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Abstract

This study theorises the lack of clarity and ambiguity in education policy relating to the purpose of Māori language education for non-Māori students. The research focuses on as-a-subject Māori language education in English medium secondary schools. It includes an analysis of the policies which affect these types of settings, and the experiences of a group of young non-Māori people who have learnt or are learning Māori. The study provides an explanation of the nature and purpose of a particular policy corpus, as well as the effects of those policies.

The lack of clarity and ambiguity in policy relating to the purpose of Māori language education for non-Māori can be explained by understanding the nature and purpose of the policy itself. I conceptualise Māori language policy for non-Māori as a symbolic policy which functions to sustain and legitimate the educational myth of biculturalism. The purpose of the bicultural myth in education is to bind groups together with a unity of purpose. However, its promise of a happy, harmonious bicultural nation obscures its ideological strategy as a mechanism to segregate groups and to justify group rather than universal rights.

The study draws on an anthropology of policy approach which conceptualises policy as ‘charters for action’ producing certain kinds of social relations by influencing attitudes and practices. This approach enables a focus on how symbolic education policy works in practice to sustain and legitimate bicultural ideology. I argue that the primary purpose of Māori language learning for non-Māori is not the development of communication skills but rather a means of ensuring that the ideology of biculturalism remains hegemonic. Instead of working to promote the use of Māori language among Māori language learners, Māori language policy, as symbolic policy, works to sustain a ‘Māori people as ethnically and culturally distinct’ narrative. This is an important narrative thread in the myth of biculturalism. The study found that the lack of clarity and ambiguity in the policy does in fact contribute to this narrative thread.
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Chapter 1: Introduction

They would probably be like pretty glad and stuff, that other people are getting to know their culture and are willing to speak [Māori]. (Katalina, Tongan, year 12)

I was at a party once and Stacey was there and we had been speaking [Māori] and someone came in and he was Māori and he was drunk, and he was like, “What are you doing speaking my language?” (Nicole, NZ European, adult)

The aim of this study is to theorise the current lack of clarity and ambiguity in education policy relating to the purpose of Māori language education for non-Māori students. The research focuses on as-a-subject Māori language education in English-medium mainstream secondary schools. It includes an analysis of the policies which affect these types of settings and the experiences of a group of young people who have learnt or who are learning Māori this way. Māori language education in schools is positioned at the intersection of a number of diverse social and political forces. Studying the lack of clarity in the policy is an effective means of illuminating those forces.

My many years working as a non-Māori teacher of Māori language in secondary schools led me into this research, in part because of my own experiences and in part because of my curiosity about how non-Māori students might view the purpose of Māori language learning. This curiosity about non-Māori learners of Māori language was also fuelled by my professional knowledge of education policy documents which promote and support biculturalism while at the same time being very unclear about the purpose of Māori language education for non-Māori students. Biculturalism, broadly speaking, is the concept of a partnership relationship between Māori and the Crown established by the signing of the Treaty of Waitangi in 1840. While biculturalism has become increasingly institutionalised through public policy since its emergence in the late 1980s there is no single understood and agreed upon definition of the term or associated practices (see for example Durie, 1989; Mulgan, 1989; Sharp, 1995; Vasil, 1988; Walker, 1986). Although biculturalism is not a fixed or stable concept, Māori language operates powerfully as its symbol.

Biculturalism and Māori language policy

Biculturalism is also used to refer to a partnership relationship between Māori and pākehā. However, even naming the groups that constitute this partnership raises issues, and I will return to this matter further on in the chapter. In 1986 a successful claim was made to the Waitangi
Tribunal which established the Māori language as a taonga (treasured possession), and as such, is guaranteed protection by the Treaty of Waitangi. The word ‘guarantee’ was interpreted as the requirement to act, “[i]t requires active steps to be taken to ensure that the Māori people have and retain the full exclusive and undisturbed possession of their language and culture” (Waitangi Tribunal, 2013b, p. 20). Although Waitangi Tribunal decisions are not binding on the government, this requirement to act would eventually become the justification for the establishment of a separate state funded education system known as kura kaupapa Māori, in which the principal language would be Māori. It is also reflected in National Education Goal 9, the “increased participation and success by Māori through the advancement of Māori education initiatives, including education in Te Reo Māori, consistent with the principles of the Treaty of Waitangi” (Ministry of Education, 2009b).

Bicultural education policy can be described as a material policy insofar as ensuring Māori language education opportunities are available for all students. A material policy is, according to Rizvi and Lingard (2010), committed to implementation and is accompanied by funding and sometimes evaluation mechanisms to ensure the achievement of its goals. Section 13(b) of the Education Act 1989 demonstrates this materiality. Accordingly a school charter must contain “[t]he aim of ensuring that all reasonable steps are taken to provide instruction in tikanga Māori (Māori culture) and te reo Māori (the Māori language) for full-time students whose parents ask for it”. Currently students being educated in the compulsory education sector can choose to learn Māori in a range of different Māori language immersion level settings, from Māori medium schools or units within schools, to as-a-subject Māori language classes. Māori Language Programme (MLP) funding exists as an additional funding stream to a school’s operations grant, providing some support or perhaps even incentive, to offer Māori language education. Funding is differentiated amongst the immersion levels, with students involved in Level 1 immersion settings receiving the most funding per capita¹.

Māori language education policy is inextricably linked with bicultural education policy within which it is nested. The New Zealand curriculum acknowledges the “bicultural foundations of Aotearoa New Zealand” and states that te reo Māori is “a taonga recognised under the Treaty of Waitangi” (Ministry of Education, 2007, p. 14). The right of school students of Māori ethnicity to learn either through the medium of Māori language, or to learn Māori language as a subject is accepted by the state as part of its obligation to honour the Treaty of Waitangi. However, the

¹ The immersion levels are clarified in the following chapter. In 2012, Māori Language Immersion Level 1 students were funded at $917.53 per student (GST exclusive) while Level 4 students were funded at $58.59 (Ministry of Education, 2013e).
purpose of Māori language education for non-Māori students, as it is articulated in policy, is not clear. This is in contrast to statements made about the purpose of Māori language education for students of Māori ethnicity which clearly signal that knowledge of Māori language contributes to a strengthened Māori cultural identity. Statements to this end include “by learning te reo and becoming increasingly familiar with tikanga, Māori students strengthen their identities”, and “[t]e reo Māori underpins Māori cultural development and supports Māori social and economic development in Aotearoa New Zealand and internationally” (p. 14).

For non-Māori students the purpose of Māori language learning lacks such clear direction. The curriculum states that “[t]e reo Māori is ... a primary source of our nation’s self-knowledge and identity” (p. 14). This could be understood as implying that Māori language ought to be viewed as a national language and shared by all, or it could be understood as suggesting that the existence of a unique indigenous language contributes to New Zealand’s point of difference in the world, regardless of who is actually using the language. In the same paragraph of the curriculum as the above statement, it is claimed that through learning Māori language and tikanga, “non-Māori journey towards shared cultural understandings” (p. 14). Beyond this vague and abstract statement, little else is said about the purpose of learning Māori for non-Māori students.

A simple explanation for this near silence regarding the purpose of Māori language education for non-Māori might be that the creators of the policy considered that there were too few of this type of student to warrant more attention. It is true that the number of students enrolled at any level of Māori language immersion programmes in secondary schools is modest as Tables 1 and 2 indicate. Yet, given these modest numbers and the ongoing concern about the future well-being of the language, it would seem that all students learning Māori language in schools should be considered equally important.

Table 1. Level of Māori Language Immersion by Year Level (Māori Medium) - 1 July 2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding year level</th>
<th>Level of Māori Language Immersion</th>
<th>Level 1: 80-100%</th>
<th>Level 2: 51-80%</th>
<th>Māori</th>
<th>Non-Māori</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Year 9</td>
<td>628</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 10</td>
<td>527</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 11</td>
<td>412</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 12</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 13</td>
<td>201</td>
<td></td>
<td>77</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 14</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2,076</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>587</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(adapted from Ministry of Education, 2013b)
Māori language education policy as symbolic policy

I argue that the lack of clarity in policy relating to the purpose of Māori language education for non-Māori can be explained by understanding the nature and purpose of the policy itself. Although Māori language education policy functions to an extent as a material policy, I consider that it functions largely as a symbolic policy, especially as it applies to non-Māori learners. Rizvi and Lingard (2010) differentiate between material and symbolic policies. They describe symbolic policies as those which “usually carry little or no commitment to actual implementation and usually do not have substantial funding attached” (Rizvi & Lingard, 2010, p. 9). In addition symbolic policies “tend to have vague, ambiguous and abstract goals statements” (p. 9). However, the effects of symbolic policy can be significant because they can have a strategic function, legitimating a particular political view (Rein, 1983).

Māori language education policy, which has the abstract purpose of enabling non-Māori to “journey towards shared cultural understandings” (Ministry of Education, 2007, p. 14), does not require any particular implementation strategy, in fact quite the opposite. Its purpose is to legitimate and sustain bicultural education policy within which it is nested. This purpose is made more complex because there is no single bicultural ideology, rather a number of bicultural ideologies which overlap with one another, sharing some common elements but not all. These changing or evolving bicultural ideologies affect the way different groups view the use of Māori language by non-Māori. A symbolic policy, with its characteristically vague and abstract goals is thus very useful as an ideological mechanism. It is able to legitimate bicultural education policy without defining biculturalism. It holds open space for different interpretations and understandings of what bicultural education practices might look like, while at the same time appearing to represent a unified set of beliefs about what is currently believed to be a worthwhile direction for the educational endeavour.
Symbolic policy and the legitimation of myth

Bicultural education policy is also more usefully understood as symbolic policy (although it does have some materiality, for example, in terms of funding) because it most often appears in documents referring to an aspirational relationship, but it is very difficult to translate this aspiration into a set of practices that can be implemented. Both bicultural education policy and Māori language education policy are symbolic policies which have considerable power because of their function in sustaining and giving substance to the educational myth of biculturalism.

I do not use the word ‘myth’ with any intention to disparage, but rather I draw on Clarence Beeby’s (1986) useful notion of an educational myth - the function of which is to give purpose and direction to the educational endeavour. In Beeby’s words an educational myth is:

... a form of communication, spoken or assumed, between contemporaries or between generations. It's a communication that can't be taken quite literally. It gets public credence and support from its capacity to express, in relatively simple terms, relations between ideas and events that aren't completely understood and whose outcomes can't be fully foreseen. Within limits, it can be interpreted in different ways by different people; it leaves some place for the element of the irrational that underlies most human activities, and it gives a sense of direction rather than absolute goals. (1986, pp. 53-54)

The notion of myth and myth-making is a significant theme in this thesis. Jurgen Habermas (1971) observed that political myth-making is an important function of the hegemonic state whose legitimacy depends on a consensus among the citizenry. While myths have a social function because they bind groups together and enable consensus, it is also important to be aware of their ideological underpinnings (Halpern, 1961).

In order to describe the processes by which the ideology of biculturalism came to be institutionalised through policy, I employ Antonio Gramsci’s concept of ideology as the “cement” (Gramsci, 1971, p. 328) which holds diverse elements of society together in a relation of consent. For Gramsci, ideology has a material existence in the social practices of individuals as well as in the institutions and organisations within which these social practices take place (Simon, 1982). This view of ideology provides the conceptual link between the notion of biculturalism as an educational myth, the function of symbolic policy and the materiality of Māori language programmes in schools.
The study draws on an anthropology of policy approach to policy, in which policy is regarded as a fundamental organising principle of society and “provides a way of conceptualising and symbolising social relations” (Shore & Wright, 2011, p. 2). This approach enables a focus on how symbolic Māori language education policy works in practice to sustain and legitimate bicultural ideology. It does this by contributing towards the production of certain kinds of social relations. The New Zealand curriculum acknowledges the “principles of the Treaty of Waitangi and the bicultural foundations of Aotearoa New Zealand” and claims to “give effect to the partnership that is at the core of our nation’s founding document, Te Tiriti o Waitangi/the Treaty of Waitangi” (Ministry of Education, 2007, p. 6). The study identifies the way symbolic policy contributes to a sustained and coherent narrative which tells of a partnership which exists between the two groups, Māori and pākehā.

Empirical research about policies and their social and economic consequences can illuminate the assumptions on which particular policies rest (Lauder, Brown, & Halsey, 2004). The empirical data included in this study includes both policies and interview data. It is intended that the research contributes to the area of policy-oriented sociology, but perhaps more importantly, to generate public debate about the consequences of a particular policy corpus on the Māori language.

There has been ongoing concern about the survival of the Māori language since the 1970s when the findings of a major research project indicated that the number of fluent Māori language speakers in New Zealand was declining at an alarming rate (Benton, 1977, 1979). Winifred Bauer (2008), for example, claims that New Zealand census data and data from other national surveys “show few positive signs that knowledge of te reo [the Māori language] is strengthening rather than declining” (p. 33). This same concern is echoed by the authors of a recently published Waitangi Tribunal report (Waitangi Tribunal, 2011).

Given that this is the case, the absence of emphasis on Māori language learning for the purpose of communication for all learners in policy is very telling. This thesis explains why. It develops the argument that the primary purpose of Māori language learning for non-Māori is not the development of communication skills, but rather a means of ensuring that the ideology of biculturalism remains hegemonic. Instead of working to promote the use of Māori language among Māori language learners, Māori language policy, as symbolic policy, works to support and sustain a ‘Māori people as ethnically and culturally distinct’ narrative. This is an important narrative thread in the myth of biculturalism. The study found that the lack of clarity and
ambiguity in Māori language education policy for non-Māori students does in fact contribute to this narrative thread.

The purpose of the bicultural myth in education is to bind groups together with a unity of purpose (Beeby, 1986). However, its promise of a happy, harmonious nation obscures its ideological strategy as a mechanism to segregate groups and to justify group rather than universal rights. Ability in the Māori language contributes towards strengthening a Māori ethnic identity, which in turn strengthens boundaries between Māori and other groups. Articulating the purpose of Māori language education for non-Māori learners in policy thus presents a problem, because developing fluency among non-Māori speakers potentially weakens ethnic boundary markers. The ambiguity evident in policy can be understood as the result of an attempt to accommodate a number of different interests and views relating to Māori language use. But a deeper theorisation is provided by conceptualising the function of symbolic policy and the complex relationship between myth and ideology.

An overview of the study

The lack of clarity and ambiguity that exists in education policy regarding the purpose of Māori language education for non-Māori students is traced to the ideological nature of biculturalism and also to its role as the myth of a harmonious New Zealand society that has successfully confronted its past (Kolig, 2004). The thesis begins with an account of the emergence and subsequent evolution of bicultural ideologies and the social and political forces at play that resulted in the eventual institutionalisation of biculturalism into the public sector through policy. This provides the context within which to locate bicultural education policies and the Māori language education policy statements which are the study’s focus. Having established the broader context of biculturalism I provide a close reading of relevant policy statements in order to show how the purpose of Māori language is framed differently for Māori and non-Māori learners.

The aim of this study is twofold however. Not only does the study aim to provide an explanation of the nature and purpose of a particular policy corpus, it also traces some of the effects of those policies. The inclusion of empirical data in the form of interview material illustrates the powerful effects of symbolic policy. I argue that the purpose of Māori language education policy for non-Māori is to legitimate and sustain the hegemonic status of bicultural ideology. The empirical data discussed in chapters eight to eleven support this claim.
Clarification of terms

One of the challenges in writing about ethnicity in New Zealand is that the names given to ethnic groups are often themselves the subject of contestation. At various points throughout the thesis this notion will be elaborated, but for the sake of clarity and consistency it was necessary to make some decisions about the terms I would use and I include a short summary of how I use key terms below.

Non-Māori

This thesis is concerned with the purpose of Māori language education for non-Māori learners. The term non-Māori is very broad and I use it deliberately, both to mirror the usage of the term in *The New Zealand Curriculum* (Ministry of Education, 2007), and to reflect the reality of the ethnically diverse group of Māori language learners that I have experienced in Auckland secondary schools. The Ministry of Education reports on the number of students learning Māori, categorising those students as either ‘Māori’ or ‘Non-Māori’. It does not currently collect data about the different ethnicities of the students who constitute the group ‘non-Māori’.

New Zealand European/pākehā

The word pākehā has come to be understood and used in two ways. In order to differentiate between the two meanings throughout this thesis I use the word either with or without capitalisation. I use ‘Pākehā’ to refer to a specific ethnic identity that emerged in the 1980s\(^2\) and ‘pākehā’ to refer to New Zealand-born people of European descent (Mulgan, 1989; Pearson, 1989; Spoonley, 1988). I use either term where it is necessary – this may be because the word is used in the literature or on policy documents. Where possible, I have used the term ‘New Zealand European’ in its place in an attempt to avoid confusion and to use a term which some people view as less political.

Little is known about the origin of the word pākehā. Historian Michael King (2003) claims it is a Māori word, in use by at least 1814, and which “probably came from the pre-European word pakepākehā, denoting mythical light-skinned beings” (p. 169). While the term is commonly used to refer to “New Zealanders of a European background, whose cultural values and behaviour have been primarily formed from the experiences of being a member of the dominant group of New Zealand” (Spoonley, 1988, p. 64), the term is contested, usually on the grounds that it assumes a homogeneity that does not exist. Many of the group ‘pākehā’ reject the use of

---

\(^2\) This will be explained in greater detail in chapter three.
the term, believing that it originated as an insult (there is no evidence to suggest this is true), or because they reject the political overtones of the term. One of the most common complaints to the Race Relations Office has been from people who object to being called pākehā (Barnard, 2001). The preferred term for many pākehā is ‘New Zealand European’ or ‘New Zealander’ (Bell, 1996; Callister, 2004).

Māori

The term Māori is generally used as an ethnic and cultural label (Royal, 2012) and, like the term pākehā, also implies a homogeneity that does not exist in reality. Traditional Māori society was structured around the kinship groups of iwi and hapū. The importance of tribal or iwi identity has increased since the 1980s, especially as tribes must register their members in order for them to secure the benefits of Treaty of Waitangi settlements (O'Sullivan, 2007; Rata, 2011b). This has been one of the factors affecting ethnic identity, along with the fact that Māori are not ethnically homogeneous due to intermarriage (Callister, 2003; Chapple, 2000). While acknowledging the complexity of the term Māori, it is still a commonly used term to refer to indigenous New Zealanders in many policy documents.

The Treaty of Waitangi partners

Naming the partners of the Treaty of Waitangi is also difficult because the groups are often given different names. The Treaty is variously referred to as a partnership between Māori and pākehā, between Māori and the Crown, or between Māori and the New Zealand government. An important process examined in this thesis is the institutionalisation of bicultural ideology via policy. Consequently in this study I conceptualise the non-Māori partner as the New Zealand state. As with the word pākehā/Pākehā, it has been at times necessary to refer to the Treaty partners inconsistently to reflect the literature or policy statements.

Thesis structure: Chapter outlines

Chapter two introduces the three stage critical policy methodology employed in this study and explains the ‘fit’ between methodology and the problem being investigated. The three stages of this methodology are first, providing the socio-historical context of the study, second, the study of relevant policy, and third, the inclusion of empirical research in the form of interview material.

Chapter three introduces the notion of biculturalism as an ideology and examines the emergence and development of biculturalism in order to establish the broader context in which
changes in education occurred. The chapter traces the broad contours of the evolution of biculturalism, from the establishment of a relationship between Māori and pākehā through the signing of the Treaty of Waitangi, to its early genesis in the post-assimilationist views of Sir Apirana Ngata (Sissons, 2000) and on through its “soft” and “strong” forms (Fleras & Spoonley, 1999, p. 238), before considering its current status.

