012, May). *Languages in Aotearoa* – Human Rights Commission
[www.hrc.co.nz/.../Te-Waka-Reo-Languages-in-Aotearo-2004-2011....](http://www.hrc.co.nz/.../Te-Waka-Reo-Languages-in-Aotearo-2004-2011...)

Te Waka Reo (2012, October). Newsletter of the Human Rights
Commission.

- Tollefson, J. (ed) (2002) *Language Policies in Education :Critical Issues*. New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Trudgill, P. (2000) *Sociolinguistics: an introduction to language and society*. (4th ed.). Penguin Books. London.
- Tunks, A. (1996). Mana Tiriti. In L. Trainor (Ed.), *Republicanism in New Zealand* (pp. 123). Palmerston North: Dunmore Press.
- United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (2007).
www.un.org/esa/socdev/unpfii/documents/DRIPS_en.pdf
- Unks, G. (1983). *The perils of a single language policy*. Educational leadership, 41(2), 18.
- WAI 11 (1986) *Te Reo Māori Claim*. The Waitangi Tribunal.
- WAI 262 (2011) *Ko Aotearoa Tenei*.
<https://www.ubsbooks.co.nz/bookweb/details.cgi?ITEMNO...>
- Waikato Tainui (2012). <http://www.waikatotainui.com/>
- Waite, J. (1992). *Aotearoa Speaking for Ourselves* Part A: The Overview. Learning Media.
- Waite, J. (1992). *Aotearoa Speaking for Ourselves* Part B : The Issues. Learning Media.
- Waitangi Tribunal (1986) *Wai 11 Te Reo Māori Claim*. Wellington: The Government Printer.
- Waitangi Tribunal (2011) Wai 262 *Ko Aotearoa Tēnei* - “This is New Zealand”

Welsh Language Act 1993 Retrieved from

<http://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/1993/38/contents>

Wilkinson, T. (2001). *The core ideas of ethics research*. In M. Tolich (Ed.), *Research ethics in Aotearoa New Zealand concepts, practice, critique* (pp. 13-24). Auckland.

Winitana, C. (2011). *My Language my Inspiration*. Wellington: Huia & Te Taura Whiri i te Reo Māori.

Wright, S. (2004). *Language policy and language planning*: Palgrave Macmillan.

APPENDIX I THE ETHICS APPLICATION FORM

RESEARCH/COURSEWORK PROJECT APPLICATION FORM

Prior to completing the application form, please check whether:

- (i) exemption applies (refer the Guiding Principles Section 3e), or
- (ii) the matter needs to be referred to a Regional Ethics Committee or a Multi-Centre Ethics Committee for approval (refer the Guiding Principles Section 3c).

Please note that the questions in the Research Project and Coursework application form are not exactly the same. Please refer to the Notes below.

Notes:

1. Questions prefixed with an **R** are applicable to a **Research Project** only.
2. Questions prefixed with a **C** are applicable to a **Coursework Application** only.
3. Questions without **R** or **C** are applicable to both Research Projects and Coursework Applications.
4. Questions prefixed with an asterisk (*) are mandatory.
5. Where an email address is requested, the University of Auckland e-mail address must be used
6. Questions that are answered with a fixed set of choices (like **Yes** or **No**) have the possible answers separated with a slash (/). Please delete the incorrect answer.

Please contact UAHPEC secretary at 3737599 extn: 87830/83761 or e-mail: humanethics@auckland.ac.nz if there are any queries on these procedures.

GENERAL INFORMATION

* **Is this a Research Project or Coursework Application?** Research

SECTION A: PERSONNEL

R A:1 **Principal Investigator** Name:

Professor Stephen May

Department:

E-Mail Address:

s.may@auckland.ac.nz

A:2 Co-Investigator

Name:

E-Mail Address:

A:3 Student

Name:

Mr Raymond Nicholson

rnic041@aucklanduni.ac.nz

E-Mail Address:

***C**

A:1 Course Coordinator

Name:

Department:

E-Mail Address:

A:2 Course Administrator

Name:

SECTION B: RESEARCH PROCEDURES

***R**

B:1 Project Title

Te reo Māori and a New Zealand national language policy: possibilities and prospects.

***C**

B:1 Paper Name & Number

B:2 Aims/Objective of Project

The Māori language is at present undergoing a revitalisation, continuing from a good 30 years of action. The official status of the language is that it is both an indigenous and an official language of Aotearoa / New Zealand. However the language is not considered to be safe from extinction and so different approaches are being undertaken both to raise its status and ensure its survival. In 1992 a Government sponsored report, *Aotearoa* spearheaded by Jeffrey Waite, promoted a New Zealand national language policy with te reo Māori as an important part of it. 20 years on the very demographic of New Zealand has changed where not only are there a lot more ethnic groups and languages in New Zealand but the number of Māori people has also greatly increased. Two influential

Government reports of 2011, namely *Te Reo Mauriora* (April) and *Wai 262-Ko Aoteroa tēnei* (July) look forward to a raise in status of te reo Māori. The aim of this research is to suggest how the status of te reo Māori can be further raised by being part of a New Zealand national language policy. Participants to be interviewed have been chosen who have been / are playing an active part in revitalisation and /or knowledgeable about it. Participants have been chosen as a result of consultation by the researcher, Raymond Nicholson, with his supervisor, Professor Stephen May

Note: Please note: all acronyms must be written out in full the first time they appear in the application, recruiting materials, Participant Information Sheet (PIS) and Consent Form (CF).

***R B:3 Summary of the Project (max 2000 characters)**

New Zealand is a “treaty country”, where in 1840 at the Treaty of Waitangi an agreement was made by the resident indigenous people, the Māori people, with the colonizing people from Britain. The signed agreement guaranteed the Māori people *tinio rangatiratanga* (“sovereignty / self-determination”) over their *taonga* (“treasures”). One of these taonga was the Māori language. Whereas there has been and continues to be much dispute over the wider dimensions of sovereignty there is now a more open agreement about Māori self-determination in regard to the status of the Māori language for the Māori people. In 1985 the Waitangi Tribunal adjudged that the Māori language was protected by virtue of Article 2 of the Treaty of Waitangi. However for a good 130 years (1840-1970) the Māori language suffered to such a degree that there were real possibilities of it becoming an endangered language. As a result Māori themselves initiated a determined and prolonged revitalisation of their language.

The research background traces the history of the Māori language in New Zealand from the Treaty of Waitangi to the present day, with an emphasis on the revitalisation of the language and outlines the measures taken to underpin this revitalisation. Only gradually and just recently the New Zealand Government has shown some real support for the revitalisation of the Māori language.

The whole background of the history of the language is set in a global perspective of the domain of “language policy” . Language policy as a domain of inquiry is very recent in human history, just 50 to 60 years old. Language policy is what a government does either officially through legislation, court decision or policy to determine how

languages are used, how to cultivate language skills needed to meet national priorities or to establish the rights of individuals or groups to use and maintain language.