Chapter four focuses on biculturalism as it developed in education and its impact on policy and in particular, the provision of Māori language education. The previous chapter shows how a number of factors converged to provide the conditions from which the ideology of biculturalism would emerge then become embedded in policy. This chapter traces a similar process whereby the ideology of biculturalism would come be seen as a solution to the educational concerns about the underachievement of Māori. The chapter continues with a discussion of the relationship between biculturalism and the provision of Māori language education. The final part of the chapter describes the current provision of Māori language education in schools and introduces concerns relating to non-Māori learning Māori language in mainstream secondary schools.

Chapter five is a discussion of current policy relating to both biculturalism and Māori language education. The aim of the chapter is to identify ambiguities in policy and to theorise the work of policy itself. This is done by drawing on the work of anthropologists of policy to explain how ideology is materialised through policy by its shaping of attitudes and practices. The chapter provides an analysis of relevant policy statements highlighting references to biculturalism and the differences in the way the purpose of learning Māori is framed for Māori and non-Māori students.

Chapter six returns to the broader context of biculturalism with the purpose of theorising the ascendance of bicultural ideology within an economic and political context. The relationship between different conceptualisations of biculturalism and Māori language use are then theorised.

Chapter seven introduces the empirical research that forms part of the overall study. The contribution of the empirical research is elaborated along with the approach taken to the analysis of the interview material. Drawing on theory from an anthropology of policy approach and Gramsci’s notion of common sense I argue that students are active in their engagements with policy. Employing an analytical device of three states of awareness on the terrain of common sense - faith, stuttering, and awkwardness, enables a means of identifying the moments when participants can be seen supporting or contesting ideology.
Chapter eight is the beginning of the analysis of the interview data and explores the theme of the purpose of learning Māori as described by the research participants. The most common reason given by participants was that they thought the language would be useful for them in the future when they thought about their employment aspirations. Another reason given, in less direct terms, was that learning Māori language contributed to cross-cultural relationship building. None of the school-aged participants knew about concerns for the future survival of the language.

Chapter nine is a discussion of the participants’ perceptions about the extent of Māori language use. This chapter shows how policy is implicated in the creation and protection of a narrative that refers to the notion of two distinct ethnic groups which constitute the partners in the mythic harmonious bicultural relationship. An outcome of this narrative is the perception among the participants that Māori language is used exclusively by, and is perhaps exclusively for Māori people.

Chapter ten discusses the relationship between participant attitudes towards the Māori language and their understanding of biculturalism. This chapter reveals significant disparities between the participants’ support of Māori language and their doubts about the relevance of biculturalism as they understand the term.

Chapter eleven considers the responses of some of the adult participants in detail. The purpose of this chapter is to theorise the effects of sustained or extreme awkwardness which occurs when an individual consciously notices inconsistencies between their experiences and a dominant legitimating narrative. For the group of people involved here, the awkwardness leads to self-silencing or a refusal to acknowledge the presence of ideological contestation.

Chapter twelve draws together the threads of the study and discusses the effects of Māori language education policy. Two significant findings emerged from the qualitative study that was undertaken. The first was an absence of concern among the participants for the survival of the Māori language. This was not because they did not care about the language, but rather that they had no awareness that it could be an issue. The existence of communities of fluent Māori language speakers was an important part of the bicultural myth narrative, as told by the participants. Consequently they did not see their own personal engagement with Māori language as being particularly important.

The second finding is that non-Māori learners of the language do sometimes experience biculturalism without its mythological cloak of unity and harmony. When this happens, and they
are confronted by difficult or challenging ideas about their involvement with Māori language, they tend to use a number of ‘withdrawal’ or ‘disengagement’ strategies. This has the effect of silencing debate. While this silencing effect ensures that the bicultural myth remains intact, its long term effect on non-Māori engagement with Māori language may be negative.

Māori language policy, as symbolic policy, has powerful ideological effects and the interview material illustrates those effects. I conclude that the primary purpose of Māori language learning for non-Māori language learners is not the development of language for communicative purposes, as might be expected, but rather a means of ensuring that the ideological ‘myth’ of biculturalism remains hegemonic.
Chapter 2: Methodology

Identifying the problem and establishing the parameters of the study

The purpose of as-a-subject Māori language education for non-Māori students in mainstream secondary schools is characterised in education policy by a lack of clarity and ambiguity. This study asks how can this lack of clarity be explained, and what are its effects? In the process of thinking through the parameters of the study I was clear that I wanted to include both an analysis of relevant policy documents and empirical research that would generate data about the beliefs and experiences of non-Māori language learners in relation to their engagement with Māori language. In order to create some parameters around the group I was interested in, that is the group of students that I would typically teach in my classroom, I decided to focus on students involved in Māori Language Immersion Level 4(b) at secondary school level (years 9-15). I began by looking at enrolment data relating to this group.

Before I discuss the implications of the data itself, it is first necessary to describe the way the Ministry of Education categorises Māori language learning in schools in order to avoid any confusion. Māori Language Immersion Levels are defined by the proportion of time a student is taught using te Reo Māori and those levels are as follows (Ministry of Education, 2013b):

Maori Medium

Level 1: 81-100%: Curriculum is taught in Māori language for between 20 and up to 25 hours a week.

Level 2: 51-80%: Curriculum is taught in Māori language for between 12.5 and up to 20 hours a week.

Level 3: 31-50%: Curriculum is taught in Māori language for between 7.5 and up to 12.5 hours a week.

English Language in English Medium

Level 4(a): 12-30%: Curriculum is taught in Māori language for between 3 and up to 7.5 hours a week.

Level 4(b): 3 or more hours: Students are learning Te Reo Māori as a separate subject for at least 3 hours a week.

Level 5: Less than 3 hours: Students are learning Te Reo Māori as a separate subject for less than 3 hours a week.

Level 6: Taha Māori: Students learn Māori songs, greetings, and simple words

No Māori Language Education: Other students in school roll not recorded at any level of Māori language learning.
When I looked at Level 4(b) enrolment data I could see that over the last ten years there have been an average 3,500 non-Māori students learning Māori language in English Medium secondary settings each year at this level as indicated in Table 3 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Māori</th>
<th>Non-Māori</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>8,853</td>
<td>3,997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>9,441</td>
<td>4,397</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>8,549</td>
<td>3,342</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>8,811</td>
<td>3,063</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>8,819</td>
<td>3,122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>8,696</td>
<td>3,303</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Gil Preston, Information Officer for the Ministry of Education, personal communication, July 5, 2013)

This number may seem too small to be significant, but given that this is approximately one third of the total cohort of students learning Māori language in this way, and that this has been the fairly steady pattern in the years, I believe this group of students is important. This is for a number of reasons.

First, non-Māori language learners are of interest because of the potential they have to contribute to Māori language revitalisation efforts. Given what is known about the current health of the Māori language it may be that more attention ought to be given to the statement made in the New Zealand curriculum - “all who learn te reo Māori help to secure its future” (Ministry of Education, 2007, p. 14, my emphasis). That includes non-Māori learners of the language, however little is known about the beliefs and experiences of this group in relation to Māori language participation.

Second, non-Māori language learners challenge an existing narrative that suggests this group is not interested in learning Māori. For example, research undertaken in Auckland schools supporting that narrative found that New Zealand European school students have conservative views on multilingualism and are more interested in learning a European language than Māori (Barkhuizen, Knoch, & Starks, 2006) while research of adult attitudes found a large group of non-Māori professing positive values towards the Māori language but not a strong desire to learn and use Māori themselves (Te Puni Kōkiri, 2002b). However, the fairly consistent number of non-Māori students learning Māori language in mainstream secondary settings each year at Level 4b indicates that there is steady interest in learning Māori language. The Ministry of Education’s July 1 roll return data of 2012 showed that the most popular language learnt at secondary school, other than English, was te reo Māori with 22,813 students, followed by French with 22,379 students then Japanese with 12,473 students (Ministry of Education, 2013d).
strengthens the argument I make that more attention could be given to non-Māori learners because of their potential to contribute to Māori language revitalisation efforts.

Finally, non-Māori are important because they are an ethnically diverse group. This adds a layer of complexity to discussions about biculturalism and the use of Māori language by different people from ethnic groups. Chapters three and four will discuss some of the concerns raised in the 1970s and 1980s about pākehā involvement with Māori language, but in the literature there is silence on the issue of the use of Māori language by other ethnic groups. The enrolment data collected by the Ministry of Education about students learning Māori language, groups students as ‘Māori’ and ‘non-Māori’ only, so little is known about the ethnicity of students within the non-Māori group. However, my experience of the secondary school classroom in Auckland is that learners of Māori language can be very ethnically diverse and part of my aim in this research was to acknowledge and include this ethnic diversity.

Non-Māori who learn Māori in schools are in some ways a shadowy presence. They are under-researched, their participation in Māori language programmes is given minimal attention in terms of Ministry of Education data collection and reporting, and in policy they are scarcely mentioned. The lack of clarity and ambiguity in policy about the purpose of Māori language education for non-Māori students may be explained by the fact that as they are a small group they do not warrant any significant attention, as I suggested in the previous chapter. It may also be explained by a general lack of interest in as-a-subject Māori language learning which occurs in English medium education programmes. Prevailing beliefs that Māori medium education offers a more effective means of language learning (May, Hill, & Tiakiwai, 2004), and limited resources, especially in the form of competent Māori speaking teachers, appear to have resulted in a focus of attention on this type of education. However, the focus on Māori medium education whether intentionally or not, also tends to mean a focus on Māori students learning Māori language. The purpose of this study is not to challenge the effectiveness of Māori medium education, or to deny that there are genuine concerns related to the resourcing of Māori language education, but rather to explore the curious silence relating to non-Maori learners of Maori language.

**Placing policy at the centre of the study**

As I thought more about non-Māori learners of Māori language in secondary schools and biculturalism, I also began to think more about ideology and ideological processes. When I considered several things simultaneously, that is, the comparative under-reporting of data about
non-Māori involvement in Māori language learning in mainstream settings, ambiguous policy statements, and my own experience of a range of attitudes towards non-Māori involvement in Māori language both in the literature and in my professional capacity, together they seemed to suggest that there might be subterranean ideological shifts occurring. Placing policy at the centre of the study offered a means to delve under the surface of appearance and explore those ideological shifts and their effects because policy is the link between power and its operation (Rata, 2014). The empirical data obtained from the interviews shows that power in operation at the level of lived experience.

**Critical policy methodology**

A sociological perspective provides the underlying theoretical framework for the research with a more specific orientation towards policy sociology. Policy sociology is characterised by Stephen Ball (1997) as policy oriented, temporal, interested in both global and local contexts, and conceptually ‘thick’. Critical policy methodology is located within this broad area. It emerged from the late 1980s onwards as a major research methodology in the sociology of education (Ball, 1990; Codd, 1988; Dale, 1989; Marginson, 1993; Whitty, 2002). A critical policy methodology enables links to be made between what happens at a global level with events at a national level and right down to the level of school practices. Rata (2014) argues that this link is made possible by “the concept of the nation-state as the ‘meeting point’ of global political and economic forces on the one hand and the implementation of policy in education practice on the other” (emphasis in original). She goes on to explain that as the regulatory site for both capitalism and democracy, the state uses policy to “regulate the disjuncture between the ideals that form the national democratic polity and the inequalities produced by global capitalism. Education is at the meeting point of this contradiction”. The other strength of critical policy methodology is that it involves the use of empirical research to show how education policy shapes practice integrated with theoretical explanations drawing from a political economy approach (Rata, 2014).

Māori language policy in education is nested within bicultural education policy. Since the 1980s biculturalism has been institutionalised by the New Zealand state. Critical policy methodology provides a way of exploring complex relationships between groups and access to resources which forms part of the bicultural discourse. These relationships are both framed in, and influenced by, policy, and affect the way different groups view the purpose of Māori language education. After theoretically conceptualising the context, the inclusion of empirical material in the research enables links to be made between the beliefs and experiences of a group of non-
Māori language learners, policy and the broader ideological context informed by political and economic forces.

**The historical context**

The first stage in critical policy methodology is establishing the historical context of the problem that is being investigated. In this way, problems can be framed in the context of their complex relational settings (Grace, 1995). The problem being investigated here is the ambiguity or lack of clarity in education policy around the purpose of Māori language education for non-Māori. The purpose of taking a socio-historical approach is to “illuminate the cultural and ideological struggles in which schooling is located” (Grace, 1995, p. 3). The broader ideological struggles which influence Māori language policy are related to changing understandings of biculturalism, and in this first stage of the methodology, these struggles are contextualised theoretically drawing on the writing of Antonio Gramsci.

While it is more common to find Foucault used in policy study, Gramsci offers a different theoretical approach because of his conceptualization of practices at the material or non-discursive level of reality, which is valuable from a sociological point of view. Sociologists have been critical of the lack of definition of Foucault’s conception of power (Fraser, 1989; Olssen, 1999; Taylor, 1986). Derek Layder (1994), for example, argues that Foucault’s notion of power is “diffuse and amorphous ... [which] makes it particularly difficult to understand its spheres of influence and the intensity of its effects” (p. 109). He concludes that while “Foucault’s notion of power makes us more analytically sensitive to the variegated nature of power and its effects ... it pays little attention to the structural conditions under which power effects are produced in people” (1994, p. 109). Foucault’s tendency to refer to the discourses and practices that are the conduits of power, doesn’t acknowledge that discourses have to be used and mobilised in certain ways, by certain groups or individuals, before power effects can be experienced by others (Layder, 1994).

Gramsci theorizes the relations between structure and agency, between individual agents and their contributions on the one hand and historical collective movements on the other, in a way that Foucault fails to do (Olssen, 1999). This provides us with a means of understanding the way in which social contexts, which include both structures and institutions, influence and shape social activity, linking individuals to group processes and to other forms of collective expression. The usefulness of Gramsci’s ideas, from a sociological perspective, is that they provides a means to understand and theorise social relations and practices within a wider social context or setting.
Chapters three and four trace the social and political changes that happened in New Zealand from which the ideology of biculturalism emerged. In these chapters Gramsci’s theory of hegemony is used to explain how an ideology can become dominant. For Gramsci, because hegemony is a relationship of consent, a group moving towards hegemony cannot simply sweep aside pre-existing ideologies. On the contrary, in order to achieve hegemony, an influential group must genuinely concern itself with the interests of social groups over which it wishes to exercise leadership in order to cement alliances between itself and those groups. The socio-historical approach to policy employed in the first chapters of this thesis allows us to see more clearly the way bicultural policies emerged from contexts shaped by competing intellectual movements. In a Gramscian sense, policy making can be understood as a complex process of negotiation between these different groups or movements, in order to achieve fragile equilibrium:

... the dominant group is coordinated concretely with the general interests of the subordinate groups, and the life of the State is conceived of as a continuous process of formation and superseding of unstable equilibria (on the juridical plane) between the interests of the fundamental group and those of the subordinate groups – equilibria in which the interests of the dominant group prevail, but only up to a certain point, i.e. stopping short of a narrowly corporate economic interest. (Gramsci, 1971, p. 192)

In summary, hegemony or the leadership of a dominant group or alliance of groups requires a compromise of sorts to be made between the interests and ideologies of diverse groups. Chapters three and four identify and explain the interests of particular groups and show how those interests coalesced around the ideology of biculturalism which was then quickly institutionalised by the New Zealand state (Edwards & Moore, 2009; Openshaw, 2006; Rata, 2004b).

History also plays a role in helping to illuminate the role of myth in society in contributing towards or challenging social cohesion. Historian Michael King acknowledges this role in the introduction of his book *The Penguin History of New Zealand* (2003), claiming that his work:

... identifies the myths that have shaped New Zealand cultures and provided them with cohesion and coherence. It examines too what happens when those myths are challenged. It reveals how societies are conditioned not so much by events as by group memories of events. (p. 10)
His fellow historian, James Belich, refers to the “third version” of the Treaty of Waitangi which exists today as the result of what “enlightened Maori and Pakeha today would have liked it to have been” (p. 195). It is this “third version” of the Treaty with its spirit and intent of partnership that has contributed to the well established myth of biculturalism that exists in education, as chapter three and four illustrate.

**Analysing curriculum policy**

The second stage in the critical policy methodology is to analyse policy within the theoretically conceptualised context that has been established in the first stage. Here I identify a particular policy corpus that influences practice in schools and pay close attention to the way relationships are framed in these documents, both the relationships between groups, and the relationship between conceptualisations of biculturalism and the purpose of Māori language education for non-Māori students.

In order to deepen the analysis of ideological processes, in this part of the methodology I return again to Gramsci and also draw on the work of anthropologists of policy to theorise the work of policy. Gramsci stresses the importance of both the material and institutional nature of ideological practice and this view of ideological practices is complemented by the conceptualisation of policy taken by anthropologists of policy. In this approach, policy is put to work by policy activists after its creation materialising ideology by its shaping of attitudes and practices. Framing policy this way enables us to better see how power relations are operationalised (Rata, 2014).

In this stage of the methodology, after the policy analysis I return, in chapter six, to a theoretical discussion of power relations. Here I work between a number of theories because the interplay of those theories provides a rich source of concepts for interpreting and understanding policy processes (Ball, 1997). Lauder, Brown and Halsey (2004) regard social problems as complex and typically requiring interdisciplinary input. Localisation is an important concept here which I use to explain how socio-political organisation at the local institutional level, including education, changes in response to global forces (Rata, 2014). Drawing on the work of world systems theorist, Jonathan Friedman (1994), to explain the relationship between global processes and local identity movements, I theorise the complex relationships between identity, language and access to economic and political resources.
The empirical study

The third stage in critical policy methodology is the inclusion of empirical or qualitative research. While policy itself provides some of the empirical data, qualitative research of peoples’ experiences provides insights into the way policy affects education practices. I use the phrase “empirical study” here to differentiate between the qualitative research undertaken and policy analysis. Rata (2014) has argued that it is “the methodological integration of theory, policy analysis, and empirical studies which enables comprehensive critical engagement with the operation and consequences of curriculum policy”. The empirical study that is included in this research illustrates the effects of ideology on a group of students learning in an environment influenced by a particular policy corpus. An analysis of student interview data provides insights into the ways that non-Māori learners of Māori language understand biculturalism and the purpose of learning Māori language. A generic qualitative study was chosen as the means of collecting empirical data for the research. The following part of this chapter details the research design, method of data collection, and the processes and methods associated with data analysis.

Generic qualitative research

Merriam claims that a generic qualitative study is one of the five types of qualitative research commonly found in education which all share the same essential characteristics. These are: a goal of eliciting understanding and meaning, the researcher as the primary instrument of data collection and analysis, the use of fieldwork, an inductive orientation to analysis, and findings which are richly descriptive (Lichtman, 2006; Merriam, 1988). The purpose of a generic approach is to use qualitative methodologies to collect and analyse data and it is an approach that has gained fairly wide acceptance in the last decade (Lichtman, 2006). Researchers who conduct these studies “seek to discover or understand a phenomenon, a process, or the perspectives and worldviews of the people involved.” (Merriam, 1988, p. 11). Data may be collected through interviews, observations or document analysis. Analysis of data uses concepts from the theoretical framework and generally results in identification of recurring patterns, categories or factors that cut through the data and help to further delineate the theoretical frame (Merriam, 1988).