In 1992 there was a government sponsored discussion document *Aotereo*, spearheaded by Jeffrey Waite, which outlined in detail a New Zealand language policy with the Māori language as a top priority. However it is said that “fiscal restraint” saw the document not proceed beyond the discussion level.

There are many facets that make up the revitalisation of the Māori language and a number of different initiatives in process but there is a seemingly lack of cohesion between the different interested parties. This research concludes that the Māori language which is both an indigenous and official language of New Zealand would not only benefit positively to being part of a New Zealand language policy but that it would also be better protected and its revitalisation more certainly planned for the present and the future.

Note: When submitting the application, please attach a more detailed description of the project and its background which places the project in perspective and allows the Committee to assess its significance.

***R**

B:4 Project Duration

Start

End D

B:5 Describe the study design

This study will use individual interviews. Each interview will be up to 2 hours in duration. For the institutions chosen an individual member of the institution will speak on behalf of the institution. There is a core set of questions that will be similar for each interview but for each interview some questions will be asked that are specific to the individual or institution’s background

*

B:6 List all the methods used for obtaining information.

Interviews will be carried out face-to-face and recorded with an iPad and a scribe pen as a back-up. The questions attached are indicative of the scope of questions that will be used to guide the interview. However although there are similar questions for each individual, there should be allowance for the conversation to go where the participant feels comfortable narrating.

Interviews: Yes

Note: If "yes", please attach the Interview Schedule when submitting your application.

Focus Groups: No

Note: If "yes", please attach the Focus Group Questions when submitting your application.

Questionnaires: No

Note: If "yes", please attach the Questionnaire when submitting your application.

Observations: No

Other: No

(If "yes" to Other, please explain)

*

B:7 Does the research involve processes that involve EEG, ECG, MRI, TMS, FMRI, EMG, radiation, invasive or surface recordings? No

(If "yes", please explain)

*

B:8 Does the research involve processes that are potentially disadvantageous to a person or group (for example, the collection of information which may expose the person/group to discrimination)? No

(If "yes", please explain)

* **B:9 Who will carry out the research procedures?**

The researcher, Mr Raymond Nicholson

Note: If the research procedures will be carried out by a third party other than the researcher or co-investigators, please attach a copy of the confidentiality agreement when submitting your application.

* **B:10a Where will the research procedures take place?**

It is proposed that the interviews take place at the workplaces of the participants, with their consent, or to another venue of the participant's choosing.

Note: Please attach the appropriate Request for Site Access and Consent Form when submitting your application, if necessary

***R B:10b Will the research be conducted overseas? No**

(If "yes", please indicate which countries are involved. Please provide local contact details as well as those of contacts at the University – all of these should appear in the PIS)

***R B:10c If the study is based overseas, explain what special circumstances arise and how they will be dealt with. Include any special requirements of the country (e.g. research visa) and/or the community with which the research will be carried out.**

(If study is based overseas, please explain)

* **B:11a If a questionnaire is used, is the questionnaire web-based?**

No

Note: If "yes", please indicate this on the PIS

* **B:11b If a questionnaire is used, is it an anonymous questionnaire?**

No

(If "yes", please explain (and indicate on the PIS) how anonymity will be preserved)

* **B:12 How much time will participants need to give to the research?**

Up to to two hours.

Note: Please indicate this on the PIS

***R** **B:13 Will information on the participants be obtained from third parties?** No

(If "yes", please explain)

Note: If Yes, please explain (and indicate on the PIS) & attach a copy of the Support Letter where necessary when submitting your application. For example: information is to be obtained from participant's employer, teacher, doctor, etc.

***R** **B:14 Will any identifiable information on the participants be given to third parties?**

No

(If "yes", please state who and explain)

* **B:15 Does the research involve evaluation of University of Auckland services or organisational practices where information of a personal nature may be collected and where participants may be identified?** No

(If "yes", please explain and indicate this on the PIS)

* **B:16 Does the research involve a conflict of interest or the appearance of a conflict of interest for the researcher?** No

(If "yes", please explain and indicate this on the PIS)

***R B:17 Does the research involve matters of commercial sensitivity?**

No

(If "yes", please explain and indicate this on the PIS)

***R B:18 Has the study design or the use of data been influenced by an organisation outside The University of Auckland? No**

(If "yes", please explain)

***R B:19 Are you intending to conduct the research in The University of Auckland class time? No**

Note: Please attach the approval from the Course Coordinator when submitting your application

*** B:20 Does the research involve deception of the participants, including concealment or covert observations? No**

(If "yes", please justify its use and describe the debriefing procedure on the PIS)

Note: Please attach the debriefing sheet when submitting your application.

***R B:21 Is there any koha, compensation or reimbursement of expenses to be made to participants? No**

(If "yes", please explain the level of payment and indicate in the PIS)

* **B:22a Is this an intervention study?** No

(If "yes", please explain and indicate this on the PIS)

* **B:22b Does this research involve potentially hazardous substances?**

No

(If "yes", please explain and indicate this on the PIS)

***C Will there be participants from outside this class?** Yes / No

(If "yes", please explain who they are and how much time will be required)

SECTION C: PARTICIPANTS

* **C:1 Who are the participants in the research?**

Adults: **Yes**

Own Colleagues: **No**

Persons whose capacity to give informed consent (other than children) is compromised: **No**

Persons who are in a dependent situation, such as people with a disability, residents of a hospital, nursing home or prison, or patients highly dependent on medical care: **No**

Persons aged less than 16 years old where parental consent is sought: **No**

Note: If you answered "yes" to the question (above) on where parental consent is sought for persons aged less than 16 years old, please indicate the age range of the persons below and explain in Section D2a & b

Less than 7 years old: **No**

Greater than 7 and less than 16 years old: **No**

Other: **No**

* **C:2 How many organisations and departments within the organisations will participate in your project?** two

The two organisations are: The Māori Language Commission (Te Taura Whiri o te Reo Māori) and The Ministry of Māori Development (Te Puni Kōkiri).

Note: If you have letters of support, please attach these when submitting your application.

***R C:3 How many individual participants (research participants) will participate in your project? Four**

C:4 How will you identify potential participants and by which method are participants invited to take part in the research?

The participants have been identified by my supervisor, Professor Stephen May. Professor May has provided me, the researcher, with the email addresses of the potential participants. He is known to all the participants. In my email, Professor May has asked me to state I am emailing the participants at his suggestion for the research.

Note: Using a direct approach to recruit participants is not recommended.

Please see the explanation for further information. Please attach the advertisement, media release, or notice, etc and the letter of permission from the agency supplying them (if applicable) when submitting your application.