This generic qualitative research approach appeared the most suitable framework for designing a means of collecting empirical data. When I planned the research I knew that I wanted to talk with students about their beliefs and experiences as non-Māori learners of Māori language in secondary schools, but I was not sure that I could predict the direction that the interview data would take me. Generic qualitative research is not guided by an explicit or established set of
philosophic assumptions, instead the researcher draws from the concepts, models and theories from a particular field which provides the framework for the study (Caelli, Ray, & Mill, 2003; Merriam, 1988). Because the qualitative research provides empirical data which constitutes part of critical policy methodology, the theories and concepts developed in the first stages of the methodology provide the framework for the qualitative study.

**Qualitative research design: Overview**

The research was carried out as a series of interviews with research participants over a six month period of time. Interviews are a very good way of accessing peoples’ perceptions, meanings, definitions of situations and constructions of reality (Punch, 2005). The quality of the interview data obtained from an interview can be dependent on the amount of direction provided by an interviewer (Merriam, 1988). For this reason, I decided to use a semi-structured interview approach and created an Interview Guide (Appendix H). Using the semi-structured interview format provided some shape and consistency to the interviews but also enabled me to probe further or expand on a discussion thread where appropriate. A digital sound recording was taken of each of the interviews and then transferred onto the computer for transcription. After the transcriptions were completed by a professional (Appendix G) I was able to begin analysing the interview data.

**Ethics procedures**

An application was made to the University of Auckland Human Participants Ethics Committee for permission to undertake the research and permission was granted on 20 May 2010 for three years, reference number 2010/193. Participant Information Sheets and consent forms were initially produced for the Principal (Appendix A), the senior students (Appendix C), parents/guardians for student participants under 16 years of age (Appendix D), and for school leaver participants (Appendix F). Participant Information Sheets and assent forms were produced for student participants under the age of 16 (Appendix E).

When I began contacting schools, principals appeared willing to give their permission as long as the Māori language teacher agreed to be involved and was willing to assist me. This was a condition that I had not anticipated. My original application did not include a Participant Information Sheet or consent form for the Māori language teacher as I had tried to minimise their involvement in my project, being mindful of the impact on their workload. I contacted the Ethics Committee to inform them of this change, and the amendment was accepted. A Participant Information Sheet and consent form for the teachers was produced (Appendix B).
Sampling

The aim of qualitative research is to increase the understanding of an issue or problem, not to report on a representative sample. Although there are a number of different qualitative sampling strategies available, the guiding principle when selecting a sampling strategy is that there ought to be an internal consistency and a coherent logic across the different components of the study (Punch, 2005). In addition to important considerations such as the relevance of the sampling to the conceptual framework, practical issues also need to be taken into consideration such as the feasibility of the study in terms of time, cost, and access (Miles & Huberman, 1994).

With the research problem in mind, that is, the lack of clarity around the purpose of Māori language education for non-Māori students, I chose to interview a small number of non-Māori students who were either currently participating in Level 4(b) Māori language learning in English Medium secondary schools, or who were no longer at school but had learnt Māori in this way. I selected this particular group because I wanted to interview participants who had actively chosen to learn Māori language. As noted in chapter one, one of the reasons I wanted to better understand changes in bicultural ideology is that it has possible consequences for the overall health of the Māori language, and I was curious to hear about the experiences of students who were interested in learning the language. At secondary school students generally choose to participate in language learning as a discrete ‘subject’ or option choice. While some secondary schools require students to include language learning in their junior programme, it is not common to find Māori language as a compulsory subject. The participants in this study all attended schools where Māori language learning was an optional subject they had chosen.

Having decided on secondary education in the first instance so that I could be sure of finding participants who had chosen to learn Māori, I was also clear that I wanted to focus on English Medium education where Māori language is taught as a subject. As noted earlier in the chapter the largest number of non-Māori students learning Māori language at secondary level are doing so in English Medium schools. From a practical point of view I believed this would make finding research participants easier, but it also meant that I draw on my own experience as a teacher in this environment to help identify the policy corpus relevant to the research. I also decided to include a small number of young adults who had learnt as-a-subject Māori (Level 4b) at mainstream secondary schools in the research because I wanted to get a sense of whether participants’ beliefs about, and experience of, learning Māori changed once they left that environment.
After contacting the Information Officer for the Ministry of Education to request Level 4b te Reo Māori enrolment data by school and ethnicity (enrolments of Māori students are recorded as well as the total number of students), I used the information sent to me to identify Auckland secondary schools that appeared to have several non-Māori students enrolled in senior Māori language classes. I then checked they also had non-Māori students enrolled in Māori at year 9. I initially identified thirteen schools in the greater Auckland area which met these criteria. I then narrowed my list down to four schools that I selected primarily because they were reasonably centrally located for ease of access.

After it became apparent that school principals preferred me to work in liaison with the Māori language teacher at their school, and after checking that those teachers were happy to assist, I asked the teachers to invite students who fitted my participant criteria to meet with me. I was looking for a similar number of year 9 and senior students who identified themselves as belonging to ethnicities other than Māori. I met with these students and arranged interview times with them. The interviews were held in schools, either in an available office or empty classroom.

When I originally designed my research I had intended to ask school principals for access to school leaver data in order to find participants who were no longer at school but who had learnt te reo Māori for the duration of their secondary education. I had then planned to ask a school administration staff member to contact recent school leavers by letter on my behalf, inviting them to be part of my research. However, in the process of talking about my intended research with different people I found I did not need to do this. A number of people suggested possible participants and contacted those people on my behalf. I then asked the first few school leaver participants if they knew of any other people who might be interested and in being participants and found a further two participants this way. Each participant was given a Participant Information Sheet and signed a consent form.

Data analysis

Kvale and Brinkmann (2009) describe an approach to analysing interview material which they call *bricolage*. In this approach a researcher moves freely between different analytic techniques and concepts and according to Kvale and Brinkmann this “eclectic form of generating meaning” (p. 233) is a common mode of interview analysis. During the process of analysing my interview data I read through the interviews several times returning again and again to the passages of interest working back and forth between concrete descriptions, metaphors and abstract concepts in order to interpret the data. As noted by Kvale and Brinkmann (2009), in the more eclectic
approaches to interview analysis, knowledge of the subject matter carries more weight than the application of specific analytical techniques. Here again, because the interview data forms part of an overall critical policy methodology, the concepts and theories developed in the earlier stages contribute to both the knowledge of the problem being investigated but also to the analysis of the data. A key concern of this thesis is ideology and ideological processes so a critical reading of the interview data was applied. The purpose of a critical reading is to get below the surface or “seek a deeper truth underlying the hegemonic discourse” (Kvale & Brinkmann, 2009, p. 236). In this way attention can be called to the larger social, political and economic issues in which the research is contextualised.

In chapter seven I introduce the analytical theoretical framework used to analyse the data in greater detail, but here I will provide an outline. As I indicated earlier in the chapter a central theoretical tool employed in this thesis is Antonio Gramsci’s concept of hegemony, which is commonly understood as the political, intellectual and moral leadership of a dominant group or alliance over consenting subordinate groups (Mouffe, 1979). In the hegemonic system ideology acts as “cement” (Gramsci, 1971, p. 328) holding diverse elements of society together in this relation of consent. Ideology for Gramsci has a material existence in the social practices of individuals as well as in the institutions and organisations within which these social practices take place (Simon, 1982) and this conceptualisation contributes to an understanding of the work that policy does in legitimating and sustaining a dominant ideology. Drawing on theory from an anthropology of policy approach and from Gramsci, I conceive an active role for policy subjects and suggest that it is possible to observe evidence of ideologies struggling for dominance on the terrain of the common-sense understandings of the participants. In order to enable a means of identifying the moments when participants can be seen supporting or contesting different ideological threads relating to Māori language learning and biculturalism, I developed a specific analytical device. I employ this device, which is the notion that the participants can be observed operating in one of three states of awareness of ideology on the terrain of common sense in my analysis of the data.

**The credibility of the research**

Concepts such as reliability and validity when applied to qualitative research are often seen as problematic because they have their origins in positivism (Kvale & Brinkmann, 2009). Sharan Merriam (1998) argues that reliability, which usually refers to the extent to which research findings can be replicated, is especially problematic, for the simple reason that human behaviour is never static. Hence “achieving reliability in the traditional sense is not only fanciful but
impossible” (Merriam, 1988, p. 206). Lincoln and Guba (1985) prefer concepts such as trustworthiness, credibility, dependability, and confirmability. Others such as Kvale and Brinkmann (2009) and Neuman (2011) continue to use the traditional concepts of reliability and validity, but reinterpret them in ways that are more appropriate for qualitative research. Neuman (2011), for example, considers a researcher’s truth claims to be valid when they are plausible. He explains:

*Plausible* means that the data and statements about it are not exclusive; they are not the only possible claims, nor are they exact accounts of one truth in the world. This does not make them mere inventions or arbitrary. Instead, they are powerful, persuasive descriptions that reveal a researcher’s genuine experiences with the empirical data. (p. 216, emphasis in original)

Hammersley (1992) suggests that internal validity for qualitative data requires attention to plausibility and credibility, the kinds and amounts of evidence required and clarity about the kinds of claims made from the research. The aim of this chapter has been to provide evidence of internal validity, or in Neuman’s language, plausibility, by carefully documenting the theoretical framework, the conceptual methodology, and the methods of data collection and analysis.

Caelli et al (2003) claim that generic qualitative research is made credible by the theoretical positioning of the researcher, the congruence between methodology and methods, and the analytic lens through which the data are examined. The critical policy methodology I am employing in this thesis integrates theoretical concepts, policy analysis and empirical data, and it is the theoretical concepts which create the connective tissue that hold the parts together and enable a deeper understanding of the particular problem being investigated. It is the explanatory power of these concepts when applied to the problem and integrated with the empirical data that ultimately attests to the degree of credibility the research attains. For example, the concept of symbolic policy provides a means of explaining the ambiguity I identify in Māori language policy and its effects.

**Researcher objectivity**

My voice is one that ‘peoples’ this policy study (Ball, 1997; Nielsen, 2011) and I acknowledge my own inescapably subjective state as a researcher. This investigation operates within an interpretive paradigm, and as such, as the researcher I cannot claim to be entirely objective or neutral. Social inquiry involves researcher participation in the social world, “we are part of the social world we study ... it is an existential fact. There is no way in which we can escape the
social world in order to study it” (Hammersley & Atkinson, 1983, pp. 14-15). Hence ideological influences relating to both biculturalism and Māori language which are sedimented in both my conscious and unconscious thoughts, continue to shape my experience of the world and my approach to this research because quite simply, “all data must go through the researcher’s mind” (Bogdan & Biklen, 1982, p. 44).

However, a degree of objectivity can be achieved by being aware of one’s contributions as a researcher to the production of knowledge through reflective thought (Kvale & Brinkmann, 2009), and by providing clear explanations of the assumptions and theory behind the study (Merriam, 1988). My personal experiences as a non-Māori learning Māori language and my subsequent professional work as a secondary school teacher of Māori language in mainstream settings requires the acknowledgement of a participant-researcher position. My experiences have led me to conceptualise the problem in a particular way. However, the use of theoretical concepts to both frame the study and examine the data provides a balancing effect and reduces the likelihood of personal value judgements unduly affecting the research process.

**Concluding comments**

This chapter has identified and justified the use of critical policy methodology to investigate the lack of clarity in education policy about the purpose of Māori language education in schools for non-Māori students and to explore the ideological effects of this. The methodology enables connections to be made between the beliefs and experiences of a particular group of Māori language learners with ideological processes at the local and global level. From here the structure of the thesis follows the three stages I have described in this chapter: establishing the context of the study, policy analysis, then analysis of empirical data in the critical policy methodology. The following chapter outlines the historical context from which the ideology of biculturalism was to emerge and develop.
Chapter 3: The evolution of biculturalism

This chapter and the next identify and theorise socio-historical influences which led to the institutionalisation of biculturalism in New Zealand, and its subsequent inclusion in education policy. The purpose of this chapter is to trace the influences, or in Gramscian terms, older ideologies, which led to the emergence of biculturalism and highlight the interests of different groups as they converged. This convergence of diverse interests is the result of a process of complex negotiation which takes place between a dominant group and its allies as it moves towards hegemony. The Gramscian “collective will” that formed as part of this process in the New Zealand context resulted in the legitimisation of biculturalism in policy.

Tracing the conditions from which biculturalism emerged, and its evolving character, contributes to an understanding of the symbolic nature and power of bicultural education policies, which include Māori language policy. The chapter will provide the historical background which shows how these policies symbolise an aspirational, mythological relationship, based on what Belich (1996) refers to as the “third version” of the Treaty of Waitangi representing “what enlightened Maori and Pakeha today would have liked it to have been” (p. 195). This aspirational relationship may, in part, “engender the feeling that collectively this society is preserving the noble spirit of civilised justice ... thus expunging the wrongs of the past (Kolig, 2004, p. 95).

The attraction of the mythological bicultural relationship for some people may be attributed in part to a collective acknowledgement of historical wrong-doing and subsequent feelings of guilt, a point I will return to in chapter six. Perhaps more importantly however, it becomes part of a narrative that is intended to contribute towards social harmony. As described by Erich Kolig (2004):

... it is not only meant as an appeasement for a minority who feel disenfranchised, but more inclusively is also intended to form an ethical matrix from which national pride and identity should emerge, and thus contribute to national cohesion. (p. 95)

Myths also have ideological underpinnings and in the case of biculturalism, there are power relations involved with very real material and economic effects. The convergence of diverse interests that this chapter describes, includes both the social and material interests of different groups.
A continuum of biculturalism

I have used the word evolution in the title of this chapter deliberately to evoke a sense of development. While the emergence of biculturalism has been one of the most important social and political developments in New Zealand in the last half century (Belich, 1996), it is impossible to find a single agreed upon definition (Durie, 1989; Mulgan, 1989; Sharp, 1995; Vasil, 1988; Walker, 1986). Rather than seeking to establish a single definition of biculturalism, I concur with Mason Durie (1998b) in proposing that it is more useful to regard biculturalism as a continuum with a gradation of goals and a number of possible structural arrangements. This notion of a ‘bicultural continuum’ also has a temporal aspect which enables a more nuanced discussion of biculturalism as a continually evolving ideology in response to changing socio-political contexts. Gramsci’s view of “the life of the State ... as a continuous process of formation and superseding of unstable equilibria” (Gramsci, 1971, p. 182) is a useful conceptualisation when considering both evolving ideas about biculturalism, and policy developments which occurred as a result.

Table 4. A Bicultural Commitment: Goals and Structures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goals</th>
<th>‘Soft’</th>
<th>Moderate</th>
<th>Inclusive</th>
<th>Strong</th>
<th>‘Hard’</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>celebrating Māoritanga</td>
<td>improving race</td>
<td>partnership</td>
<td>separate but equal</td>
<td>tino rangatiratanga:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>relations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>challenging the system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structures</td>
<td>removal of discriminatory</td>
<td>a Māori perspective</td>
<td>active Māori</td>
<td>parallel institutions</td>
<td>Māori models of self-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>barriers and prejudice</td>
<td></td>
<td>involvement and</td>
<td></td>
<td>determination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>special treatment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy outcomes</td>
<td>mainstreaming</td>
<td>te taha Māori</td>
<td>responsiveness</td>
<td>devolution</td>
<td>He Putahitanga</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Fleras & Spoonley, 1999, p. 238)

Fleras and Spoonley (1999) developed Durie’s notion of a continuum further to include the policy outcomes associated with different forms of biculturalism as represented in Table 4. While neither Durie (1998b) nor Fleras and Spoonley (1999) identify time periods which correspond with this continuum, I propose that this continuum may also serve as a timeline of sorts representing stages in an evolutionary process. Biculturalism, it may be argued, had its genesis in a soft form and has continued to develop until the present day where examples of it in practice in both its inclusive and strong forms can be observed. The idea of an evolving ideology of biculturalism has also been proposed by Elizabeth Rata (2005, 2008). She argues that
biculturalism was originally a progressive project, heavily informed by social justice rhetoric (Renwick, 1986), committed to incorporating Māori culture into the nation’s symbolic identity (Rata, 2005). Rata (2000) refers to this type of biculturalism as “inclusive biculturalism”, but claims that this has been replaced by “exclusive biculturalism” which is “primarily the political project of tribal sovereignty or tino rangatiranga” (p. 52).

This chapter traces the broad contours of the evolution of biculturalism, from the establishment of a relationship between Māori and pākehā through the signing of the Treaty of Waitangi, to its early genesis in the post-assimilationist views of Sir Apirana Ngata (Sissons, 2000) and on through its soft and strong forms (Fleras & Spoonley, 1999) before considering its current status. While I will refer to the emergence of biculturalism in education, and touch on the relationship between biculturalism and the Māori language, a full discussion of these significant relationships will be the subject of the following chapter.

The Treaty of Waitangi – a relationship is established

The Treaty of Waitangi (1840) was a treaty of cession and protection signed by representatives of the British Crown and over 500 iwi (tribe) and hapū (subtribe) chiefs. What was to be ceded and what would be afforded protection has been the subject of much debate since the signing, as a result of the confusion caused by having both a Māori and English version of the Treaty, neither of which accurately corresponds with the meaning of the other.

Ranginui Walker (1984) argues that one of New Zealand society’s powerful myth-themes was racial harmony, stemming from the belief that Māori and pākehā had been joined as one by the Treaty as captured in Hobson’s often-quoted phrase “he iwi tahi tātou (we are now one people)” (Colenso, 1971, p. 33, parentheses in original). Accounts of New Zealand history reveal instead difficulties in living up to this ideal as Māori and pākehā, with their different cultural traditions competed for the land and its resources (Walker, 1984). A historical account of biculturalism can thus be described as a genealogy of changing Māori and pākehā relationships, borne out of competition for resources. Walker (1984) presses this point home by declaring that Māori activism has its genesis in the signing of the Treaty of Waitangi, and from that time onwards Māori leaders have been engaged in a “restless” search to “recover and reassert their lost sovereignty” (p. 280).
Assimilation

Assimilation is, broadly speaking, the process by which one group takes on the cultural traits of another group. The goal of assimilating the Māori people into British culture was first declared in New Zealand in the preamble to the Native Trust Ordinance of 1844:

And whereas great disasters have fallen upon uncivilised nations on being brought into contact with colonists from the nations of Europe, and in undertaking the colonisation of New Zealand Her Majesty’s Government has recognised the duty of endeavouring by all practical means to avert the like disasters from the native people of these islands, which object may best be attained by assimilating as speedily as possible the habits and usages of the native to those of the European population.

At this time assimilation was clearly seen not only as an appropriate policy to pursue, but in fact, one that must be beneficial to the natives as a means of avoiding the “great disasters” of earlier British colonisation experiences. Assimilation was to remain the state policy objective until after World War II when integration became the preferred policy goal. Education was regarded as a primary means of achieving cultural assimilation and, even though English was formally established as the language of instruction in schools, debates over the place of Māori language in education have continued since the signing of the Treaty. These debates will be discussed in greater detail in the following chapter.

Māoritanga – a precursor to biculturalism

Eric Schwimmer is often credited with first making use of the term biculturalism in his edited collection, The Māori People in the Nineteen Sixties, defining biculturalism as the “conscious confrontation and reconciliation of two conflicting value systems, both of which are accepted as valid” (Schwimmer, 1968, p. 13). However, historian Jeffrey Sissons (2000) argues that contemporary biculturalism has its genesis in late 1920s and 1930s in the thoughts and policies of Sir Apirana Ngata.