*** C:5 Who will make the initial approach to potential participants?**

Researcher

(If "Researcher and/ or "Other", please specify and explain)

The researcher is Mr Raymond Nicholson, a MEd student of Professor May. The interviews are for the specific research of the researcher.

*** C:6 Will access to participants be gained with consent of any organisation? No**

(If "yes", please explain)

* **C:7 Is there any special relationship between participants and researchers?** No

(If "yes", please explain)

***R C:8 Does the research involve University of Auckland staff or students where information of a personal nature may be collected and where participants may be identified?** No

(If "yes", please explain and indicate this on the PIS)

* **C:9 Does the research involve participants who are being asked to comment on employers?** No

(If "yes", please explain and indicate this on the PIS)

***R C:10 Are there any potential participants who will be excluded?**
No

(If "yes", please explain and state in here the criteria for excluding participants)

SECTION D: INFORMATION AND CONSENT

* **D:1 By whom and how will information about the research be given to participants?**

The researcher will send the Participant Information Sheets (PIS) and the consent forms (CF) to the participants by email.

* **D:2a Will the participants have difficulty giving informed consent on their own behalf?** No

* **D:2b If participants are not competent to give fully informed consent who will consent on their behalf?**

Parent or Guardian/Caregiver: **No**

Other: **No**

(If "Other", please specify)

* **D:3a If a questionnaire is used, will the participants have difficulty completing the questionnaire on their own behalf?** No

Note: If yes, please answer the next question. If no, please skip the next question.

* **D:3b If participants are not competent to complete the questionnaire, who will act on their behalf?**

Parent or Guardian/Caregiver: **No**

Other: **No**

(If "Other", please specify)

* **D:4 Does the research involve participants giving oral consent rather than written consent?** No

(If "yes", please explain and justify and indicate this on the PIS)

* **D:5 Does the research use previously collected information or biological samples for which there was no explicit consent?** No

(If "yes", please explain)

***R D:6 Is access to the Consent Forms restricted to the Principal Investigator and/or the researcher?** Yes

(If "no", please explain and justify and indicate this on the PIS)

* **D:7 Will Consent Forms be stored by the Principal Investigator, in a secure manner?**

Yes

(If "no", please explain and justify and indicate this on the PIS)

***R D:8 Are Consent Forms stored separately from data and kept for six years?**

Yes

(If "no", please explain and justify and indicate this on the PIS)

SECTION E: STORAGE AND USE OF RESULTS

* **E:1 Will the participants be audio-taped, video-taped, or recorded by any other electronic means such as Digital Voice Recorders? Yes**

(If "yes", please indicate the types of recordings)

iPad and scribe pen audio-recordings.

Note: If "no", please skip the next 5 questions.

* **E:2a Will the recordings be transcribed or translated? Yes**

Note: If "yes", please indicate this on the PIS & CF.

* **E:2b Who will be transcribing the recordings?**

The researcher

(If "Researcher and/or "Other", please explain in PIS & CF who will do the transcription (if not the researcher) & how confidentiality of information will be preserved. Please attach Confidentiality Agreement when submitting)

* **E:2c If recordings are made, will participants be offered the opportunity to edit the transcripts of the recordings? No**

(Please explain)

The transcripts will not be made available to participants but access to the **recordings** will be available to the participants.

- * **E:2d Will participants be offered their tapes or digital files of their recording (or a copy thereof)?** Yes

(If yes, please explain)

The access to the recordings will be available for up to one month after the interviews take place.

- * **E:3 For the questionnaire, is any coding scheme used to identify the respondent?** No

Note: If "yes", please explain the coding procedure in the PIS.

- * **E:4a Explain how and how long the data (including audio-tapes, video-tapes, digital voice recorder, and electronic data) will be stored.**

Following the guidelines of the University of Auckland Human Participants Ethics Committee (UAHPEC), data will be retained for a period of 6 years post publication in a secure cabinet in the Supervisor's office at the Faculty of Education, University of Auckland and after which time it will be disposed of in a secure manner (e.g. shredded and deleted).

Note: Please explain in the PIS & CF in what format data will be stored

- * **E:4b Explain how data will be used.**

The data will be used for my Master's thesis and any other subsequent publication, conference, etc.

Note: Please indicate this on the PIS.

- ***R E:4C Explain how data will be destroyed.**

Textual data will be shredded. Digital recordings will be deleted.	
--	--

Note: Please explain in the PIS & CF in what format, data will be subsequently destroyed.

* **E:5 Describe any arrangements to make results available to participants.**

Once the research is complete, a brief summary of the findings from this study will be available for participants who indicated they wanted to receive a copy	
---	--

Note: Please explain this in the PIS

***R E:6a Are you going to identify the research participants in any publication or report about the research? Yes**

Note: If "yes", the PIS must inform the participants, and this must be part of the consent obtained in the CF. If "no", please answer the next question.

***R E:6b Is there any possibility that individuals or groups could be identified in the final publication or report? Yes**

(If "yes", please explain here and describe in the PIS)

There is still a possibility of being identified as the participants are national figures.
--

SECTION F: TREATY OF WAITANGI

* **F:1 Does the proposed research have impact on Māori persons as Māori?**

Yes

Note: If "yes", please answer the remaining questions in this section. If "no", please go straight to Section G.

* **F:2 Explain how the intended research process is consistent with the provisions of the Treaty of Waitangi.**

This research is consistent with Article 2 of the Treaty of Waitangi *tino rangatiratanga* (“sovereignty” / “self-determination”) as it sees the Māori language as a *taonga* (“treasure”). In trying to ascertain how the Māori language is being revitalized, my supervisor has selected four well-known Māori leaders who can be most helpful with their first-hand knowledge of the situation of te reo Māori in New Zealand today. As part of the research process I will proceed with sensitive caution, being respectful of the positions of the potential participants, in the spirit of kaupapa Māori. Dr Fiona Cramm (Ngati Kahungunu) in her article “Rangahua Māori –The Validity and integrity of Māori research” writes: *for Māori research the initial approach take place at the level of the community: the iwi, hapū, whānau, rather than at the level of the individual.* However each of the individuals, the potential participants– Hana O’Regan, Tipene Chrisp, Joris de Bres, and the two institutions – the Māori Language Commission (Te Taura Whiri I te Reo Māori) for which Mere-Heeni Simcock Reweti is the spokesperson and the Ministry of Māori Development (Te Puni Kokiri), for which Tipene Chrisp is the spokesperson, has been representative of pan-Māori association rather than a particular *iwi*. Access to all the people is in an urban situation rather than on a marae. So in place of kaumatua, my initial contact will be through my supervisor, Professor Stephen May, who has both national and international standing in the knowledge area of te reo Māori and language policy. Known to all the potential participants and institutions mentioned above, he will act as the person of first approach as is appropriate for Māori leaders. He will recommend me, the researcher, as a worthy representative to research in the area of te reo Māori.