Ngata developed post-assimilationist views in the context of his own political practice as Minister of Native Affairs between 1928 and 1934 and through his theoretical engagement with the work of anthropologists Te Rangi Hiroa, Felix Keesling, George Pitt-Rivers and I.L.G Sutherland. By 1931, it was clear that Ngata had rejected the goal of assimilation and was proposing that Māori success would come from a “judicious” selection and combination of
“elements of Māori and Western culture” (Sissons, 2000, p. 50). Sissons (2000) suggests that despite the temporal interruption of the second world war and subsequent urbanisation, contemporary biculturalism was born out of the merging of Apirana Ngata’s concept of Māoritanga and the Treaty-based politics of the late 1970s and early 1980s. In his most complete definition of Māoritanga, Ngata (1940) explains that it:

... means an emphasis on the continuing individuality of Māori people, the maintenance of such Māori characteristics and such features of Māori culture as present day circumstances will permit, the inculcation of pride in Māori history and traditions, the retention so far as possible of old-time ceremonial, the continuous attempt to interpret the Māori point of view to the pākehā in power. (pp. 176-177, emphasis in original)

Sissons (2000) argues that by the mid-1970s, Māoritanga had become a state resource able to be used to ameliorate Māori alienation caused by urbanisation and this will be discussed further in the following section.

The 1970s

Until the 1970s “[p]akeha had presented New Zealand as a model of a multi-racial society in which people of different ethnic origins, including Māori, had full freedom to maintain and sustain their separate identity, language and culture” (Vasil, 1988, p. 16). Yet up to that time assimilation had remained the state policy objective until after World War II when integration became the preferred policy goal (O'Sullivan, 2007, p. 15). The Hunn Report (Hunn, 1960) rejected the policy of assimilation which had shaped New Zealand’s education policy since 1844 and offered an alternative of integration, an equal partnership which would “combine (not fuse) the Māori and pakeha elements to form one nation wherein Maori culture remains distinct” (p. 15). Belich (2001) argues that this new policy was still fundamentally assimilationist envisaging state leadership rather than Māori leadership. However, the notion of “combining (not fusing) Māori and pākehā elements to form one nation” foreshadows the early soft form of biculturalism which was to emerge in the not so distant future.

What particular convergence of conditions and events resulted in pākehā being more willing than they had been in the past to listen to Māori grievances in the early 1970s? Or to ask that question in a Gramscian form, what ideological elements and interests were present at this time and were able to be synthesised in order to create a new collective will? Belich (2001) suggests that among other reasons, pākehā themselves were decolonising and liberalising. Māori urban migration in
the late 1950s and 1960s, a sharp downturn in the economy in the 1970s and the rise of Māori activism were other major contributing factors. These changes resulted in greater awareness of inequity between Māori and pākehā and the precarious state of the Māori language. A new focus on the place of the Treaty of Waitangi in New Zealand society emerged. In the next section, while I do not claim to provide an extensive and detailed history of each of these contributing factors, I present a summary of main events and the outcomes of those events considering in particular how they contributed to development of a particular expression or understanding of biculturalism.

Māori activism

Around the middle of the twentieth century Māori history experienced a sharper shift than did the rest of New Zealand history. The Māori population rapidly increased, urbanised and industrialised (Belich, 2001). By the 1970s a partial Māori decolonisation was taking place bringing with it radicalism and political and cultural self-assertion (Walker, 2004). Belich claims that at this time pākehā were more ready to listen to Māori demands, because they themselves were decolonising and liberalising. At the same time the Māori population had increased and was quickly becoming urbanised, making Māori issues more difficult to ignore.

In the mix was also the economic downturn that occurred in the mid-1970s and which was particularly damaging for Māori. Up until that time it had been possible to find employment in relatively high paying though unskilled jobs, “in terms of cash, if nothing else, the period 1945-1975 was something of a golden age for Māori” (Belich, 2001, p. 474). Contrary to what one might assume, the era of Māori protest and activism that began around 1970 did so at a time when Māori were economically better off than they had been for a century. Belich (2001) explains that the economic upturn that Māori had experienced prior to 1975 generated increased expectations and aspirations and thus the subsequent economic downturn caused fertile conditions for activism.

While Māori activism is often considered to have its origins in the late 1960s and early 1970s Ranginui Walker (1984) claims that it has had a much longer history, locating the genesis of Māori activism in the Treaty of Waitangi in 1840 when “tribal chiefs were misled into signing away their sovereignty” (p. 280). He explains that the dynamic of Māori activism is mana motuhake (the sovereignty of the Māori nation), and notes that while the history of Māori

---

3 Decolonization, the central concern of post-colonial theory, is generally regarded as the process whereby ethnic or ‘native’ groups strive to secure economic, political and intellectual freedom from the dominant European ruling class (Jasen & Nayar, 2010).
activism has been characterised by the creation of ad hoc movements, it has continued to be a “restless search by Māori leaders to recover and reassert their lost sovereignty” (p. 280). His account traces the shift in the dynamic of Māori self-determination that was first centred on the rangatira (fighting chiefs), then on charismatic prophet leaders such as Te Kooti, Rua Kenana, and Ratana, to a more recent contemporary Māori leadership that derives its potency from a better knowledge of the institutional structures of metropolitan society. The impact that Māori leaders, academics and politicians have had on institutional structures can be seen in the institutionalisation of biculturalism that was to begin to occur in the 1980s (Rata, 2004b).

Contemporary Māori activism is usually associated with the formation of the Māori activist group Nga Tamatoa after the 1970 Young Māori Leaders Conference at Auckland University (Belich, 2001; King, 2003; Walker, 1984). This group consisted primarily of young and urban-educated Māori who were adept at using techniques such as petitions and demonstrations to bring about social action (Poata-Smith, 1996; Walker, 1984). Some members of the group were influenced by international, and particularly American black activism. While there was initially division in Nga Tamatoa between radicals and more conservative university educated students, the conservatives eventually took control of the movement and initiated a number of self-help programmes (Walker, 2004).

While Māori activism is often associated with an intense period of public protest relating to land grievances, the revival of Māori culture and participation in the social mainstream was also a focus of educated Māori leaders at this time (Walker, 1984). In an interesting account of Māori acculturation patterns written in 1972, Thomas Fitzgerald noted a “backward acculturation” occurring among Māori graduates. This took the form of a revival (renaissance) in the latent culture of the graduates. Fitzgerald (1972) distinguishes between:

> ... a culture which grows out of a natural interaction of individuals in group contexts, hence is expressed as a living phenomenon, and a culture which, from the individual’s standpoint, is no longer functional in everyday life adjustments. The latter is a latent as distinguished from a manifest culture. (p. 39)

In his study, Fitzgerald noted that while non-kin-based urban Māori may forgo both manifest and latent Māori culture in order to achieve economic security, the success of Māori graduates in the larger New Zealand society enabled a greater freedom of choice with respect to acculturation. “Backward acculturation” for this group, becomes “a characteristic of the emergent middle class” (Fitzgerald, 1972, p. 41). The shift from class to identity politics during the 1970s was a
phenomenon that occurred in many Western liberal democracies and will be discussed in the following section. Suffice to say at this point that many of the university educated leaders of the cultural revival of this era went on to become influential in the development of biculturalism and the subsequent establishment of a new socio-political unit, the neotribe (Rata, 2000, 2011b).

Protests over land grievances had two significant outcomes in terms of the development of biculturalism. The first was the establishment of the Waitangi Tribunal in 1975. The Tribunal was established by Matiu Rata, a Northland politician who had become Minister for Māori Affairs in the Third Labour government of 1975-78, in response to the Land March (Hikoi) of 1975 which was held in order to peacefully protest and raise awareness of the loss of Māori land over the years. At its establishment the Tribunal could hear Māori claims for recompense for breaches of the Treaty of Waitangi, but could not hear retrospective claims so was generally regarded as not having “teeth” (Belich, 2001, p. 410). Despite its relative powerlessness in the early years of existence, the establishment of the Tribunal moved the Treaty of Waitangi, which had languished in relative obscurity, back towards centre stage in New Zealand history (Belich, 2001; King, 2003).

Another significant outcome occurred as a result of the convergence between increasing activism and the national protests which occurred when the racially-selected South African rugby team toured New Zealand in 1981. This tour generated the worse civil violence in New Zealand history since the Depression riots in 1932 (Belich, 2001) and raised awareness of racial issues in New Zealand. David Bromell (2008) recalls that, “following the South African Springbok rugby tour of 1981, Māori activists challenged White liberals (myself included) to demonstrate the same commitment to racial justice in New Zealand as we had demonstrated to the dismantling of the apartheid regime in South Africa” (p. 36).

While protests continued throughout the 1970s and 1980s, notably the occupation of Moutoa Gardens for 79 days in Wanganui, ongoing protests at Waitangi itself between the years 1971-1988, and attacks by Māori radicals on pākehā icons, there were fewer Māori protests in the late 1980s coinciding with changes made to the Waitangi Tribunal (Belich, 2001).

**The emergence of soft biculturalism**

In the 1970s, not only was the state under increasing pressure as a result of Māori protest in relation to land grievances, it was also under pressure to deal more effectively with ethnic inequality which was at the time being reflected in lower school achievement rates and higher arrest, conviction and imprisonment rates for young Māori. The emergence of urban Māori gangs
(Belich, 2001; Sissons, 1993) contributed to a perceived sense of urgency of this problem. Both academics and those in official circles attributed the problem of underachievement to the social alienation of Māori people due to a loss of their cultural identity. Officially promoting and affirming ‘traditional’ Māori culture was thought to be a means of eliminating, or at least reducing, ethnic inequalities. The Office of the Race Relations Conciliator and the Departments of both Māori Affairs and Education, began to actively pursue cultural promotion activities (Sissons, 1993).

Low rates of examination passes and low school leaving ages among Māori students began to prompt calls for the inclusion of Māori culture and Māori language in the school curricula (National Advisory Committee on Maori Education, 1970). Protest pressure from Nga Tamatoa, a number of Māori teachers and a more liberal Minister of Education in the 1972 Labour Government combined to bring about significant changes in education (Walker, 2004). Nga Tamatoa were particularly active organising a petition calling for the inclusion of the Māori language at both primary and secondary level collecting thousands of signatures. By 1973, all seven Teachers Colleges had established Māori courses and in 1974 a one-year teaching training scheme for native speakers was established in response to the challenge that there were insufficient teachers to introduce the language into schools nationwide. According to Walker (2004) the leaders of Nga Tamatoa were “relentless” in their language campaign due to their own incapacity to speak Māori. In his words they felt “culturally disadvantaged and cheated by a monocultural education system” (p. 211).

By 1983 Māori language was taught in 178 secondary schools and about 330 primary schools and was studied by nearly 13,500 secondary and an estimated 30,000 primary students. Marae-based courses for school principals and senior school leaders were established aiming to increase knowledge of Māori cultural values, language and the special needs of Māori students. 31 courses were offered between March 1976 and March 1986, sponsored by the Department of Education and catering for 1350 principals and teachers (Sissons, 1993).

Taha Māori dominated official discussions of Māori education by the mid-1980s. Taha Māori (a Māori dimension) was to be included in all aspects of school life from curriculum to values to organisation. In addition to the promise cultural recognition seemed to offer as a solution to the underachievement of Māori students, taha Māori was seen as beneficial for all as a means by which racial harmony could be ensured:
For the Maori youngster, the incorporation of taha Maori is an important avenue in the development of self worth an identity, and the degree of success that it likely to follow.... For the non-Maori New Zealander, taha Maori gives the child a share in something that is uniquely New Zealand and facilitates cross-cultural understanding. (Department of Education, 1984b, p. 5)

Over a similar time period, the Race Relations Office which had been established in 1972, developed its own cultural awareness courses for employees of government departments. Seminars and training sessions were organised for members of the Police, Justice, Social Welfare, Labour, Health, and Education Departments (Sissons, 1993). Throughout the decade these were increasingly held on urban marae, and in 1984, the Office extended its marae visit programme to the general public. In 1983 the Office set itself the target of directly contacting one million people and as a consequence a number of pamphlets, booklets and resource material for schools were produced, including Māori tanga in Practice and The Challenge of Taha Māori (Sissons, 1993).

The future of Department of Māori Affairs was in doubt by the mid-1980s as plans were made to devolve many of its functions to local tribal authorities (Department of Maori Affairs, 1988a, 1988b; Fleras, 1991; Sissons, 1990). However, prior to its disestablishment, the Department was involved in its own cultural promotion endeavours. A central feature of its programme was encouraging the development and use of marae, particularly in urban areas. From March 1978 to March 1983 three and a half million dollars was spent on 389 different marae renovation and building projects. In response to the growing unemployment of the early 1980s, the Department began funding Basic Skills centres for young Māori school leavers offering a range of programmes such as traditional carving, weaving, Māori language and arts, carpentry, horticulture childcare and Māori religion and philosophy. One of the most significant initiatives in cultural promotion supported by the Department of Māori Affairs was the kohanga reo (Māori language nest) programme which offered Māori language early childhood education. The programme was initially widely supported and in the early period of its existence the growth in the number of centres was rapid. In March 1983 there were 84 centres operating and two years later there were 399 centres (Sissons, 1993).

In summary then, understandings of biculturalism in the 1970s and 1980s stemmed from ideals of political justice and social inclusion and the focus was on recognising and including Māori culture within the national New Zealand culture. The intentions of early biculturalists to “bring Māori in from the margins of society” (Rata, 2005, p. 267) fitted with democratic ideals. The
establishment of the Waitangi Tribunal in 1975 had affirmed the place of the Treaty of Waitangi in New Zealand society and the widespread perception that emerged during the 1970s and early 1980s was that the Treaty was, first and foremost, an agreement made with Māori at the founding of the nation that should be honoured in the name of fairness. It can be argued, then, “that biculturalism gained traction and coherence, primarily through a discourse of equality rather than as a recognition of cultural claims within democracy per se” (Barclay, 2005, p. 120, emphasis in original). The social alienation of Māori people was understood as being due to a loss of their cultural identity and the solution was seen as greater visibility and inclusion of Māori culture and perspectives in mainstream society. This period of biculturalism can be described as being located at the soft to moderate end of the bicultural continuum.

The move to inclusive then strong biculturalism

By the mid 1980s, it was becoming clear to state officials and Māori leaders that the systemisation of Māori tradition for Māori self esteem and social integration had failed to significantly reduce socio-economic inequalities between Māori and pākehā, and this coincided with increasingly demanding calls for greater Māori political and economic autonomy (Sissons, 1993). Once again we can identify a convergence of factors that resulted in further development or evolution of biculturalism, in particular the impact of culturalism on education in particular, and the increasing influence of the Waitangi Tribunal. This was the period during which biculturalism became firmly embedded in New Zealand institutions.

In 1988 the Government abolished the Department of Māori Affairs and established the much smaller Ministry of Māori Affairs, and the Iwi Transition Agency. The Iwi Transition Agency was charged with facilitating the establishment of Iwi Authorities which are legally constituted corporate identities, able to contract themselves with government departments for development projects, job training and social welfare delivery. This was known as devolution, and at the same time the state increased its number of Māori advisors within the public service. Sissons (1993) claims that these developments:

... increased the saleability of Māori identity, knowledge and expertise, and created the appearance of a significantly expanded Māori middle-class. They had a further effect of masking the ineffectiveness of earlier cultural promotion to foster upward mobility while blunting Māori nationalist criticisms of a pākehā state. (p. 107)
The state also began promoting symbolic expressions and public displays of a bicultural partnership between itself and Māori. The idea of partnership characterises the inclusive stage of biculturalism and will be discussed in a later section of this chapter which considers the role of the Waitangi Tribunal in promoting this idea.

Biculturalism became official government policy through the State Sector Act 1988. As part of being good employers, Section 56 required chief executives to recognize the aims, aspirations and employment requirements of the Māori people and the need for greater Māori involvement in the public service. Guidelines were issued to government departments instructing them on how to be bicultural and departments had a corporate plan that included a performance target for that output (Kelsey, 1996).

**Education**

In a detailed discussion of biculturalism in education under the Fourth Labour Government, Richard Benton (1990) traces the policy changes that occurred during their term, and in particular, the shift made in education from a cultural appreciation approach to institutional changes. He notes the “remarkable” conclusion of Treasury in its analysis of education issues provided for the incoming 1987 government, that “the institutional framework of state provision” may need to be altered if the needs and aspirations of the Māori community were to be met (Treasury, 1987). “Remarkable” because for the first time a powerful state department, with no direct involvement in Māori issues, publicly announced that Māori people have legitimate needs and aspirations of their own and that the State had an obligation to help them (Benton, 1990).

In 1988 the influential report *Administering for Excellence* (*Taskforce to Review Education Administration, 1988*) was published. An observation made in this report highlights the influence of the Māori language revival lobby, and the justification of the increased importance of the language in education as a means of improving Māori educational achievement:

> It is clear from the submissions made to us that the Maori people attach high priority to the revitalisation of the language and culture and that they are looking to the education system to assist them in the task. It is also clear that the revival of the Maori language and culture is not seen as an end in itself, but as the key of lifting the educational performance of Maori children. (Taskforce to Review Education Administration, 1988, p. 65)
Benton (1990) considers the policy and practice of the Fourth Labour Government in relation to biculturalism to be a tactical masterpiece. As part of an overall move to retain and consolidate central control while shifting responsibility for details to individual institutions, the Government explicitly recognised its commitment to the Māori language and culture under the Treaty of Waitangi while evading the obligation to take direct action to fulfil them. The Government was more willing to make concessions to Māori desires for special institutional arrangements (for example within the structure of the Ministry itself or in the setting up of kaupapa Māori schools), but the law itself (School Trustees Act 1989, incorporated into the Education Act 1989) requires individual schools to honour the Treaty and the language, rather than binding the Crown to do so. In 1990 Benton predicted that there might be sufficient strength nonetheless in these educational provisions to enable Māori people to co-opt the system in order to advance their own aspirations, particularly in view of what he observed as a heightened political and social consciousness of those in the kohanga reo and kura kaupapa Māori movements. He also suggested that the newly established Iwi Authorities may in time “have a substantial influence on bicultural policy making in education, if they identify (or reject) biculturalism as a major priority in iwi development” (Benton, 1990, p. 209).

**Waitangi Tribunal**

In 1985 the Labour government granted the Waitangi Tribunal powers to hear Māori claims retrospective to 1840, a change which “cast New Zealand firmly into the postcolonial era” (Walker, 2004, p. 254). The Tribunal is a permanent commission of inquiry charged with making recommendations on claims brought by Māori relating to actions or omissions of the Crown, which breach the promises made in the Treaty of Waitangi (Waitangi Tribunal, 2013a). This means, in effect, the Waitangi Tribunal has exclusive authority to determine the meaning and effect of the Treaty as it is embodied in the English and Māori texts (Bromell, 2008; Rata, 2004b). The Tribunal has thus been a major force behind the development of biculturalism (Levine, 2005).

By establishing the Tribunal, Parliament provided a legal process in which claims by Māori that their Treaty rights had been violated could be considered. However, because in the early years of its existence the Tribunal was unable to hear historical claims, its influence remained minor. This was to change when Edward Durie, Chief Judge of the Māori Land Court became Chairman. In 1981, Te Atiawa had submitted to the Tribunal its claim (Motunui-Waitara claim) that the town of Waitara was discharging effluent which interfered with the tribe’s gathering shellfish from reefs along the coast. The Tribunal found that the article in the Treaty of Waitangi
that guaranteed Māori chiefs their rights to their lands, villages and taonga katoa⁴, applied to the reefs because they are considered taonga or treasured possessions. Regardless of ownership, it was agreed that not only were Te Atiawa actively using the reefs, but that the reefs had considerable historical and cultural significance (Waitangi Tribunal, 2012b). The idea that taonga are not only owned possessions effectively turned Motunui into a cultural claim which set the precedent for subsequent claims including the Te Reo Māori (Wai 11) claim. The findings of the Tribunal established that “the Treaty gives Māori spiritual and cultural values a place equal to that of the values of the majority culture. This view of two cultures operating in a partnership under the Treaty came to define the agenda of biculturalism” (Levine, 2005, p. 108).

The 1985 Treaty of Waitangi Amendment Act, as well as enabling retrospective Treaty claims, also established tribes, not pan-Māori as the legal claimants for historical reparations. This significantly changed the discourse of biculturalism as ‘Māori’ became used increasingly to mean tribal Māori, and the idea of social justice came to refer to tribal recognition, rather than inclusion of Māori culture into broader New Zealand society (Rata, 2011b).

The Treaty of Waitangi - Partnership and Principles

The Waitangi Tribunal has been pivotal in establishing then naturalising first the concept of treaty partnership and later principles (Rata, 2004b). The principle of partnership was first explicitly identified in the Tribunal’s 1985 Manukau Report (Waitangi Tribunal, 2012a). By 1987 the Court of Appeal could say that the Treaty of Waitangi had established a relationship “akin to a partnership” (Te Puni Kōkiri, 2001, p. 77). The principle of partnership is now deeply embedded in Treaty jurisprudence. In the 2001 Guide to the Principles of the Treaty of Waitangi as Expressed by the Courts & the Waitangi Tribunal, it is noted that “both the Courts and the Waitangi Tribunal frequently refer to the concept of partnership to describe the relationship between the Crown and Māori” (Te Puni Kōkiri, 2001, p. 77).

The most influential supporters of the Waitangi Tribunal’s interpretation of the treaty are the “culturalists” (Rata, 2004b). These people are located in social science departments in universities, in education, health, law, the media, church and social services and culturalist ideas have informed academic analysis, government policy and popular understanding since the 1970s. Culturalist ideas of “primordial ethnic-cultural difference, cultural relativity and ahistoricism” (Rata, 2004b, p. 60) underpin Tribunal reports, and the Tribunal’s interpretation of the Treaty has become the orthodox interpretation (Levine, 2005; Rata, 2004b). Oliver (2001) claims that

⁴ All their treasured possessions (my translation).
the Waitangi Tribunal has used its reports to create “instrumental presentism”, that is to say, it has applied the standards of its own time to the events of an earlier time enabling the tribunal to “establish a basis for ideal colonising policies which it believes, should have informed government action affecting Māori from the very beginning” (p. 12). Oliver describes how E.T. Durie, chair of the Tribunal from 1981 to 2000, "made clear his belief that the Tribunal should help rewrite New Zealand history ‘from a Māori point of view’” (Durie, cited in Oliver, 2001, p. 10, emphasis in original).

Section 9 of the State-owned Enterprises Act 1986 states that “[n]othing in this Act shall permit the Crown to act in a manner that is inconsistent with the principles of the Treaty of Waitangi”. This section of the legislation was included as a response to concerns about the possible infringement of rights guaranteed to Māori by the Treaty of Waitangi, if Crown assets were transferred to private enterprise (Rata, 2004b). This was the first reference in legislation or policy to the principles of the Treaty, yet by May 2001, there were over thirty pieces of legislation referring to the Treaty of Waitangi or its principles (Te Puni Kōkiri, 2001).

The development of treaty principles to express the partnership interpretation and the subsequent inclusion of these principles in legislation was a quick process. A legislative requirement to acknowledge the principles of the Treaty of Waitangi affected the policy and practice activated what Elizabeth Rata has called “the march through institutions of a non-democratic neotraditionalist ideology5” (Rata, 2004b, p. 68). In education, for example, one of *The National Education Goals* is “[I]increased participation and success by Māori through the advancement of Māori education initiatives, including education in Te Reo Māori, consistent with the principles of the Treaty of Waitangi” (Ministry of Education, 2009b).

In 1989, in response to confusion about what the term ‘treaty principles’ meant, the government defined five principles: Principle 1: The Principle of Government. The Government has the right to govern and make laws. Principle 2: The Principle of Self-Management. The iwi has a right to organise themselves as iwi and under the law to control their own assets and resources. Principle 3: The Principle of Equality. All New Zealand citizens are equal before the law. Principle 4: The Principle of Reasonable Cooperation. Reasonable cooperation can only occur if there is consultation on major issues. The outcome of reasonable cooperation will be partnership. Principle 5: The Principle of Redress. The Crown accepts a responsibility to provide a process for the resolution of grievances arising from the Treaty (Justice Department, 1989, p. 2).

---

5 Neotraditional ideology refers to the concealment of contemporary capitalism’s relations of production by beliefs in a restored (and romanticised) kinship structure characterised by a benign birth-ascribed leadership (Rata, 2003b).
A cautionary note is also included, the government adding “[I]n interpreting the principles of the Treaty, the spirit of the Treaty is to be applied, and not the literal words” (Justice Department, 1989, p. 3). Despite the ongoing confusion surrounding the principles of the Treaty, it was Principle Two, that gave iwi the right to control their resources as their own. This principle became the justification for the establishment of a separate Māori education system which will be discussed in the following chapter.

In an extensive discussion of the constitutional status of both the Treaty of Waitangi and the principles of the Treaty, David Round (2011) reminds us that the Treaty has no legal status per se in New Zealand law, and that the principles, outside of the mention of them in particular statutes, have even less status. The Treaty itself makes no mention of partnership or special privilege, only of equality before the law and there is still no agreement on what the principles of the Treaty are. Any set of principles, Round argues, is nothing more than the personal interpretation of the person discovering them from where they lie in the terms of the Treaty and he is scathing in his critique of the debates surrounding the place of the Treaty in our law, constitution and national life. Round is adamant that they are not legal debates - “[t]he ‘principles’, even more so than the Treaty itself, do not have any independent legal existence, and to speak of New Zealand’s constitutional order as being founded on the principles of the Treaty is nonsense” (Round, 2011, p. 531, emphasis in original).

In the 1990s biculturalism was largely in its inclusive stage, the government professing a commitment to partnership. This commitment tended to focus on institutional accommodation, usually by incorporating a Māori dimension into state practices and national symbols (Durie, 1995). Māori names were adopted for government departments, Māori language and protocol became increasingly visible at ceremonial occasions, and official reports were printed in both Māori and English (Poata-Smith, 1996; Spoonley, 1993). Biculturalism also began to extend to collaborations by Māori and the Crown to draft legislation protective of Māori interests (Durie, 1998a).

Yet a stronger form of biculturalism was also developing. Māori academic Ranginui Walker was already advocating for a power-sharing model of partnership arguing that:

... biculturalism means more than Pākehās learning a few phrases of Māori language and how to behave on the marae. It means they will have to share what they have monopolised for so long, power, privilege and occupational security. (Walker, 1986, p. 5)
Education became the site where strong biculturalism in the form of parallel institutions emerged. Educational researcher Sue Middleton (1992), provides a neat snapshot of two quite different forms of biculturalism:

In its less radical sense, it refers to “bicentral individuals”, for example, Pākehā attempting to learn Māori language and customs. In its more radical sense it refers to the restructuring of major social institutions ... according to Māori values. Separatist institutions – Māori controlled and often funded with public money – are also seen as a way of achieving a “bicentral society.” (p. 305 emphasis in original)

In 1990 the Runanga Iwi Act (RIA) was passed which enabled iwi to acquire the legal mandate to deliver government funded social, economic and culture programmes for their people, provided they met prerequisites relating to their constitution and operational systems. They were to be business entities and were required to adopt a corporate model of management (Hill, 2009). One effect of this was to establish a political relationship between the corporate tribe and the government and the consolidation of a system for the transfer of economic resources from public to tribal ownership and for the devolution of state services into tribal control (Rata, 2011b).

Elizabeth Rata (2000, 2003a, 2011a) has developed a theoretical approach to understanding the processes leading to retribalization and late biculturalism in New Zealand called “neotribal capitalism”. The approach conceptualises the revived tribal unit (iwi) as a corporate economic enterprise operating in the national and international capitalist economy. The term neotribe is used to capture the entity’s economic character and the traditionalist ideology that justifies claims for economic and political inheritance of the past with the neotribal unit understood as a contemporary entity created by a small group of Māori professionals and academics.

The corporatisation of tribes has resulted in the emergence of strong biculturalism which is characterised by devolution and notions of separate but equal power sharing. Andrew Sharp (1997) distinguishes the shift from inclusive to strong biculturalism as the shift from “bicentral reformism” which is an adaptation of “[p]ākehā institutions to meet Māori requirements” to “bicentral distributivism” meaning the development of “different and specifically Māori institutions to share the authority defined by the Treaty” (p. 230). The shift or evolution in biculturalism can be seen clearly if we compare the definitions of two commentators writing during different time periods. In 1989 Richard Mulgan described biculturalism as “the public recognition of the importance of two cultures, Māori and Pākehā, as central to the life of
Aotearoa-New Zealand” (p. 28). Two decades later Bromell (2008) observes that “quite apart from any political consensus on the matter” biculturalism is commonly expounded in New Zealand as a “power-sharing partnership between Māori and the Crown, based on the Treaty of Waitangi” (p. 41).

**Hard biculturalism – self determination**

In the past decade a discourse of biculturalism has begun to be replaced by one of tino rangatiratanga (Māori sovereignty) or indigeneity. Biculturalism has a waning appeal for advocates of indigeneity because while it is understood as a sharing of power with Māori, biculturalism positions Māori in the role of junior partner in the relationship (O'Sullivan, 2007). In the evolving discourse and practice of biculturalism, there is evidence to suggest that in the past decade or so Māori models of self-determination have emerged with some vigour.

Political scientist Dominic O’Sullivan (2007) believes that biculturalism was enthusiastically embraced by state institutions as an apparently liberal strategy for managing resistance while actually denying more autonomous models of tino rangatiratanga/self determination. Consequently it has been encouraged by governments because of its potential to mediate between assimilation and self-determination which O’Sullivan contends, have been the main competing paradigms in Māori/state relations. Biculturalism from this view simply cannot accommodate Māori aspirations and is rejected.

The indigeneity approach envisages a new constitutional arrangement that involves a partnership of self-determining peoples within a multi- (or bi-) national framework (Fleras, 1998; McRoberts, 2001). The autonomy and authority of iwi (tribe), hapū (subtribe) and whānau (extended family) are affirmed in this approach and it is proposed that these traditional social units become part of a very different constitutional arrangement. The principle of indigeneity:

> ... secures a framework for advancing an innovative, if unorthodox, pattern of belonging that endorses the notion of nation states as sites of multiple yet interlocking jurisdictions, each autonomous and self-determining yet sharing in the governance of the whole. (Maaka & Fleras, 2005, p. 12)

In recent times this new relationship is considered to be made possible by the extent to which Māori have economic influence within New Zealand and by focusing on the potential for increasing that influence as well as the degree to which Māori play leadership roles in indigenous networks across the globe. According to Mason Durie (2009):
These measures place less emphasis on jurisprudential arguments, the differences between law and lore, and the assumption that Māori as indigenous New Zealanders can be defined by somewhat outdated legal constructs. Rather than authenticating the Māori position in law, Māori authority is a product of economic might and acknowledgement by peers. (p. 11)

Elizabeth Rata (2011b) has traced the increasingly powerful economic influence of corporate tribes since the 1990s. The incorporation of the Federation of Māori Authorities (FoMA) in 1987 established an influential group who have continued to lobby in the name of corporate Māori tribes. The group became streamlined in 2008 and is now referred to as the Iwi Leadership Forum or Group. The Iwi Leaders Group Taskforce Report (2010) shows the corporate tribes planning for economic expansion within a political arrangement with the government. The goal is to establish State-Iwi Owned Enterprises from tribal ownership of public assets and services which include schools and hospitals, and economic infrastructure assets such as toll roads, bridges, tunnels, airports, seaports, rail networks and energy infrastructure (Ministerial Taskforce on Maori Economic Development, 2010).

Recent policy initiatives in education also suggest a growing government commitment to strengthening partnerships between the state and iwi authorities. For example, Ka Hikitia – Managing for success (Ministry of Education, 2009a) is a strategic document with the goal of setting the conditions necessary for the educational success of Māori in secondary schools. The document identifies increasing whānau and iwi authority and involvement in education as one of these conditions. The Ministry of Education has also identified establishing education partnerships with iwi as a priority and currently nine such partnerships have been formed (Ministry of Education, 2011).

On the 8 December 2010 the Deputy Prime Minister Hon Bill English and the Minister of Māori Affairs Hon Dr Pita Sharples publicly announced a wide-ranging review of New Zealand’s constitutional arrangements. The review falls into three general categories, one of which is concerned specifically with Māori issues such as Māori participation and representation, and the “role of the Treaty of Waitangi in our constitutional arrangements” (Ministry of Justice, 2011). Round (2011) notes that the Cabinet paper appears to assume as fact what actually has to be established as the paper speaks of “seek[ing] the views of all New Zealanders ... in ways that reflect the Treaty relationship” (p. 526). My point in including the proposed constitutional review is not to rehearse the complex arguments about constitutional change presented by
interested parties, but simply to acknowledge the political climate of present day New Zealand which makes proposing such a review possible.

While this chapter has traced the evolution of biculturalism, I wish to acknowledge that it is not possible to identify precise time periods corresponding with concrete tangible changes in policy and practice relating to biculturalism. Throughout the past forty years biculturalism has continued to be understood by different people in different ways and hence also enacted in different ways. What I think it is possible to say about the current situation is that understandings of biculturalism are continuing to change and in 2013 tend to sit much more definitely towards the hard end of the continuum as evidenced by the political events described above.

**Criticism of biculturalism**

There are criticisms of biculturalism in any of its forms which coalesce around several main concerns. One of the central divisive issues relates to the appropriateness of regarding the Treaty of Waitangi as the founding document upon which subsequent group relations should be built. Many New Zealanders believe the Treaty formed a partnership between Māori and pākehā, but even if it is agreed that some sort of partnership was formed, it was a partnership between those iwi (tribes) and hapū (subtribes) who signed the Treaty and the Crown. Some iwi did not sign the Treaty, however, it has long since generally been viewed as a treaty between Māori as an emergent group and the Crown. Not only are Māori a diverse group, but the Crown now is a very different Crown to the Crown of 1840. In 1840, the Crown was the British Government representing British subjects. Now the Crown is the New Zealand Government and as such, the Crown represents all New Zealanders including Europeans, Asian peoples, Pacific peoples and Māori (Bromell, 2008).

Issues around who the ‘groups’ are in the Treaty relationship have continued to constitute much of the criticism of biculturalism. Biculturalism ignores the fact that Māori are neither a homogenous group nor a closed population. All Māori also have European or other ancestry and around half the Māori population identifies as both Māori and European (Chapple, 2000). Commentators argue that the assumption of the existence of two peoples and two cultures greatly oversimplifies the reality of New Zealand society (Mulgan, 1989) and the entangled history of Māori and pākehā (McCarthy, 2011).

There is also an unresolved issue around the relationship between multiculturalism and biculturalism. It has been argued that biculturalism marginalises Pacific peoples, Asian peoples and other non-British New Zealanders by excluding them from the national identity discourse.
and simply does not take account of the demographic reality of an increasingly multiethnic population (Bromell, 2008). The multiethnic nature of New Zealand’s population has resulted in a long-standing debate about multiculturalism versus biculturalism which has not yet been reconciled. This debate has become one that “turns on how New Zealand can become a multicultural society that does not compete with or undermine the biculturalism of its founding contract in the Treaty” (McCarthy, 2011, p. 234). Indeed, some Māori view an emphasis on multiculturalism as an attempt to diminish the importance of biculturalism (Bartley & Spoonley, 2005). Ranginui Walker for example, argues that multiculturalism and immigration together represent a polite yet “covert strategy to suppress the counter-hegemonic struggle of the Māori by swamping them with outsiders who are not obliged to them by the Treaty” (Walker, 1995, p. 292).

Despite the descriptor ‘multicultural’ often being applied to New Zealand society the state does not encompass multiculturalism as a social policy principle. In the mid-1980s there were some tentative explorations of multiculturalism, particularly in response to issues relating to the arrival of Pacific peoples. However, for the most part, the 1980s were almost exclusively dominated by discussions about biculturalism, and the problem of reconciling multiculturalism and biculturalism continues to this day.

Biculturalism has its foundation in the notion of a partnership established by the 1840 Treaty of Waitangi, but attitudes towards the Treaty are not unanimously positive. In 1999 a survey of attitudes towards the Treaty and the Waitangi Tribunal found that the Treaty was “a major point of division within the country” (Perry & Webster, 1999, p. 74). While 5.4 percent of those surveyed thought that the Treaty should be strengthened and given the full force of the law, about 34 percent wanted the Treaty abolished. Ten years later there is evidence of continuing dissatisfaction among some New Zealanders in relation to the role of the Treaty of Waitangi in contemporary society. For example, the Human Rights Commission’s annual progress report on Treaty issues for 2010 found declining numbers of people who agree that the Treaty is the country’s founding document (Human Rights Commission, 2012).

Barclay (2005) claims the revalidation of the Treaty in the name of fairness brought Māori culture to the heart of government institutions without formal public debate on the validity or wider implications for local democracy of recognising indigenous or cultural rights. However, debates surrounding biculturalism, the Treaty, and Treaty settlements process have emerged. Biculturalism as a recognition of the Treaty Principles has encountered increasing pākehā disapproval over the privileged status being afforded to the Māori culture. Predominant pākehā
narratives in opposition to biculturalism include the following: “biculturalism institutionalises Māori privilege in a way that compromises a basic equality; that biculturalism is divisive rather than unifying; and that differential rights for Māori constitute a form of racism that must be rejected” (McCreanor, 2005, p. 120).

Concluding comments

This chapter has traced an evolution of biculturalism with the aim of showing how the interests of various influential groups converged and sufficient consensus was reached among the groups to create the conditions from which biculturalism could first emerge and then become quickly embedded in policy. The process by which this happened is further theorised in chapter six using Gramsci’s concepts of ideology and hegemony where the notion of enduring or durable ideological elements will be discussed more fully. The following chapter has a narrower focus. Having described the emergence of biculturalism and its evolution, I turn now to the education context and the effects of biculturalism on education policy and the provision of Māori language education.
Chapter 4: Biculturalism, education and the provision of Māori language education

The previous chapter has shown how a number of factors converged to provide the conditions from which the ideology of biculturalism would emerge then become embedded in policy. This chapter traces a similar process whereby the ideology of biculturalism would come to be seen as a solution to the educational concerns relating to the underachievement of Māori. The influence of culturalism on New Zealand educators in the 1970s (Openshaw, 2006) consolidated a growing belief that the academic achievement of Māori students could be improved by greater recognition of the Māori culture and language in schools, and consequently biculturalism became rapidly embedded in the policy documents of the New Zealand education system. In time these policies came to have significant effects on the provision of Māori language education in school.

The chapter begins with an overview of the history of Māori language education in the New Zealand primary and secondary education sectors. While the word biculturalism did not come into popular usage until the 1980s, the debate about the appropriate place of Māori culture and language in the New Zealand education system has a much longer history. The long history of lobbying to have Māori language incorporated into the curriculum provided a cause for supporters of bicultural ideology. The Gramscian notion of the way new ideologies are formed by incorporating the enduring elements of older ideologies is useful in understanding this convergence of support for biculturalism. It certainly seems that in the early stages of soft biculturalism, a commitment to biculturalism was synonymous with a commitment to the support of Māori language revitalisation initiatives.