My follow-up, should potential participants agree to be interviewed, is to approach each one face-to-face, while observing all the Māori protocols of meeting people. On this, Fiona Cramm further writes: *An important part of any research process is actually fronting up, face-to-face to the community where the research is being conducted. This might happen, for example, in an office, at a school or on a marae.*

- * **F:3 Identify the group(s) with whom consultation has taken place, describe the consultation process, and attach evidence of the support of the group(s) when submitting the application.**

The following people have been consulted concerning potential interviews with the potential participants: my supervisor, Professor Stephen May, the critical studies Ethics Advisor, Dr Katie Fitzpatrick, the Pro Vice Chancellor Māori nominee, Dr McMurchy, the secretary of UAHPEC Rimmi Kothari, and Sharon Boyd, Administrator, Research Unit, Faculty of Education the University of Auckland.

- * **F:4 Describe any on-going involvement the group(s) consulted has in the project.**

Professor Stephen May will continue as my supervisor.

- * **F:5 Describe how information will be disseminated to participants and the group consulted at the end of the project.**

A summary of the findings will be made available to the participants as stipulated in the PIS and CF.

- * **F:6 List all the Māori methodology used for obtaining information.**

Predominant use of a kanohi ki te kanohi (face to face) approach when establishing networks, interacting and engaging with individuals and organizations: **Yes**

The use of karakia and appropriate protocols to conduct hui: **No**

The use of powhiri, whakatau and mihimihi processes: **No**

The use and promotion of te reo Māori: **No**

The use of protective mechanisms regarding cultural and intellectual property of participants: **Yes**

The use and significance of kai: **No**

The use and active practice of culturally appropriate processes wherever possible: **Yes**

Other: **No**

(If "Other", please explain)

SECTION G: OTHER CULTURAL ISSUES

* **G:1 Are there any aspects of the research that might raise any specific cultural issues?**

No

Note: If "yes", please answer the remaining questions in this section. If "no", please go straight to Section H.

* **G:2 What ethnic or cultural group(s) does the research involve?**

* **G:3 Identify the group(s) with whom consultation has taken place, describe the consultation process, and attach evidence of the support of the group(s) when submitting your application.**

* **G:4 Describe any on-going involvement the group(s) consulted has in the project.**

***R G:5 Describe how information will be disseminated to participants and the group(s) consulted at the end of the project.**

Note: Please indicate this on the PIS and CF.

SECTION H: RISKS AND BENEFITS

***R H:1 What are the possible benefits to research participants of taking part in the research?**

A possible benefit to research participants is the knowledge that this research sees the chosen participants as active contributors towards the revitalisation of te reo Māori and their contribution is seen to enhance the status of the Māori language, something each participant is actively promoting in his/ her daily life.

*** H:2 Is the research likely to place the researcher at risk of harm?**

No

(If "yes", please clearly identify/explain these risks here and in the PIS and CF)

*** H:3 Is the research likely to cause any possible harm to the participants, such as physical pain beyond mild discomfort, embarrassment, psychological or spiritual harm? No**

(If "yes", please clearly identify/explain these risks here and in the PIS and CF)

*** H:4 Does the research involve collection of information about illegal behaviour(s) which could place the researcher or participants at risk of criminal or civil liability or be damaging to their financial standing, employability, professional or personal relationships? No**

(If "yes", please clearly identify/explain these risks here and in the PIS and CF)

- * **H:5 Is the research likely to give rise to incidental findings?** No

(If "yes", please explain how you will manage the situation)

Note: Clearly identify/explain these risks in the PIS and CF.

- * **H:6 Describe what provisions are in place for the research participants should there be adverse consequences or physical or psychological risks.**

The interviews are to be done with the full knowledge of my supervisor, Professor May, and the Ethics Committee. Participants will be given telephone numbers of both the supervisor and the Ethics Committee, should the participants want to make contact with them.

Note: Please explain this in the PIS and CF.

SECTION I: HUMAN REMAINS, TISSUE AND BODY FLUIDS

- * **I:1 Does the research involve use of human blood, body fluids, or tissue samples?**

No

Note: If "no", please go to Section J. If "yes", please explain in the PIS.

Provide a copy of the information to be given to the Transplant Coordinator (if necessary), and state the information that the Transplant Coordinator will provide to those giving consent. Complete the remaining questions in this section.

- * **I:2 Are these samples obtained from persons involved in research or will the tissue be obtained from a tissue bank?**

- * **I:3 Is the tissue imported or taken in New Zealand? Imported / NZ**

(If "imported", please indicate the country of origin)

Note: If ethics approval is obtained from the country of origin, please attach the approval when submitting your application.

- * **I:4 Describe how the sample / specimen is taken.**

- * **I:5a Is blood being collected? Yes / No**

Note: If "yes", please indicate this on the PIS and answer the next 4 questions. If "no", please skip the next 4 questions.

- * **I:5b What is the volume at each collection?**

- * **I:5c How frequent are the collections?**

- * **I:5d Who is collecting it?**

- * **I:5e Is the collector trained in phlebotomy? Yes / No**

(If "no", please explain)

- * **I:6a Will sample / specimen be retained for possible future use?**

Yes / No

(If "yes", please explain and state this in the PIS and CF)

Note: If "yes", please answer the next 2 questions. If "no", please skip the next 2 questions.

- * **I:6b Where will the material be stored?**

* **I:6c How long will it be stored for?**

* **I:7a Will material remain after the research process? Yes / No**

(If "yes", please explain and state this in the PIS and CF)

Note: If "yes", please answer the next 2 questions. If "no", please skip the next 2 questions

* **I:7b How will material be disposed of?**

* **I:7c Will material be disposed of in consultation with relevant cultural groups? Yes / No**

(If "yes", please explain and state this in the PIS and CF)

SECTION J: CLINICAL TRIALS

***R** **J:1 Is the research considered a clinical trial? No**

Note: If "yes", please include the declaration of the trials in the PIS under "Compensation" and attach Form A or Form B when submitting your application and answer the remaining questions in this section. If "no", please go straight to Section K.

***R** **J:2 Is this project initiated by a Pharmaceutical Company? Yes / No**

Note: If "yes", please attach the letter from the Pharmaceutical Company when submitting your application.

***R** **J:3 Are there other NZ or International Centres involved? Yes / No**

Note: If "yes", please attach the support letter when submitting your application.

***R** J:4 **Is there a clear statement about indemnity? Yes / No**

(If "no", please explain)

Note: If "yes", please attach a copy of the indemnity when submitting your application.

***R** J:5 **Is Standing Committee on Therapeutic Trials (SCOTT) approval required?**

Yes / No

Note: If "yes", please attach a copy of the SCOTT approval when submitting your application.

***R** J:6 **Is National Radiation Laboratory (NRL) approval required?**

Yes / No

Note: If "yes", please attach a copy of the NRL approval when submitting your application.