The relationship between biculturalism and the provision of Māori language education, as biculturalism evolved, forms the second part of the chapter. Initially, in the period of soft biculturalism there was a close relationship between biculturalism and an ideal of bilingualism for all, Māori and non-Māori alike. In time the discourse of biculturalism shifted to focus more on bicultural structures, and in doing so, identified the state, via the education system, as having a responsibility to actively contribute to Māori language revitalisation as part of its Treaty obligations. Biculturalism became the justifying ideology for the establishment of a separate Māori education system, and its successful establishment marked the emergence of strong biculturalism.

Despite evolving understandings of biculturalism, and the establishment of a separate Māori education system, Māori language has continued to be taught as a subject in mainstream
secondary schools in much the same way. The final part of the chapter describes the current provision of Māori language education in schools and provides the rationale for choosing non-Māori students who are involved in Māori-as-a-subject education in mainstream secondary schools as participants in this research.

A brief history of Māori language education in schools

Education policy in early colonial New Zealand history was shaped by the goal of assimilation and education was viewed as a key means by which this goal could be achieved. Provision for the education of Māori had been made very early on through the mission schools, the first of which opened in 1816. However, instruction in these schools took place in Māori, and by the late 1860s a belief had emerged among government officials that missionary schooling was proving ineffective in achieving the goals of assimilation (Stephenson, 2008). In 1867 the Native Schools Act was passed establishing state control of Māori education. Secular village day schools were created which were to be controlled and administered by the Department of Native Affairs. These were primary schools and were chiefly for Māori, although non-Māori could also attend if they chose and attendance was voluntary. The language of instruction was to be English, except in cases where it proved impossible to employ an English speaking teacher. The whole system was considered to be transitory; as soon as the children in the district had learnt enough English, the school could become an ordinary district school (Barrington & Beaglehole, 1974).

The parliamentary debates that took place when the 1867 Native Schools Bill was read make it very clear that there were some strong opinions held at this time regarding the Māori language, and of the need to provide education through the medium of the English language in order to achieve the civilisation and assimilation of the Māori people. For example, Hugh Carleton, Member for the Bay of Islands and a former Inspector of Native Schools, voiced the opinion that Māori could never be civilised through the medium of their own language because it was imperfect as a medium of thought (Carlton, 1867). Another member, Mr Graham claimed that the Māori language was a fit medium for reading and writing, albeit as a precursor to learning English, arguing that “the Bill did not go far enough, as they should first teach the Natives to read and write in their own language” (Graham, 1867, p. 866).

The appointment of Douglas Ball in 1928 as Inspector of Native Schools resulted in modification of what had been uncompromisingly assimilationist policies at the official level. In 1930 a survey was undertaken which evaluated the extent to which the education system had ‘Europeanised’ the Māori. It was found that Māori was the only language used in 99.6 percent of
Māori homes (Openshaw, Lee, & Lee, 1993, p. 58). The survey concluded that the assimilationist doctrine of early native schooling was now outdated and inappropriate. Ball responded to the survey by identifying a need to restore to the Māori his pride of race, initiative and confidence, and issued guidelines to native school teachers which formed the core of Māori education policy in the 1930s and early 1940s. Māori arts and crafts were included in the curriculum but there was still no officially sanctioned place for the systematic teaching through or of the Māori language at the primary level (Openshaw, et al., 1993). However, despite its continued exclusion from primary schools in the 1930s there was increased interest and comment about the place of Māori language in the education of Māori children. For example, the focus of the 1930 session of the New Zealand National Summer school was “Education and the Māori Race”. A complete record of the lectures and papers delivered were published the following year in an edited book entitled Māori and Education (Jackson, 1931).

Native school inspectors and some Māori themselves continued to express the view that the introduction of Māori language instruction would impede, rather than facilitate, the effective teaching of English. In 1930, influential Māori leader Apirana Ngata expressed the view that the primary purpose of the native schools was to teach English saying “Māori parents do not like their children being taught in Māori even in the Māori schools, as they argue that the children are sent there to learn English and the ways of the English” (Ngata, cited in Barrington & Beaglehole, 1974, p. 206). However, by the late 1930s he had become so aware of the possibility of language loss that he began to argue forcefully for Māori pupils to learn both English and Māori stating his belief that “nothing was worse than for one to be with Māori features but without his own language” (p. 207).

Against a background of changes in policy and attitudes in the primary sector, Māori became a compulsory subject for both boy and girl government scholars in the denominational boarding schools in 1931 (Barrington & Beaglehole, 1974). At this time there seemed to be a focus on developing leadership amongst a small group of Māori students. In his annual report on the Native Schools, W. Bird mentions funding and scholarships that enabled “the best pupils to continue their studies in the direction of enabling them to be leaders amongst Maoris” (Appendix to the Journals of the House of Representatives, 1931, p. 2) and later in the same report states that “the provision of a definite academic course for about 10 per cent of the pupils is necessary” (p. 4). It seems from these comments that there was perceived value in encouraging effective leadership among Māori, perhaps in the likeness of leaders of that time like Apirana Ngata and Maui Pomare, and an implicit understanding held that to be effective leaders of their own people,
educated Māori would continue to need to be proficient in the language that was still being spoken by a large majority of their own people (Barrington & Beaglehole, 1974).

In 1937 the new Labour government abolished the primary school Proficiency Certificate so that all children could have access to secondary schooling without having to pass an examination. This led to hugely increased numbers of primary students entering secondary schools – from 58 percent in 1935 to 92 percent in 1949 and close to 100 percent in 1955 (Grant, 2003, p. 15). In 1941, the first Native District High Schools were opened as the government recognised the need for additional secondary facilities for Māori pupils who at this time continued to live in rural areas. These schools were intended to bring education into the closest touch with the realities of Māori life, and in accordance with this aim, Māori language was included as a subject for instruction (Barrington & Beaglehole, 1974). Between 1941 and 1945 a number of significant changes were made in post-primary education. These included the raising of the school leaving age to 15, and the 1945 publication of the Education (Post-Primary) Regulations, which gave effect to the recommendations of the Thomas Report (Department of Education, 1959), including the introduction of the “new” School Certificate Examination (Openshaw, 1995). Like its predecessor established in 1934, the “new” School Certificate examination included Māori language as an examinable subject (Barrington & Beaglehole, 1974; Openshaw, et al., 1993). The Thomas report recommended a core curriculum based on the idea of providing a generous and well balanced education for post-primary students with a wide range of abilities and interests and led to the common core curriculum being established for all secondary schools. It also recommended that in as many schools as possible the study of Māori should be fostered, and “if it is taught full advantage should be taken of the opportunities that here exist to reveal it as the ‘living language of a living people’ and to use it as a vehicle for the understanding of the culture it expresses” (Department of Education, 1944, p. 70).

The 1950s saw a growth in concern for the education of Māori youth, partly stimulated by the comparatively low numbers of Māori students staying at school past Form IV, and by the increasing number of Māori students in city schools due to urban migration. In response, the Government established the National Committee on Māori Education in 1955. There was strong Māori representation on this committee, and its establishment gave Māori a direct voice on issues relating to the education of their children (Ronald, 1972). The Committee voiced its support for the teaching of the Māori language and recommended that everything possible be done to implement it.
Attitudes towards the Māori culture and language continued to shift. In reflecting back on her career, Myrtle Simpson (1968), previously a school inspector, noted that despite earlier negative attitudes towards things Māori, by the 1960s elements of traditional Māori culture had come to be regarded as valuable. These shifting attitudes included attitudes towards the Māori language and the extent to which it was being taught in schools. During this period of time there was much greater thought and discussion of a concept that was later to become known as biculturalism; and the role of the Māori language in developing and contributing to the unique cultural background of New Zealanders. For example in 1965 the writer of a letter to the editor published in the *Journal of the Polynesian Society* expressed the belief that too much emphasis was being placed on making a Māori a European and that New Zealand’s cultural background must contain both “Maoritanga and pakehatanga”. He concluded in his letter that “it is time that sincere efforts were made by the Education authorities to provide a foundation of teachers to make possible the eventual teaching of the Māori language in all secondary schools” (Masters, 1965, p. 12).

**Concern about the achievement of Māori students**

The *Report of the Department of Māori Affairs*, or Hunn Report was released in 1960. After surveying the fields of education, employment, crime, health, housing and welfare, Hunn concluded that Māori were a depressed ethnic minority. Hunn argued that education had a major part to play in the economic and social advancement of the Māori, but that at the time of the report they were underachieving compared to pākehā. Perhaps more significantly, the Hunn Report marked a turning of the tide in terms of attitudes towards the place of Māori culture. The report rejected the policy of assimilation which had shaped New Zealand’s education policy since 1844 and offered an alternative of ‘integration’, an equal partnership which would “combine (not fuse) the Maori and Pakeha elements to form one nation wherein Maori culture remains distinct” (Hunn, 1960, p. 15).

The Hunn Report was followed in 1962 by the Currie Report which collected evidence from a wide variety of educational organisations in order to take stock of the educational situation. This resulted in the emergence of disquieting data of an educational gap between Māori and non-Māori students. Without explaining its perceived value, the Currie Commission recommended “that the Māori language continue as an optional subject in secondary schools ... and that efforts be made to foster its teaching in schools that have many Māori pupils” (1962, p. 433). Implicit in this recommendation seems to be the understanding that learning Māori language may be of benefit to the educational achievement of Māori students.
Increased awareness of the educational underachievement of Māori students during the 1960s seems to have been paralleled by an expansion of the teaching of Māori as a second language (Benton, 1981; Grant, 2003). By 1966 there were 1886 Māori secondary school pupils learning Māori as a school subject and over the next five years the number grew steadily until by 1971 this number had risen to 3048 (Ronald, 1972, p. 25). Clearly shifting attitudes and perhaps increased resourcing were having an effect on what was taking place in the schools themselves.

In 1968 Eric Schwimmer became one of the first non-Māori academic commentators to reject the concept of integration and instead make use of the term biculturalism in his edited collection, *The Māori People in the Nineteen Sixties*. Schwimmer (1968) believed the introduction of the Māori language into the New Zealand education system was an important change to education policy, but was critical of its enactment. The framework of school courses, followed by examinations after the European pattern, and the use of European teaching techniques he argued, all belonged to a system set up to instil European values. Schwimmer’s commentary is significant because up until this time, discussions relating to the role of Māori language in education had focused on whether or not it should be taught in schools and to what extent. Schwimmer moves the discussion beyond the provision of Māori language education within existing structures to a critique of the structures themselves, in many ways foreshadowing the significant structural changes that were to occur in education in the 1980s.

**Soft biculturalism and Māori language revitalisation**

The 1970s marked a significant shift in attitudes towards the Māori language. At this time Māori groups had begun to raise the political profile of treaty grievances and while the issues were largely land related, this period of renaissance (Walker, 2004) resulted in the general public becoming much more aware of Māori issues including the apparently precarious state of the Māori language. The first major survey to look at the state of Māori language was initiated in 1973 by the New Zealand Council for Educational Research (NZCER). The findings of this research showed an alarming decline in the number of fluent speakers, and that outside the institution of the marae, Māori people tended to speak English. The survey raised serious questions as to whether the Māori language would survive beyond the generation of that time (Benton, 1977, 1979) and by the end of the 1970s concerns for the future of the Māori language which had been expressed since the beginning of the urban migration were becoming more insistent. Educational policy reflected this shift and began to move away from previous principles of assimilation and integration towards soft biculturalism.
This raised awareness and concern appears to have been reflected in increasing numbers of Māori students learning Māori language in secondary schools which increased quite dramatically during the 1970s, as did the number of students presenting themselves as candidates for the School Certificate Examination. In contrast to the previous decade when between 1962 and 1972 there was no real increase in the popularity of Māori as an examination subject there was a dramatic change as the number of students presenting themselves for the School Certificate Examination increased from 331 students in 1970 to 2089 in 1979 (Benton, 1981). The number of Māori students learning Māori language in secondary schools increased from 2,249 in 1969 to 6,850 in 1973 and by the end of the decade the number was around 15,000 (Benton, 1981). By the beginning of the 1980s, growth in the enrolments of non-Māori into Māori language courses had also increased. At this time Benton predicted that the recognition of Māori as the “other language” of New Zealand would in all likelihood ensure the survival of the language as a national symbol “but not necessarily its maintenance as a language for everyday use” (Benton, 1981, p. 43).

In addition to concerns about the state of the Māori language, figures released in 1970 revealed a worsening situation in relation to Māori educational achievement. The public education sector, particularly state secondary education began to be increasingly seen as failing to address serious social and cultural issues (Openshaw, 2009). While not reflected in educational policy at this time, there is evidence to suggest that discussions in the education community were taking place about possible links between the greater inclusion of Māori language in the curriculum and the educational achievement of Māori children. Lester Ronald (1972), for example, found that Māori language teachers and school principals in Auckland at this time considered that Māori language study would help Māori children to achieve better at school and enhance their self worth because of the common bond that would be created through the entry of pākehā children into the Māori domain.

The heightened interest and focus on Māori language education was evident in the Review of the Core Curriculum for Schools (Department of Education, 1984a). This review was an examination of the structure and balance of the compulsory core curriculum in both primary and secondary education, which had not been modified since the recommendations of the Thomas Report took effect. The review made a number of significant comments relating to the place the Māori language within schools. While it did not recommend that it should be part of the compulsory core curriculum, it made strong suggestions that its development within schools should be fostered as far as possible. The review noted that while there was still no syllabus for te reo Māori, both a primary and secondary syllabus were being prepared. Tihē Mauri Ora
(Ministry of Education, 1990), a syllabus for primary school, was eventually developed but the only available national syllabus for Māori language in secondary schools continued to be the examination prescriptions for the School Certificate and University Entrance examinations until the inception of the National Certificate of Educational Achievement (NCEA) in 2002.

Prior to the appearance of the *New Zealand Curriculum Framework* (Ministry of Education, 1993), a comprehensive discussion document on the development of a New Zealand languages policy had been prepared by Jeffrey Waite (1992). This document articulates the bicultural ideal of the 1980s:

Learning Māori as a second language contributes to goals of cross-cultural understanding and social harmony. By learning Maori, non-Maori New Zealanders have access to the indigenous culture, to its customs, to its oral traditions and growing written literature. Most importantly, non-Maori are able to speak with, and listen to, Maori people *in* Maori, in the language in which the essence of Maoritanga is expressed. (p. 38, emphasis in original)

**A separate Māori education system**

The 1985 Treaty of Waitangi Amendment Act, followed in 1987 by the Court of Appeal ruling had suggested that the treaty was “akin to partnership” and the treaty partnership language soon entered education discourse (Rata, 2008). In 1986, a successful claim was made to the Waitangi Tribunal which established the Māori language as a taonga (a valued possession), and as such, guaranteed protection by the Treaty of Waitangi. This ‘guarantee’ was interpreted as the requirement to act:

... the word (guarantee) means more than merely leaving the Māori people unhindered in their enjoyment of their language and culture. It requires active steps to be taken to ensure that the Maori people have and retain the full exclusive and undisturbed possession of their language and culture. (Waitangi Tribunal, 1986, p. 20)

The following year, in 1987, Māori was made an official language of New Zealand, and the combined effect of these two acts firmly entrenched the place of Māori language in all education sectors.
In the late 1980s the development of kura kaupapa Māori\(^6\) as an extension of kohanga reo (Māori language early childhood centres) for school age children was actively supported by pākehā biculturalists. The campaign for legislation that would enable these schools to be given state funding was based upon the understanding that kura kaupapa Māori would produce “bilingual and bicultural citizens” (Nepe, Rata, Smith, & Smith, 1989, p. 40). However, following the 1989 legislation and acquisition of state funding, kura kaupapa Māori shifted its focus from the goal of biculturalism to retrabilisation (Rata, 1996). Kura objectives expanded beyond the determination to ensure the survival of the Māori language and to create citizens for a bicultural society, to the revival of the Māori body of knowledge and cultural practices. The revival of the kin-group, which informs the ideas in exclusive biculturalism, became central to kura kaupapa Māori pedagogy. Te Aho Matua, the philosophical document of the kura kaupapa Māori, has as its central theme the placement of the child within the tribal world (Ministry of Education, 2013). Likewise the pathway for kohanga reo came to be about whānau development. As described by Royal Tangaere “[i]t is not just about the revival of the Māori language anymore” (Tangaere cited in Rata, 2008, p. 18).

At this time the language revival movement could have taken one of two paths. It could continue to support the kura kaupapa Māori movement which was focused on strengthening the language among the Māori population only, enabling the scarce resource of language teachers to be concentrated on those who had a declared commitment. The other path was to strengthen the bicultural movement which would focus on Māori cultural inclusion within a developing nationhood identity. This would have required enormous government resourcing and the support of the retrabilisation movement. By the early 1990s it seemed apparent that neither group were likely to support the latter path, and the commitment to the former path is evidenced by the funding and resourcing decisions made (Rata, 2007).

For example, during the 1990s curriculum statements were written and eventually mandated for the each of the essential learning areas established by the 1993 Curriculum Framework document. In keeping with its bicultural approach the Curriculum Framework emphasised inclusion in relation to the Māori language; “[a]ll students will have the opportunity to acquire some knowledge of Māori language and culture” (p. 7), but a curriculum statement for te reo Māori in the mainstream did not appear. The curriculum statement \emph{Te Reo Māori i roto i te Marautanga o Aotearoa} (Ministry of Education, 1996) was written primarily for Māori immersion classes, but with a nod at students who may have been learning te reo Māori immersion classes, but with a nod at students who may have been learning te reo Māori immersion classes.

---

\(^6\) Māori medium schools which adhere to a separate education philosophy known as \emph{Te Aho Matua}.
elsewhere; “kua tuhia te tauākī marautanga nei hei tautoko i ngā mahi o ngā whakaakoranga rumaki ki te reo. Heoi anō rā, kei konei anō ngā painga mō ngā ākonga katoa e ako ana i te reo Māori” (p. 11). Until the appearance of *te reo Māori in the New Zealand Curriculum (draft)* (Ministry of Education, 2006b) a curriculum statement specifically for Māori language learning in English-medium schools did not exist. At this time exam prescriptions still dictated to a large extent what students were learning as part of Māori language courses. Anecdotal accounts from teachers employed during this time suggest that some teachers in the mainstream attempted to use *Te Reo Māori i roto i te Marautanga o Aotearoa* (Ministry of Education, 1996) as a basis for programmes of learning but struggled to reconcile the curriculum statement with the external exam prescriptions.

**As-a-subject Māori language education in mainstream secondary schools**

In contrast to the rapid development of kaupapa Māori and Māori-medium education options (these are schools or classes that offer bilingual or partial immersion programmes), very little changed during the same period for students learning Māori as a subject in mainstream secondary schools. While a curriculum statement, *Te Reo Māori i roto i te Marautanga o Aotearoa* (Ministry of Education, 1996), was written for Māori-medium students, until the appearance of the draft document *te reo Māori in the New Zealand Curriculum* in 2006, a curriculum statement specifically for Māori language learning in English-medium schools did not exist.

Kura kaupapa Māori schools have had the support of the Ministry of Education since their establishment. Between 1992 and 2011, the number of kura kaupapa schools has grown from 13 to 72 (Ministry of Education, 2013a). The first Māori Education Strategy published in 1999 had as one of its three main goals “to support the growth of high quality kaupapa Māori education” (Ministry of Education, 2008a, p. 12). A recent Waitangi Tribunal report (Wai 262) contains as part of its overall content, an assessment of the government’s performance in relation to the Māori language over the last 25 years (Waitangi Tribunal, 2011). It is critical of government policy highlighting, in particular, flawed education policy, and recommends urgent action to halt further decline of the language. The criticisms however, extend beyond government policy. The report notes the influence of the pro-immersion lobby which can be seen in the particular status given to kura kaupapa Māori within the Education Act 1989. The authors of the report make a plea for open-mindedness:

---

7 This curriculum statement has been written to support Māori immersion classes. However, it will also provide benefits for all students learning te reo Māori (my translation).
We do urge Māori language revivalists to see value in all three approaches: immersion, bilingual and ‘as-a-subject’ Māori language learning. All make a contribution to maintaining the health of the language. The considerable demand for the latter two forms of learning, combined with the state of te reo, means they should be explored more fully by the joint Crown-Māori partnership. (Waitangi Tribunal, 2011, p. 468)

Current beliefs about what constitutes an effective language learning environment does explain in part the strong emphasis on and interest in Māori-medium education. *Ka Hikitia* the Māori Education Strategy, for example, states that evidence suggests kaupapa Māori learning environments are “particularly conducive to ensuring Māori success” because “Māori students in Māori immersion and bilingual schools have a lower rate of stand-downs, unjustified absences and truancy than Māori in English-medium schools” (Ministry of Education, 2008a, pp. 25-26). It also refers to international research on bilingual and immersion education which “clearly indicates that a high level of immersion is beneficial for revitalising te reo Māori” (p. 26). This has meant that while there is concession that “all Māori language learning opportunities, including learning te reo Māori in English-medium schools, contribute to positive outcomes for Māori students” (Ministry of Education, 2008a, p. 25), the goal of the Ministry of Education has been to continue to support the growth of high quality kaupapa Māori education.

But, as noted in the Waitangi Tribunal report *Ko Aotearoa tēnei: A report into claims concerning New Zealand law and policy affecting Māori culture and identity (Wai 262)*, there is danger in focusing too narrowly on this type of Māori language education. This point was made some years earlier by Mason Durie who warned “the inclusion of Māori language teaching in regular state schools at primary and secondary levels probably impacts on a greater number of pupils than the immersion methods allow, and even though the potential for fluency may be less, the significance and success of such classes should not be discounted” (Durie, 1998a, p. 63).

Ironically however, given the plea in the Wai 262 report to consider the contribution of all types of Māori language education settings, the report makes very few references to as-a-subject Māori language education. Ironic also because one of the few areas of growth they report has been in the number of students learning Māori as a subject in secondary schools. Between 1989 and 2009 the number of these students rose 40.3 per cent, and the number of schools offering the subject increased by around two thirds (Waitangi Tribunal, 2011, p. 399). As-a-subject Māori language education statistics are also under-reported by the Ministry of Education. Their Education Counts website reports on participation in Māori Medium education (which refers to
students who are taught the curriculum in Māori language for at least 51 percent of the time) and Māori Language in English Medium (which refers to students who are learning Māori as a language subject, or taught the curriculum in the Māori language for up to 50 percent of the time). As-a-subject Māori language is not given any special attention despite the fact that this is where the majority of students participating in Māori language learning can be found. In 2012 there was a total of 130,652 students enrolled in as-a-subject Māori language at Levels 4b and 5 (at least 3 hours a week, or less than 3 hours a week respectively). This is considerably more than the total number of students involved in Māori medium education (Māori language Immersion level 1-2) which was 16,792 in 2012 (Ministry of Education, 2013b). This is an example of the near silence I referred to in chapter one about non-Māori learning Māori language.

Non-Māori learning as-a-subject Māori language

Despite the commitment to the ideology of biculturalism espoused in curriculum documents, the under-reporting of non-Māori participation in Māori language learning in schools together with the ambivalence evident in policy documents (which will be discussed in detail in the following chapter), suggest that the purpose of Māori language education for non-Māori is unclear. In particular, the question of whether the aspiration of bilingualism includes all New Zealanders or Māori only, is especially ambiguous. The debate about what constitutes an effective language learning environment tends to mask a deeper tension that is established by the existence of two quite different views of the Māori language: the view of the Māori language as a national language and the view of the language primarily as a cultural taonga belonging to those of Māori ethnicity. These two views stem from different ideological understandings of biculturalism and this idea will be further developed in chapter six.

The tension between promoting bilingualism for all New Zealanders and bilingualism for Māori is evident beyond the education context. For example, in 2000 the Māori Language Commission stated that it had one major outcome to be pursued:

... to promote the idea that Māori language is a living national taonga for all New Zealanders, reflecting a vision for Aotearoa as “a bilingual nation where all New Zealanders value ‘our’ reo as a living national taonga. (Te Taura Whiri i te Reo Maori, 2004)

Chairperson Patu Hohepa was promoting a ‘20-30-40’ vision for New Zealand in the 21\textsuperscript{st} century stating his desire to see 40 percent of all New Zealanders become bilingual in Māori and English
by the year 2030. “We need this if bilingualism is to flourish in this country. We need to highlight Māori language is for everybody” (McCarthy, 2000, p. 11). In contrast with its earlier vision, the 2010 Māori Language Commission Statement of Intent is quite different in that the focus is much more on ensuring that, “where appropriate, Māori language regeneration efforts are driven by iwi and community groups”. A recent focus is “supporting the promotion and preservation of iwi and hapū dialect via Māori language corpora developments” (Te Taura Whiri i te Reo Māori, 2009). There are references to the importance and relevance of Māori language in society, but the very explicit goal of bilingualism for all New Zealanders contained in the earlier statement of intent is no longer evident. This shift reflects the shift from soft to harder forms of biculturalism discussed in the previous chapter.

The recent Wai 262 report (Waitangi Tribunal, 2011) is critical of the Māori Language Strategy, describing it as a failure of policy because it is too abstract. The strategy does not set any goals for the speaking of the Māori language in the wider community – the goals instead being only that all New Zealanders will value the language or have enhanced access to Māori language learning opportunities. “It seems to us essential that the strategy also include goals around non-Māori use of te reo [Māori language], if it is to have a sufficiently broad vision” (p. 462). The report also comments on the latest census which showed a 15 per cent drop in the number of non-Māori speakers. The writers concur with Te Puni Kokiri, the Ministry of Māori Development, who suggested that this may relate to an increased awareness of what conversational Māori entails through exposure to Māori Television. But the report goes on to say that it:

... may also indicate that many non-Māori are abandoning the reo revival movement, in the way that those at the margins of interest and with less at stake are the first to leave movements that begin to falter. In this case, the decline in non-Māori speakers may be a warning sign of impending disaster, like those provided by canaries in the coal mine. (Waitangi Tribunal, 2011, p. 462)

There may be truth in this observation, the decline in non-Māori speakers may be a warning sign of ‘impending disaster’, but the disaster may be the hidden processes that are causing the policy failure. The reframing of biculturalism may involve the exclusion of non-Māori from the use of te reo Māori. This point is also made in the Wai 262 report, albeit tucked away in the footnotes, “this abandonment may also be happening because of a degree of non-acceptance by some Māori of non-Māori learning te reo. The extent of this is, of course difficult to know” (p. 485). While there is indeed very little evidence about the prevalence of this kind of attitude, the research
conducted as part of this study supports its existence. The introduction to this thesis began with a quote from one of the research participants who experienced a negative reaction from a Māori person towards her use of Māori language. She was not alone in her experience. Some of the other research participants had similar experiences which will be discussed in later chapters.

**Concluding comments**

This chapter has traced the broad contours of debate over the role of Māori language education in New Zealand state schools, and explored the way some of the enduring concerns relating to the achievement of Māori students converged with, and contributed to, the popularity of biculturalism in education. Once biculturalism became embedded in policy, it had significant effects on the provision of Māori language education, and became the justifying ideology in the establishment of a separate education system. The chapter has also shown that understandings of biculturalism have continued to evolve and suggested that this has resulted in a lack of clarity about the purpose of Māori language education for non-Māori students in mainstream settings.

Later in this thesis the contributions of the research participants illustrate the ideological effects of bicultural education policy, both on the way they make sense of the world, and on their experience of Māori language use. However, the second stage in critical policy methodology is to take a close look at how particular ideas are framed in specific policy documents. The following chapter identifies the policy corpus that influences practices in mainstream secondary settings and presents a close reading of these documents.
Chapter 5: Policy analysis

The previous two chapters have explored the socio-historical context in New Zealand from which biculturalism emerged, both broadly and more specifically in the education sector. Chapter four described the establishment of a separate Māori education system justified by bicultural ideology which has, as one of its characteristics, Māori language as the medium of instruction. In contrast, as-a-subject Māori language has continued to exist in mainstream secondary schools in much the same way as it has done since the emergence of bicultural education policies. My aim in these chapters has been to introduce and develop two key themes: the first is the idea of biculturalism as a continually evolving ideology. The second is that beliefs about the use of the Māori language are related to the social and political aspirations of different interest groups, and this affects how those groups view the purpose of Māori language education.

The focus of the thesis now turns to current policy relating to both biculturalism and Māori language education. I begin by theorising the work of policy drawing on the work of anthropologists of policy to explain how ideology is materialised through policy by its shaping of attitudes and practices. The other important contribution of this approach is that it moves away from a traditional policy cycle model, with its instrumental-rational assumptions (Shore, 2012). Cris Shore describes the more traditional approach as follows:

Most academic research is premised on the idea of policy as a neat, hierarchical and seamless flow that moves from ‘agenda setting’, ‘policy formulation, and policy adoption’, to ‘policy implementation’ (and ‘enforcement’) and ‘policy evaluation’ – which then lead to ‘policy reviewing’ and ‘updating’. (p. 91, emphases in original)

The approach he and others take (Shore, 2012; Shore, Wright, & Pero, 2011; Wright & Reinhold, 2011) explores how policies work in practice and in the kinds of relations they produce. This idea frames the close reading of policy documents that follow which highlights the way biculturalism is framed, and the purpose of learning Māori for both Māori and non-Māori students. In this chapter I use the term policy to refer to a specific corpus of documents or statements relevant to my focus which shapes practice in schools. These include The National Education Guidelines (Ministry of Education, 2009c), The New Zealand Curriculum (Ministry of Education, 2007), Te Aho Arataki Marau mo te Ako i Te Reo Māori/Curriculum Guidelines for Teaching and Learning Te Reo Māori in English-medium Schools (Ministry of Education, 2009d), and The Registered Teacher Criteria (New Zealand Teachers Council). While schools
are required to write their own charters, meaning their practices are also affected by unique local policies, my discussion is limited to national policy documents and statements.

**Ideology and policy**

Gramsci insists on the importance of both the material and institutional nature of ideological practice. This practice possesses its own agents, or *intellectuals*, who lead the elaboration and spreading of ideology (Mouffe, 1979). Chapters three and four have traced the ascendance of the ideology of biculturalism, with a focus on the education sector and how this ideology became institutionalised through policy. I propose here that an important group of Gramscian “intellectuals” (Gramsci, 1971, p. 10), whose work it is to both elaborate and extend the influence of an ideology, are policy writers. Once the policy has been created, it can then be put to work by policy activists, materialising ideology in practice. In describing this process I employ key ideas from the anthropology of policy, the relatively new area of anthropology referred to above, which emerged from the recognition that policy has become an “increasingly central concept and instrument in the organization of contemporary societies” (Shore & Wright, 1997, p. 6).

In Cris Shore and Susan Wright’s edited volume, *Anthropology of Policy: Critical Perspectives on Governance and Power* (1997), the authors develop a number of key ideas, one of which is that “policies are inherently anthropological phenomena and should be conceptualized as discursive formations through which larger-scale processes of social and historical change can be mapped” (Shore, 2012, p. 94). They describe discourse as “configurations of ideas which provide the threads from which ideologies are woven” (Shore & Wright, 1997, p. 18). In time, a discourse may become dominant and in doing so it establishes particular terms of reference while disallowing or marginalising others. Policies thus enable the setting of a political agenda by giving institutional authority to one, or a number of overlapping discourses (Shore & Wright, 1997). Once a particular world view is institutionalised it is able to work through non-agentive power as institutional practices instead are able to shape perceptions, values and behaviour (Wright, 1998). The final stage in this process is when a particular “way of thinking about one aspect of life enters other domains (outside the activities of the state) and becomes a diffused and prevalent way of thinking in everyday life” (Wright, 1998, p. 9). At this point, ideology appears hegemonic, that is, it seems natural, taken-for-granted and true.

This understanding of the ideological processes relating to policy provides a useful addition to Gramsci’s conceptualisation of ideology as a synthesis which takes into account the unique

64
historical traditions of a nation, and the contributions made by diverse social movements. It is the formation of these alliances that enables the ascendance of a hegemonic group, and the cement which holds these alliances together is mutual support for a particular ideology. However, these alliances are fragile, in Gramscian terms they are characterised by a “continuous process of formation and superseding of unstable equilibria” (Gramsci, 1971, p. 182). This view is echoed by Susan Wright (1998) who reminds us that “no ideology, however hegemonic and entrenched in institutions and in everyday life, is beyond contest” (p10). So while policy may appear stable in terms of its material existence in the form of documents or statements, it continually creates spaces of contestation as both institutions and groups attempt to “defend or unsettle established discourses and advance particular ways of conceptualising the role of the individual” (Wright & Reinhold, 2011, p. 86).

Policies thus have an inherently complex nature. They create spaces of contestation as various policy activists attempt to make particular ideas ‘stick’. They are instrumental and can affect the way people and groups interact with one another, but as Shore (2012) points out, while they may be instrumental, they are not necessarily rational. Echoing Appadurai (1986), Shore (2012) claims policies have complex “social lives” (p. 101). Once they are created, they enter into complex relationships with other policies and actors, and these relationships have unpredictable and sometimes contradictory consequences. It is thus little wonder that policy can appear contradictory, either in terms of how ideas are expressed, or in terms of consequences. Contradictions or ambiguity in policy can thus be understood as the result of complex and ongoing processes of negotiation and compromise between different interest groups.

The following discussion of the corpus of policy documents I named at the beginning of the chapter, is framed within the notion of policies as “charter for action” (Shore, 2012, p. 100). According to Shore (2012) policies often occupy the same role as myth in traditional societies, providing guides to behaviour and containing implicit messages about how individuals should relate to society and each other. Bicultural education policy and Māori language policy are symbolic of a particular relationship. Not only do they contain implicit messages about how Māori and pākehā ought to relate to one another, their very existence legitimates the educational myth of biculturalism (Beeby, 1986).

These charters for action create spaces for contestation at the sites where they are interpreted and enacted, but they remain charters for some sort of action nonetheless, especially when accompanied by political technologies in the form of accountability measures. The chapter continues with a discussion of the purpose of Māori language education for different groups as it
is articulated in policy. The latter part of the chapter considers the implications of the accountability measures, or auditing technologies, that also contribute to the shaping of institutional practices.

**Biculturalism in education policy**

Māori language policy sits within bicultural education policy and it is the broader ideology of biculturalism that influences how the purpose of Māori language education is understood and articulated. The discussion of policy begins with a discussion of biculturalism in policy for this reason. The broad understanding of biculturalism is that it is a partnership relationship between Māori and pākehā (or between Māori and the Crown or the New Zealand government - I think it is fair to say there is some confusion about who the partners are exactly), and that this relationship was established by the signing of the Treaty of Waitangi in 1840. The following discussion pays particular attention to the way the bicultural relationship is framed by policy, and to the implicit messages these charters for action convey.

*The National Education Guidelines* are defined by Sections 60A of the Education Act 1989 (Ministry of Education, 2009b) and legislate the direction New Zealand schools must take in the planning and provision of education. The Guidelines have four main components: *National Education Goals*, which outline desirable achievement and policy objectives, *National Administration Guidelines* which provide direction to boards of trustees relating in particular to management, planning and reporting, *National Standards* which are literacy and numeracy standards applicable to all students of a particular age or in a particular year of schooling, and *The New Zealand Curriculum*. The place of the Treaty of Waitangi in New Zealand education, and the commitment of the education sector to biculturalism are made clear in three of the four components.

*National Education Goal (NEG) 9* establishes the principles of the Treaty of Waitangi as the justification for the advancement of Māori education initiatives, which include the provision of Māori language education in New Zealand schools. The goal is to have “[i]ncreased participation and success by Māori through the advancement of Māori education initiatives, including education in Te Reo Māori, consistent with the principles of the Treaty of Waitangi” (Ministry of Education, 2009b).

A key component of *The National Education Guidelines* is *The New Zealand Curriculum* (Ministry of Education, 2007) which is “a statement of official policy relating to teaching and learning in English-medium New Zealand schools” (p. 6). The curriculum clearly establishes the
place of biculturalism in the Principles section of the curriculum document. The Principles are explained as “beliefs about what is important and desirable in school curriculum – nationally and locally. They should underpin all school decision making” (p. 9). This section states “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 ona tikanga” (p. 9).

As I mentioned earlier, the popular understanding of biculturalism as a relationship of partnership established by the signing of the Treaty of Waitangi, and defined by treaty principles, has been naturalised in policy since the 1980s. As a result, policy relating to biculturalism refers to one or all of the following: the Treaty of Waitangi, the principles of the Treaty of Waitangi or the term ‘bicultural’ itself.

Not only are the principles of the Treaty of Waitangi and the bicultural foundations of Aotearoa New Zealand acknowledged in the Principles section of The New Zealand Curriculum (2007), but a further reference to the Treaty of Waitangi is made in the Vision section of the document. This section describes “what we want for our young people” (p. 8), and makes a strong statement of support for the idea of partnership, “[o]ur vision is for young people .... Who will work to create an Aotearoa New Zealand in which Māori and Pākehā recognise each other as full Treaty partners” (p. 8). Returning to the anthropological idea that policy can provide messages about how people ought to relate to one another, The New Zealand Curriculum (2007) as policy clearly signals a vision of how Māori and pākehā are two distinct ethnic groups who ought to relate to one another as partners.

The following chapter will elaborate some of the difficulties that arise when trying to determine who exactly ‘pākehā’ are as a group, especially now that people can respond as ‘New Zealander’ to the question of ethnic origin in the New Zealand Census of Population and Dwellings. It is suffice to note at this point that the vision of The New Zealand Curriculum (2007) for a future in which Māori and pākehā recognise each other as full Treaty partners does not take into account the complex ethnicities of New Zealand students (Callister, 2003; Chapple, 2000), nor does the vision include, or provide guidance for the inclusion of students who are neither Māori or pākehā.

Significantly, having just noted the difficulties arising from establishing the groups ‘Māori’ and ‘pākehā’, I want to point out, that all other references to groups of students in both the NZC and
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Te Aho Arataki Marau mo te Ako i Te Reo Māori/Curriculum Guidelines for Teaching and Learning Te Reo Māori in English-medium Schools (2009) are to ‘Māori’ and ‘non-Māori’. The group ‘pākehā’, (as problematic as it is to define) is subsumed into a much larger, even more heterogeneous group. This shift to using Māori and non-Māori as group identifiers has interesting implications when considering the relationship between ethnicity and Māori language use, and these implications will be considered in the following chapter.

**Policy relating to Māori language**

Section 13(b) of the Education Act 1989 states that a school charter must contain “[t]he aim of ensuring that all reasonable steps are taken to provide instruction in tikanga Māori (Māori culture) and te reo Māori (the Māori language) for full-time students whose parents ask for it”. This requirement, in conjunction with NEG 9, means that it is common to find Māori language offered as an option subject in mainstream secondary schools, particularly at years 9 and 10. In addition The New Zealand Curriculum (2007) implies a sense of responsibility for the language that extends beyond only those who identify ethnically as Māori, stating “[a]ll who learn te reo Māori help to secure its future as a living, dynamic, and rich language” (p. 14).