***R** J:7 **Is Gene Therapy Advisory Committee on Assisted Human Reproduction (NACHDSE) approval required? Yes / No**

Note: If "yes", please attach a copy of the NACHDSE approval when submitting your application.

SECTION K: FUNDING

***R** K:1 **Have you applied for, or received funding for this project? No**

Note: If "yes", please answer the remaining questions in this section. If "no", please go straight to Section L.

***R** K:2 **From which funding institution?**

***R** K:3a **Is this a UniServices project? Yes / No**

***R** K:3b **Is this a Research contract? Yes / No**

***R** K:3c **Is this a Commercial or consulting contract? Yes / No**

***R K:4 Contract reference number**

***R K:5 Do you see any conflict of interest between the interests of the researcher, the participants or the funding body? Yes / No**

(If "yes", please explain)

SECTION L: OTHER INFORMATION

*** L:1 Have you made any other related applications? No**

(If "yes", please provide Approval Reference Number)

*** L:2 Is there any relevant information from past applications or interaction with UAHPEC? No**

(If "yes", please indicate it here and attach the relevant information when submitting your application)

*** L:3 Please provide a summary of all the ethical issues arising from this project and explain how they are to be resolved.**

(For example: confidentiality, anonymity, informed consent, participant's rights to withdraw, conflict of interest, etc.)

(UAHPEC expects applicants to identify the ethical issues in the project and explain in the documentation how they have been resolved. The application will not be considered if this is not answered adequately. A "Not applicable" response is not acceptable.)

Confidentiality:

The four individuals to be interviewed: Joris de Bres, Tipene Chrisp, Hana O'Regan, and Mere-Heeni Simcock Reweti are well known people in their fields in New Zealand and currently write or speak on matters related to the Māori language. With their consent their information will be reported in this thesis. The two institutions: Te Taura Whiri o te Reo Māori (the Māori Language Commission) and Te Puni Kokiri (the Ministry of Māori Development) are both institutions active in the revitalisation of the Māori language.

Everyone will be given the opportunity to receive the recordings.

The researcher will transcribe all the interviews so there will be no need of a confidentiality agreement for any one else to sign as regards the transcriptions.

Anonymity:

Anonymity will be granted if requested by participants in which case confidentiality will also be granted. Where anonymity is not requested, reference to participants will be noted in the thesis.

Informed consent:

Each potential participant will receive both a consent form (CF) and Participant Information Sheets (PIS). Written consent will be sought from all participants.

Participant's rights:

The participant's rights are spelt out in both the consent form (CF) and the participant information sheet (PIS) concerning consent, participation, withdrawal, data storage, destruction of files, and future use.

Participant's right to withdraw:

This right is spelt out on the consent form: "I understand that I am free to withdraw participation at any time, and to withdraw any data traceable to me up to one month after the interview."

Conflict of interest

Should any conflict of interest arise in the interview, the participant's right not to answer the conflict of interest areas will be fully respected.

SECTION M: APPLICATION CHECKLIST

- * Have you attached the Participant Information Sheet? (See Applicant’s Manual Sections 2b-ii, 2c and 5a for explanation and sample) : **Yes**
- * Have you attached the Consent Form? (See Applicant’s Manual Sections 2b-iii, 2d and 5b for explanation and sample) : **Yes**
- * Have you attached the list of interview questions? : **Yes**
- * Have you completed the Application Checklist (Preliminary Assessment)? : **Yes**

APPLICATION CHECKLIST (Please delete whichever is not applicable)

Preliminary Assessment				
A.	Risk of Harm			
	1.	Does the research involve situations in which the researcher may be at risk of harm?		NO
	2.	Does the research involve the use of any method, whether anonymous or not, which might reasonably be expected to cause discomfort, pain, embarrassment, psychological or spiritual harm to the participants?		NO
	3.	Does the research involve processes that are potentially disadvantageous to a person or group, such as the collection of information which may expose the person/group to discrimination?		NO
	4.	Does the research involve collection of information about illegal behaviour(s) which could place the researcher or participants at risk of criminal or civil liability or be damaging to their financial standing, employability, professional or personal relationships?		NO
*	5.	Does the research involve any form of physically invasive procedure on participants, such as the collection of blood, body fluids, tissue samples, DNA, human tissue from a tissue bank, exercise or dietary regimes or physical examination?		NO
*	6.	Does the research involve any intervention administered to the participant, such as drugs, medicine (other than in the course of standard medical procedure), placebo, environmental conditions, food/drink?		NO

*	7	Does the research involve processes that involve EEG, ECG, MRI, TMS, FMRI, EMG, radiation, invasive or surface recordings?		NO
*	8.	Is the research considered a clinical trial?		NO
	9.	Does the research involve physical pain beyond mild discomfort?		NO
B. Informed and Voluntary Consent				
	1.	Does the research involve participants giving oral consent rather than written consent? (If participants are anonymous the response is “No”).		NO
	2.	Does the research involve participation of children (seven years old or younger)?		NO
	3.	Does the research involve participation of children under sixteen years of age where parental consent is not being sought?		NO
	4.	Does the research involve participants who are in a dependent situation, such as people with a disability, residents of a hospital, nursing home or prison, or patients highly dependent on medical care?		NO
*	5.	Does the research involve participants who are being asked to comment on employers?		NO
	6.	Does the research involve participants (other than children) whose capacity to give informed consent is in doubt?		NO
	7.	Does the research use previously collected information or biological samples for which there was no explicit consent?		NO
C. Research conducted overseas				
	1.	Will the research be conducted overseas?		NO
D. Privacy and confidentiality issues				
	1.	Does the research involve evaluation of University of Auckland services or organisational practices where information of a personal nature may be collected and where participants may be identified?		NO
	2.	Does the research involve University of Auckland staff or students where information of a personal nature may be collected and where participants may be identified?		NO
	3.	Does the research involve matters of commercial sensitivity?		NO
	4.	Does the research involve Focus Groups?		NO

E.	Deception			
	1.	Does the research involve deception of the participants, including concealment or covert observations?		NO
F.	Conflict of interest			
*	1.	Does the research involve a conflict of interest or the appearance of a conflict of interest for the researcher (for example, where the researcher is also the lecturer/teacher/treatment provider/colleague or employer of the participants, or where there is a power relationship between researcher and participants)?		NO
G.	Cultural sensitivity			
	1.	Does the research have impact on Māori?	YES	
	2.	Does the research raise any specific ethnic or cultural issues not relating to Māori?		NO
H.	Requirements imposed from outside The University of Auckland			
	1.	Does the research involve a requirement imposed by an organisation outside The University of Auckland?		NO

A more detailed description of the project.

New Zealand is a “treaty country”, where, in 1840 at the Treaty of Waitangi, an agreement was made by the resident indigenous people, the Māori people, with the colonizing people from Britain. The signed agreement guaranteed the Māori people *tino rangatiratanga* (sovereignty, self-determination) over their *taonga* (treasures). One of these *taonga* was the Māori language. Whereas there has been and continues to be much dispute over the wider dimensions of sovereignty in Aotearoa/New Zealand, there is a more open agreement about the status of the Māori language for Māori people. In 1985 the Waitangi Tribunal adjudged that the Māori Language was protected by virtue of Article 2 of the Treaty of Waitangi (a *taonga*). However for a good 130 years (1840-1970) the Māori language suffered to such a degree that there were real possibilities of Māori becoming an endangered language. As a result Māori themselves initiated a determined and prolonged revitalisation of their language.

The research background traces the history of the Māori language in Aotearoa/New Zealand from the Treaty of Waitangi to the present day, with an emphasis on the revitalisation of the language and outlines the measures taken to underpin this revitalisation. Only gradually and really just recently the New Zealand Government have shown some real support for the revitalisation of the Māori language.

The whole background of the history of the language is set in a global perspective of the domain of “language policy”. Language policy as a domain of inquiry is very recent in human history, just 50 to 60 years old. Language policy is what a government does either officially through legislation, court decision or policy to determine how languages are used, cultivate language skills needed to meet national priorities or to establish the rights of individuals or groups to use and maintain language. A language policy in a country can have positive or negative consequences for a language or languages within the particular country. A number of countries have recognized language policies, such as Australia, Canada, Wales, France, Germany, Japan, China, and many others. New Zealand does not have a language policy, although a government sponsored discussion document *Aotearoa* spearheaded by Jeffrey Waite in 1992 outlined in detail a New Zealand language policy with the Māori language as a top priority. However it is said that “fiscal restraint” saw the document not proceed beyond the discussion level. Today the Human Rights Commission continue to champion a New Zealand national language policy and has a monthly newsletter *Te Waka Reo* through which the National Language Policy Network is facilitated by the Human Rights Commission as part of the New Zealand diversity Action Programme.

In the last 30 years or so the Māori Language has become an intricate part of the Aotearoa/New Zealand society. At international events it appears as the first verse of our national anthem; with English it is one of the two languages that make up the New Zealand passport; there are two Māori Television Māori channels and 22 Iwi Radio Stations; bilingual signage is on the increase (*tane* “men”, *wahine* “women”, *Aorangi* “Mt Cook”); Pākehā New Zealanders readily understand many Māori words (e.g. *iwi*, *haka*, *marae*, *hui*, *tapu*, *tangi*...); besides Māori being taught in mainstream education it is taught also in Māori medium schools. In a recent document *Te Reo Mauriora* (April 2011) “Review of the Māori Language Sector and the Māori Language Strategy” a Minister of the Māori Language is promoted and Māori in the home supported by the tribe (*iwi*) is seen as critical.

In July 2011 the publication of the Waitangi Tribunal's *Wai 262* document has wide Government support. This document seeks to go beyond grievance to partnership. With the Māori population estimated to be 21% of the New Zealand population by the year 2050, this partnership is reassuring.

The prospects and possibilities of the Māori language as part of a national language policy are spelt out in the thesis. In general what is foreseen is a natural evolution of the revitalisation process that is already happening provided there is an increase of Māori spoken in the home, supported by both iwi and education.

There are many facets that make up the revitalisation of the Māori language and a number of different initiatives in process but there is a seemingly lack of cohesion between the different interested parties. This research concludes that the Māori language which is both an indigenous and an official language of New Zealand would not only benefit positively to being part of a New Zealand National Language Policy but would also be better protected and planned with more certainty for the present and the future.

References

- Benton, N., & Benton, R. (1999). Revitalizing the Māori language: The Māori Development Education Commission.
- Chrisp, S. (2005). Māori intergenerational language transmission. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, 172, 149-181.
- De Bres, J. (2009). Renewed Call for a national languages policy in New Zealand: Letter to Ministers of Parliament.
- East, M. Shackleford, N. & Spence, G. (2007). *Promoting a Multilingual Future for Aotearoa/New Zealand : Initiative for Change from 1989 to 2003*. *Journal of Asian Pacific Communication* 17:1 (2007), pp. 11-28).
- Fishman, J. A. (2000). Reversing language shift : RLS theory and practice revisited. In

K. G. E. L. M. P. (eds) (Ed.), *Assessing ethnolinguistic vitality: theory and practice, selected papers from the Third International Language Assessment Conference. SIL International* (pp. 1-25). Dallas, Texas.

Hoffmann, Alison 1998. The contribution of applied linguists to recent language policy initiatives in New Zealand: An argument for greater involvement. *TESOLANZ Journal*, 6 pp. 1-11.

Holmes, J. (2005). Using Māori English in New Zealand. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, 172, 91-115.

Keegan, P. (2011). Annotated Working Bibliography on Māori Revitalisation. *9th Version*.

May, S. (2008). *Language and minority rights: ethnicity, nationalism, and the politics of language*: Harlow, Essex, England New York: Longman.

Romaine, S. (2002). The Impact of Language Policy on Endangered Languages. *International Journal on Multicultural Societies*, 4(2).

Spolsky, B. (2004). *Language Policy*: Cambridge University Press.

Strategic Directions Te Taura Whiri I te Reo Māori 2009-2011

Te Paepae Motuhake (2011) Te Reo Mauriora

Waite, J. (1992). *Aotearoa Speaking for Ourselves Part B : The Issues*. Learning Media.

Waitangi Tribunal (2011) Wai 262 Ko Aotearoa Tenei - “This is New Zealand”

APPENDIX II: THE CONSENT FORM



The University of Auckland
The Faculty of Education
Phone (09) 623 889

Consent Form

(This form will be kept for a period of 6 years.)

Project title: Te reo Māori and a New Zealand national language policy –possibilities and prospects.

Name of Researcher: Raymond Nicholson, Ngati Kahungunu

I have read the Participant Information Sheet, have understood the nature of the research and why I have been selected. I have had the opportunity to ask questions and have them answered to my satisfaction.

- I agree to take part in this research.
- I agree to being interviewed for up to two hours.
- I understand that I am free to withdraw participation at any time, and to withdraw any data traceable to me up to one month after the interview.
- I agree to be recorded and understand that data will be stored in a digital format and transcribed by the researcher.
- I wish/do not wish to have what is recorded given to me.
- I wish / do not wish to receive the summary of findings.

- I understand that data will be kept for 6 years after which both the digital recordings and transcriptions will be destroyed.
- I would like/ not like to be named in the study.
- I understand that even if I am not named there is a possibility of being identified.
- I understand that should any area arise in the interview that could cause a conflict of interest, the interviewer will respect my right not to answer questions relating to the conflict of interest area.
- I understand that should I have any questions about the whole process of this research, directed communication to all the interested parties has been supplied on the Participant Information Sheets.

This Consent Form will be restricted to the Principal Investigator and the researcher and will be stored on University premises

Name

Signature..... Date

Approved by the University of Auckland Human Participants Ethic Committee on

22-Mar- 2012 for 3 years

Reference number 7960

APPENDIX III: THE PARTICIPATION INFORMATION SHEET



The University of Auckland

The Faculty of Education

Phone (09) 623 889

For Providers

TITLE: Te reo Māori and a New Zealand national languages policy – possibilities and prospects.

Tena koe e

I am a Master of Education student from the University of Auckland at the Faculty of Education where my supervisor is Professor Stephen May. I am studying and researching for a thesis concerning the status of the Māori language in New Zealand, suggesting that, although te reo Māori is today both an indigenous and official language of Aotearoa/New Zealand, its status could be raised and its revitalisation better promoted if the language could be part of a national language policy of New Zealand. As a student working on my thesis I am requesting your permission for you to be involved as a participant in this research project.

In carrying out this research project I propose seeking your perspective concerning various aspects of te reo Māori. These aspects relate to the revitalisation of the language, the providers of Māori language learning both Māori-medium and mainstream, the present state of Māori spoken in the home, the role of the different

iwi concerning the language, and the benefit of te reo Māori being part of a national languages policy.

I note that you are active in promoting the revitalisation of te reo Māori and I would hope that my research will piece together the different strands of those groups who are involved in the revitalisation. Your participation in this research is voluntary, but my supervisor and I think that you have a valuable part to play in the research. However, should any conflict of interest arise in the interview, your right not to answer the conflict of interest areas will be fully respected.

With your consent I will carry out an interview using an iPad with a recording scribe pen as a back-up. The interview will be up to two hours in duration and will be recorded and transcribed for later analysis. Those being interviewed may request the recording to be turned off at any stage during the interview. If you want a copy of the recorded interview this will be available to you. The interview is scheduled to take place in March or April 2012 at the availability of both the participant and the researcher. If you agree to be a participant, I am requesting that the interview be undertaken at your workplace but am flexible for it to be another venue of your choosing.

As the researcher I will also be the transcriber of the recording and initially it will be only myself and my supervisor who will have access to the recording. The data from the recordings will be used for my Master's thesis and any other subsequent publication, conference, etc. You have the right to anonymity which will be granted if you request it in which case confidentiality will also be granted. Where anonymity is not requested, reference to participants will be noted in the thesis. As a participant you may wish to have access to a brief summary of the findings and/or the thesis when it is completed.

The recordings will be stored in digital format and following Auckland University procedures the recording will be retained for 6 years and then destroyed and the transcriptions shredded.

If you have any questions about this project before you make up your mind to participate or any stage during the process please feel free to contact me as the researcher or any other of the interested parties listed below.

The Researcher

Mr Raymond Nicholson, *Ngati Kahungunu*

School of Critical Studies in Education
Epsom Campus, Auckland University
mic041@aucklanduni.ac.nz Phone 0212 386 178

Professor Stephen May
Principal Investigator
School of Critical Studies in Education
Faculty of Education
The University of Auckland
A Block, Room 105
Gate 4, 74 Epsom Avenue
Epsom, Auckland
Ph: 623 8899 extn 48410
s.may@auckland.ac.nz

Dr Airini
Head of School
School of Critical Studies in Education
Faculty of Education
The University of Auckland
N Block, Room 372
Gate 4, 74 Epsom Avenue
Epsom, Auckland
Ph: 623-8899 extn 48826
airini@auckland.ac.nz

For Ethical concerns contact: The Chair, The University of Auckland Human
Participants Ethics Committee, The University of Auckland, Office of the Vice
Chancellor, Private Bag 92019, Auckland 1142
Telephone 09 373 7599 extn. 83711

APPROVED BY THE UNIVERSITY OF AUCKLAND HUMAN PARTICIPANTS
ETHICS COMMITTEE on 22 Mar-2012
For 3 years, Reference Number 7960

APPENDIX IV: THE QUESTIONNAIRES

Core Questions for Each Interview

- 1 What is the present status of te reo Māori in NZ today?
- 2 When did the revitalisation of the language begin?
- 3 Who were the main drivers of the revitalisation?
- 4 What is the progress of the revitalisation in the different iwi?
- 5 What is the state of the teaching and learning of te Reo Māori in mainstream education today?
- 6 What is the state of the teaching and learning of te Reo Māori in Māori medium education today?
- 7 What present and future possibilities are there for the Māori language in the community, both spoken and written?
- 8 How successful is Māori spoken in the home?
- 9 If NZ were to adopt a national language policy (e.g. compare the 1992 discussion document *Aotearoa* by Jeffrey Waite), how do you think this would affect te reo Māori?
- 10 Is there any other aspect of te Reo Māori you would like to comment on?

Hana O'Regan

- 1 What is the present status of te reo Māori in NZ today?
- 2 When did the revitalisation of the language begin?
- 3 Who were the main drivers of the revitalisation?
- 4 What is the progress of the revitalisation in the different iwi?
- 5 Te Puni Kōkiri?
- 6 Te Taura Whiri i te reo Māori?
- 7 the Human Rights Commission *Te Waka Reo*
- 8 What is the progress of revitalisation in Kai Tahu?
- 9 How is the “1000 homes “ project progressing?
- 10 What is the state of the teaching and learning of te reo Māori in mainstream education today?
Schools- Polytechs-universities-Wānanga-Ministry of Education-?
- 11 What is the state of the teaching and learning of te reo Māori in Māori medium education today?
- 12 What present and future possibilities are there for the Māori language in the community, both spoken and written?
- 13 To what extent is Māori spoken in the home generally in New Zealand?
- 14 Are there any real obstacles for people understanding te reo Māori throughout the country because of dialects? What about “standard Māori”, is there a place for it?
- 15 What are your opinions concerning the *Te Reo Mauriora* document? A Minister for the Māori language? Has the Te Matawai Board been established? And the Rūnanga-ā-Reo (9 of them)? Are the different iwi leading revitalisation? Who are they and what are they doing?
- 16 Ko Aotearoa Tēnei Wai 262
- 17 The coming Constitutional Review
- 18 The effect of the Government’s endorsement of the Universal Declaration of the Rights of Indigenous Peoples
- 19 What does the body of written Māori consist of? Māori literature?
- 20 If NZ were to adopt a national language policy (e.g. compare the 1992 discussion document *Aotearoa* by Jeffrey Waite), how do you think this would affect te reo Māori?

- 21 What is your perception of the New Zealand general public's attitude towards te reo Māori today?
- 22 What is your broad vision for the future of te reo Māori?
- 23 What particular books or articles would you recommend me reading on what we have been talking about?
- 24 Is there any other aspect of te reo Māori you would like to comment on?

Joris de Bres

- 1 What is the present state of te Reo Māori in NZ today?
- 2 When did the revitalisation of the language begin?
- 3 Who were the main drivers of the revitalisation?
- 4 What is the progress of the revitalisation in the different iwi?
- 5 What is the state of the teaching and learning of te Reo Māori in Māori-medium education today?
- 6 The Education Department? Universities? Polytechs? Wānanga? The Māori Language Commission? Te Puni Kōkiri?
- 7 What present and future possibilities are there for the Māori language in the community, both written and spoken?
- 8 To what extent is Māori spoken in the home?
- 9 Is there any place for “standard” Māori?
- 10 What is the state of iwi radio today?
- 11 What is the state of Māori television today?
- 12 What do you see as the main functions of the *Te Waka Reo* newsletter?
- 13 In the Human Rights Commission what is the climate like for te Reo Māori?
- 14 If NZ were to adopt a national language policy (e.g., compare the 1992 discussion document *Aotearoa* by Jeffrey Waite), how do you think this would affect te Reo Māori?
- 15 What are your opinions concerning the *Te Reo Mauriora* document? What about a Minister of te Reo Māori?
- 16 What about Wai 262 *Ko Aotearoa Tēnei*?
- 17 The coming Constitutional Review?
- 18 The effect of the Government’s endorsement of the Universal Declaration of the Rights of Indigenous Peoples?
- 19 What does the body of Māori literature consist of? Written Māori literature?
- 20 What is your perception of the New Zealand general public’s attitude towards te Reo Māori today?
- 21 What is your broad vision for the future of te Reo Māori?

- 22 Are there any particular books or articles you would recommend me reading?
- 23 Is there any other aspect of te Reo Māori you would like to comment on?

Mere-Heeni Simcock Reweti

- 1 Are you representing both yourself and the Commission?
- 2 What is the present status of te reo Māori in NZ today?
- 3 What do you see as the main functions of the Māori language Commission?
- 4 When did the revitalisation of the language begin?
- 5 Who were the main drivers of the revitalisation?
- 6 What is the progress of the revitalisation in the different iwi?
- 7 What is the state of the teaching and learning of te reo Māori in mainstream education today?
- 8 What is the state of the teaching and learning of te reo Māori in Māori medium education today?
- 9 The Education Department? Universities? Polytechs? Wānanga? Te Puni Kōkiri? The Human Rights Commission?
- 10 What present and future possibilities are there for the Māori language in the community, both spoken and written?
- 11 To what extent is Māori spoken in the home generally in New Zealand?
- 12 Is there any place for “standard Māori”?
- 13 What is the state of iwi radio today?
- 14 What is the state of Māori television?
- 15 If NZ were to adopt a national language policy (e.g. compare the 1992 discussion document *Aotearoa* by Jeffrey Waite), how do you think this would affect te reo Māori?
- 16 What are your opinions concerning the *Te Reo Mauriora* document? What about a Minister of te reo Māori?
- 17 What about Wai 262 *Ko Aotearoa Tēnei*?
- 18 The coming Constitutional Review?
- 19 The effect of the Government’s endorsement of the Universal Declaration of the Rights of Indigenous Peoples?
- 20 What does the body of Māori literature consist of? Written Māori literature?
- 21 What is your perception of the New Zealand general public’s attitude towards te reo Māori today?

- 22 What is your broad vision for the future of te reo Māori?
- 23 Are there any particular books or articles you would recommend me reading?
- 24 Is there any other aspect of te reo Māori you would like to comment on?

Tipene Chrisp

- 1 What do you consider the main functions of Te Puni Kōkiri?
- 2 What is the present status of te Reo Māori in NZ today?
- 3 When did the revitalisation of the language begin?
- 4 Who were the main drivers of the revitalisation?
- 5 What is the progress of the revitalisation in the different iwi?
- 6 What is the state of the teaching and learning of te Reo Māori in mainstream education today?
- 7 The Education Department? Universities? Polytechs? Wānanga? The Māori Language Commission? The Human Rights Commission?
- 8 What present and future possibilities are there for the Māori language in the community, both spoken and written?
- 9 To what extent is Māori spoken in the home?
- 10 Is there any place for “standard Māori”?
- 11 If NZ were to adopt a national language policy (e.g., compare the 1992 discussion document *Aotearoa* by Jeffrey Waite), how do you think this would affect te Reo Māori?
- 12 What are your opinions concerning the *Te Reo Mauriora* document? What about a Minister of te Reo Māori?
- 13 The coming Constitutional Review?
- 14 The effect of the Government’s endorsement of the Universal Declaration of the Rights of Indigenous Peoples?
- 15 What does the body of Māori literature consist of? Written Māori literature?
- 16 What is your perception of the New Zealand general public’s attitude towards te Reo Māori today?
- 17 Are there any particular books or articles you would recommend me reading?
- 18 What is your broad vision for the future of te Reo Māori?
- 19 Is there any other aspect of te Reo Māori you would like to comment on?

Te Puni Kōkiri

(Ministry of Māori Development)

- 1 What is the present status of te reo Māori in NZ today?
- 2 What do you see as the main functions of Te Puni Kokiri?
- 3 When did the of the language begin?
- 4 Who were the main drivers of the revitalisation?
- 5 What is the progress of the revitalisation in the different iwi?
- 6 What is the state of the teaching and learning of te reo Māori in mainstream education today?
- 7 What is the state of the teaching and learning of te reo Māori in Māori medium education today?
- 8 What present and future possibilities are there for the Māori language in the community, both spoken and written?
- 9 How successful is Māori spoken in the home?
- 10 What is the state of iwi radio stations today?
- 11 What is the state of Māori TV today?
- 12 If NZ were to adopt a national language policy (e.g. compare the 1992 discussion document *Aotearoa* by Jeffrey Waite), how do you think this would affect te reo Māori?
- 13 Is there any other aspect of te reo Māori you would like to comment on?

Te Taura Whiri I te Reo Māori
(The Māori language Commission)

- 1 What is the present status of te reo Māori in NZ today?
- 2 What do you see as the main functions of the Māori language Commission?
- 3 When did the revitalisation of the language begin?
- 4 Who were the main drivers of the revitalisation?
- 5 What is the progress of the revitalisation in the different iwi?
- 6 What is the state of the teaching and learning of te reo Māori in mainstream education today?
- 7 What is the state of the teaching and learning of te reo Māori in Māori medium education today?
- 8 What present and future possibilities are there for the Māori language in the community, both spoken and written?
- 9 How successful is Māori spoken in the home?
- 10 What is the state of iwi radio today?
- 11 What is the state of Māori television?
- 12 If NZ were to adopt a national language policy (e.g. compare the 1992 discussion document *Aotearoa* by Jeffrey Waite), how do you think this would affect te reo Māori?
- 13 Is there any other aspect of te reo Māori you would like to comment on?