The above sentence is found in the section of The New Zealand Curriculum (2007) which discusses the official languages of New Zealand. Several reasons that Māori language is considered important (aside from its status as an official language) are given. However, these reasons read together are confusing. Take for example the following, “[t]e reo Māori is ... a primary source of our nation’s self-knowledge and identity” (Ministry of Education, 2007, p. 14). This statement suggests that knowledge of the Māori language contributes to our national identity. However, in the following paragraph we find the claim “[b]y learning te reo and becoming increasingly familiar with tikanga, Māori students strengthen their identities, while non-Māori journey towards shared cultural understandings”. A clear link is evident in this statement between the Māori language and its capacity to strengthen the identity of Māori students as Māori. This is a good example of policy that attempts to accommodate two different views of the role of the Māori language in New Zealand society.

If we move on to look at the Te Aho Arataki Marau mo te Ako i Te Reo Māori/Curriculum Guidelines for Teaching and Learning Te Reo Māori in English-medium Schools (2009) we can find further examples of ambivalence or lack of clarity, in terms of the purpose of learning Māori
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9 This observation is based on my professional experience in the sector and supported by subject enrolment data available on the Ministry of Education’s Education Counts website.
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language for non-Māori students. This document, unlike *The New Zealand Curriculum* which refers specifically to biculturalism and the two distinct ethnic groups of Māori and pākehā, only uses the descriptor non-Māori. All non-Māori New Zealanders are thus in effect grouped together, whether they be a recent immigrant from Afghanistan, a New Zealand-born Samoan or a fourth generation pākehā. In other words, there is no reference to a relationship, implied or otherwise, between biculturalism and Māori language use by the group ‘pākehā’ in the curriculum guidelines.

When the draft form of *Te reo Māori in the New Zealand Curriculum*, (Ministry of Education, 2006b) was developed and circulated in 2006 it had a clear emphasis on inclusion; “[t]hese curriculum guidelines reflect the need to be inclusive … Māori language programmes should offer both Māori and non-Māori learners the opportunity to learn Māori” (p. 10). In addition to the inclusive aspect, all New Zealanders were identified as having responsibility for the survival of the language; “[i]t is everyone’s responsibility to ensure that te reo Māori endures”. *Te Aho Arataki Marau mo te Ako i Te Reo Māori/Curriculum Guidelines for Teaching and Learning Te Reo Māori in English-medium Schools* replaced *Te Reo Māori in the New Zealand Curriculum*(draft) in 2009. The updated curriculum guidelines no longer mention the need to be inclusive, and no reference is made to the responsibilities of all New Zealanders towards the Māori language. Instead the guidelines refer to the goals of the government’s Māori Language Strategy, initiated in 2003, which include “ensuring that, by 2028, the majority of Māori will have some proficiency in te reo Māori and all New Zealanders will appreciate its value to New Zealand society” (Ministry of Education, 2009d, p. 10).

We learn more about the purpose of Māori language education for non-Māori in the section of the curriculum guidelines entitled *Nga hua o te ako i te reo Māori/The benefits of learning te reo Māori*. This section identifies a number of benefits for students learning te reo Māori relating to a number of broad headings which include *Cultural, Social, Cognitive, Linguistic, Economic and Career*, and *Personal*. The *Cultural* section begins “[t]he reo Māori and tikanga Māori are intertwined, and so learning te reo Māori gives students access to te ao Māori (the Māori world) and to Māori world views” (Ministry of Education, 2009d, p. 13). The value here is identified as student access to a distinct Māori world view.

The section continues with a reference to indigeneity - students “learn about the important role that indigenous languages and cultures play in New Zealand and throughout the world” (Ministry of Education, 2009d, p. 13). If we consider here for a moment the evolution of biculturalism described in chapter three, it is relevant to note the use of the word indigenous being used for the
first time in a New Zealand education policy document that clearly identifies biculturalism as its ideological basis. As discussed in the earlier chapter, proponents of indigeneity tend to reject biculturalism as an appropriate policy, the discourse of indigeneity located more often as ‘beyond biculturalism’ (O’Sullivan, 2007). Both harder forms of biculturalism and the discourse of indigeneity however, have as a key underpinning, the notion of a distinctly different Māori world view.

In the section of the curriculum guidelines entitled *The benefits of learning te reo Māori* it is claimed that through learning te reo Māori, students develop an understanding of “the roles that language, culture, place, and heritage play in shaping identity” (Ministry of Education, 2009d, p. 13). While this is considered of benefit for all students, it:

... may be especially important for those students who identify as Māori and for whom te reo Māori is a second language. For these students, the enhanced sense of connection to a rich cultural heritage can be deeply empowering. (p.13)

Once again the purpose of learning te reo Māori for Māori is presented as contributing to the development of a Māori ethnic identity, while for non-Māori there is no mention of a relationship between the Māori language and their own cultural identity.

The *Economic and career* sub-section of *The benefits of learning te reo Māori* in the curriculum guidelines continues to represent ethnic Māori as a discrete group:

In addition, Māori-owned businesses and enterprises play an important and growing part in the New Zealand economy. The ability to speak te reo Māori is an asset both for those who wish to work within these businesses and for those who wish to do business with them. (p. 14)

Martin Devlin (2006) has argued that there is little evidence to support the claim that there is such a thing as a ‘Māori business’ that is substantially different from business involving people from other ethnic groups11. Furthermore, he claims there is “no evidence to suggest that ethnicity confers distinct advantages on, and results in better performance of, new ventures” (p. 94). Yet, since 1984 successive governments have implemented affirmative action policies to encourage and assist Māori to start new business enterprises. The above statement from the curriculum guidelines implies continued government support for the development of ‘ethnic’ businesses.
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11 The term ‘Māori business’ can be used to refer to Māori owned businesses, business in which Māori cultural values play a part, or businesses which provide tourists with a Māori experience (De Bruin & Mataira, 2003).
The statement also implies that Māori-owned businesses and enterprises are Māori speaking businesses and enterprises. Apart from this implication, which in reality may or may not be true, two other problems seem apparent. Firstly, people who want to be identified as working within Māori businesses are likely to believe their businesses reflect a distinctly Māori world view, and way of doing business. If they are committed to using their own indigenous language it seems unlikely they would want to employ non-Māori speakers of te reo Māori. Rather, it would be more likely that the Māori language would be used as an ethnic boundary marker as one means of distinguishing a Māori business from other businesses. The statement from the curriculum guidelines would perhaps be more accurate if it read ‘the ability of Māori people to speak te reo Māori is an asset.’

The second problem with this statement is, given that even fluent Māori speakers are bilingual, there is no need to speak Māori in order to sustain business relationships with Māori businesses. It seems unlikely in the foreseeable future that Māori businesses will require outsiders (“those who wish to do business with them”) to be able to communicate in Māori, given their own fluency in English, and that an outsider’s fluency in te reo Māori, weakens the impact of the language as an ethnic boundary marker.

The final point I want to make about The benefits of learning te reo Māori section of the curriculum guidelines is a rather strange statement in the sub-section entitled Personal. Here, it is claimed, learning Māori “enables all students of te reo Māori to participate and contribute more effectively as citizens of a multicultural society” (p. 14). Why is this strange? Because in the first fourteen pages of this curriculum document there are references to biculturalism, indigeneity and finally multiculturalism, as if these three terms sit alongside one another in an unproblematic way. Chapter three discussed the very different ways relationships between ethnic groups are framed in these three approaches. Including them all in one curriculum document that attempts to articulate the purpose of Māori language education in New Zealand schools is another example of one-size-fits-all policy and contributes to a lack of clarity around perceived purpose for non-Māori students. The phrase from the guidelines quoted at the beginning of this paragraph could be read as implying that for non-Māori students, learning Māori is no more or less important or useful than learning any other of the languages that are used in New Zealand’s multicultural society.

These inconsistencies in policy documents are worthy of close attention if we understand policies as unstable and in a constant state of contestation, both at the time of writing, and then as their contents as charters for action are interpreted and enacted at different sites.
Inconsistencies in policy are the surface manifestation of ideological tension or struggle (Grace, 1995), fractures or fissures of a sort which offer a way to delve under the surface and identify different ideological threads and their socio-historical context. Providing a sociological explanation for the development of biculturalism and the increasing politicisation of language is the focus of the following chapter.

However, before we turn our attention to the ideologies themselves, I want to consider some of the ways that policy is able to materialise ideology, influencing attitudes and practices. A policy may say how something ought to be done (a charter for action), or it may provide messages about how people and groups ought to view one another. What often gives those policy ‘teeth’ are their accompanying auditing technologies such as performance management systems, appraisal, external benchmarking and in the case of New Zealand schools, external reviews conducted by the Education Review Office (ERO). These auditing technologies contribute to the complex social lives of policies as they interact with each other and institutions, influencing practices within those institutions (Shore & Wright, 2011).

**Auditing technologies**

There are a number of key auditing technologies relating to biculturalism and the provision of Māori language education which influence perceptions and practices within New Zealand schools. In this section I will briefly discuss teacher registration, appraisal, and the role of the Education Review Office, considering some of the implications and effects of these technologies. These technologies are interesting, not only because of the potential they have to influence practice once they have been developed, but because the actual development of the technologies is part of a process which Shore and Wright (2011) refer to as the “re-translation of a policy narrative” (p. 14). Re-translation occurs when policy moves from one political or social space to another. Each time it occurs, space is created for new voices to enter with new ways of reinforcing or contesting the concepts or assumptions built into policy texts.

What makes the auditing technologies I am about to discuss so powerful, is that they interact with one another and the policy documents previously mentioned, creating spaces for the re-translation of ideas about what constitutes bicultural practice, and the purpose of Māori language education. Shore and Wright (2011) argue that this creates multiple spaces for the contestation of hegemonic ideas, however, if that contestation is unsuccessful, the web of policy and auditing technologies that are created around a particular world view begin to obscure other ways of thinking about the world. In time, institutional practices are able to shape perceptions, values and
behaviour to the extent that a way of thinking about the world becomes a prevalent way of thinking in everyday life (Wright, 1998). The technologies discussed below present biculturalism as a universally-agreed upon foundation for New Zealand education and clearly articulate what biculturalism ought to look like in practice. As auditing technologies, they strongly discourage contestation because they are presented as what is right and aspirational in teaching practice, so any potential disagreement is positioned as unprofessional.

**Teacher registration and appraisal**

It is mandatory for practising teachers in New Zealand to be registered. *The Registered Teacher Criteria* (New Zealand Teachers Council, 2013) are designed to represent the essential knowledge and capabilities for quality teaching in Aotearoa New Zealand, be both aspirational and achievable for teachers, and apply to all teachers seeking to gain full registration and to renew practising certificates (p. 1). Two criteria in particular refer to the bicultural nature of education in New Zealand. Criterion 3 requires teachers to “demonstrate commitment to bicultural partnership in Aotearoa New Zealand” (p. 11) and the key indicator for this is that a teacher can “demonstrate respect for the heritages, languages and cultures of both partners to the Treaty of Waitangi” (p. 11). Criterion 10 requires teachers to demonstrate that they “work effectively within the bicultural context of Aotearoa New Zealand” (p. 14). There are two key indicators for this criteria, one of which is that they “practise and develop the relevant use of te reo Māori me ngā tikanga-a-iwi” in context” (p. 14).

The appraisal process which is mandated by the Ministry of Education, but managed within schools, requires teachers to demonstrate on an annual basis that they are meeting *The Registered Teacher Criteria (RTC)*. In order to progress up the pay scale teachers must provide satisfactory evidence that they are meeting the criteria in order for the attestation document to be signed off by the school. If this document is not signed off, teachers are unable to move up a level in the pay scale. Biculturalism is thus established as the accepted ideological basis for teaching practice in schools, and some evidence of teachers’ commitment to bicultural partnership and the incorporation of te reo Māori me ngā tikanga-a-iwi in context is required. How this expectation is met in different schools is unknown, and beyond the scope of this thesis, but the RTC and the appraisal process are included here both as ideological statements and practice drivers. The RTC in particular, make it clear that Māori language has a place in mainstream schools but leave it for individual schools to define what the “relevant use” (New Zealand Teachers Council, p. 14) of te reo Māori might mean.
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External review

The Education Review Office (ERO) is a New Zealand government department which, in its own words, “independently evaluates the quality of education in schools and early childhood services and reports on these publicly with the aim of improving the achievement of all students” (Education Review Office, 2011, p. 1). Schools and early childhood services are reviewed on average once every three years, more frequently if the performance or centre is underperforming. The reports produced by ERO are posted on the ERO website and as such, freely accessible to the public.

The handbook entitled Evaluation Indicators for School Reviews (Education Review Office, 2011) begins with a clear statement about biculturalism “ERO has a commitment to honouring Te Tiriti o Waitangi as the founding document of Aotearoa New Zealand that underpins relationships between Māori and the Crown” (p. 4). The handbook identifies six dimensions of good practice then presents in table form, suggestions for evaluative prompts, indicators and evidence of good practice. One of the dimensions of effective teaching is “[t]eaching to promote te reo and bicultural awareness” (p. 25). This is a good example of the implicit assumption that biculturalism is the universally agreed-upon ‘correct’ ideological basis for New Zealand education. As an articulated dimension of effective teaching practice, to disagree with the ideological positioning, would imply ‘ineffective’ teaching.

The indicator for the effective teaching dimension identified above is “all students have opportunities to increase their understanding of te reo and tikanga” (p. 25). This makes an interesting, although rather vague, link between knowledge of Māori language and bicultural awareness. Returning to one of the central concerns of this thesis, which is the purpose of Māori language education for non-Māori students as it is expressed in policy, it could be argued that some sediments of inclusive biculturalism can be identified here. Inclusive or soft biculturalism, as discussed in chapter three, included the aspiration of non-Māori knowledge of Māori language.

One of the evaluative prompts listed under the dimension Leading and Managing the School asks “to what extent has the school provided professional learning opportunities to enhance staff knowledge and understanding of the Treaty of Waitangi, te reo and tikanga Māori?” (p. 32). Again, this is an example of what biculturalism ought to look like in practice. And again, the implication is that a school who is not offering these professional learning opportunities is neglecting some of its responsibilities.
The final indicator that I want to mention, which also comes under the dimension *Leading and Managing the School* refers to the performance appraisal system and states “the performance appraisal system is effectively used to identify and address on-going improvement of the quality of teaching” (p. 31). The performance appraisal system appraises teacher performance against *The Registered Teacher Criteria*. This system itself is in turn audited by the ERO. The point I want to make here, is not whether biculturalism is an appropriate ideological underpinning for the New Zealand education system, but rather, that to contest the idea is almost impossible. An individual is immediately positioned as an ineffective and hence underperforming teacher, while a school or school leadership team is positioned as not fulfilling its professional responsibilities. While ERO does not publicly report on the performance of individual teachers, it does report on the overall performance of schools, making their reviews a powerful auditing technology.

**Reporting**

The public reporting of achievement data would typically be considered an auditing technology. However, I want to take a slightly different approach to public reporting and focus on public reporting relating to student participation in Māori language learning. Despite the commitment to the ideology of biculturalism espoused in curriculum documents, and auditing technologies, the lack of clarity around the purpose of Māori language education is amplified by the under-reporting of non-Māori participation in Māori language learning in schools. The previous chapter presented the statistics; here I want to highlight an implication of the current way these statistics are reported.

*Education Counts* is the Ministry of Education website which publishes a wide range of statistics relating to all areas of the education sector from early childhood education through to the tertiary sector. There are seven headings that statistics are published under, *Māori* being one of the seven (Ministry of Education, 2013c). Participation and attainment are two of the foci. *Ka Hikitia – Managing for Success* (the Ministry of Education’s strategy for working with Māori in education) has the goal of ensuring “Māori are enjoying education success as Māori” (Ministry of Education, 2009a, p. 18) and as such the participation of Māori students in Māori language learning is given close attention. This is because “through te reo Māori, Māori learners can affirm their identities and access te Ao Māori and Māori world views” so the strategy is insistent that “all students must be able to access quality Māori language options across the education sector if they so choose” (Ministry of Education, 2009a, p. 24).
However, data is not collected about the ethnic identities of the non-Māori students which suggests that the ethnicity of those students is not important. This would seem to imply that there is no special relationship between pākehā learners of Māori language and the language itself, despite the fact they are clearly identified as one of the partners in the bicultural relationship. One of the aspirations articulated in *The New Zealand Curriculum* if you recall, is to develop young people “who will work to create an Aotearoa New Zealand in which Māori and Pākehā recognise each other as full Treaty partners” (Ministry of Education, 2007, p. 8) The inclusion of te reo Māori in schools is justified because “learning te reo Māori gives students access to te ao Māori (the Māori world) and to Māori world views” (p. 13), and yet this does not seem to be viewed as having any special benefit or significance for one of the partners in the bicultural partnership.

**Concluding comments**

Critical policy analysis integrates theories of macro political and economic movements with an analysis of how policy puts the generated power relations into practice (Rata, 2014). The purpose of this chapter has been to theorise the ways in which policy both materialises and gives institutional authority to ideology. Policy conceptualised as charters for action enables us to see how policy is able to influence attitudes and practices. This gives institutional authority to a dominant ideology, especially when it works in tandem with auditing technologies.

However, the other important aspect relating to both ideology and policy is that neither are fixed or stable, no matter how hegemonic they appear. Gramsci’s concept of hegemony or the leadership of a dominant group or alliance of groups requires a compromise of sorts to be made between the interests and ideologies of diverse groups. Policy making can thus be understood as a complex process of negotiation between different groups or movements in order to achieve Gramsci’s “unstable equilibria” (Gramsci, 1971, p. 182). Once created policy continues to be contested and retranslated as it moves from site to site, by both policy activists and by the policy subjects themselves.

This fluidity or space for contestation at both the policy making and policy enactment levels helps to explain the presence of ambiguities in the policy corpus I have discussed. The earlier chapters of the thesis traced the development of biculturalism over time and the close reading of the policy documents provided in the previous section has identified the ways the changes in bicultural ideology have influenced policy relating to the purpose of Māori language education for non-Māori. While biculturalism as an ideology is deeply entrenched in policy, I propose that
the purpose of Māori language education is changing and has the potential to exclude non-Māori from meaningful engagement with the Māori language. The following chapter theorises the political and economic shifts which have occurred that explain changing beliefs about the relationship between biculturalism and Māori language education for non-Māori.
Chapter 6: Theorising ambiguities in policy

The previous chapter identified ambiguities in policy relating to the purpose of Māori language education for non-Māori students. Beliefs about the use of the Māori language are related to the social and political aspirations of different interest groups, and this affects how those groups view the purpose of Māori language education. Chapter three described the socio-historic context from which biculturalism emerged and traced the contours of its evolution. This chapter returns to the broader context of biculturalism with the purpose of theorising the ascendance of bicultural ideology within an economic and political context. By doing so, it then becomes possible to theorise the relationship between different conceptualisations of biculturalism and Māori language use.

The early part of the chapter elaborates Gramsci’s theory of hegemony in order to explain how the Fourth Labour Government was able to establish a culturalist framework as the dominant social ideology of the state (Edwards & Moore, 2009; Poata-Smith, 1996; Rata, 2005). The chapter continues with a summary of post-colonial interpretations of the rise of Māori nationalism and presents an alternative explanation of the turn to identity politics offered by global systems theory (Friedman, 1994). The focus of the chapter then turns to a discussion of the relationship between the Māori language and biculturalism which is theorised using the concept of ethnic boundary marking (Borell, 2005; Kolig, 2006; McIntosh, 2005; Van Meijl, 1999).

Hegemony and ideology

Gramsci’s theory of the relationship between hegemony and ideology provides a useful conceptual framework in which to examine the ideological tension relating to the use of Māori language by non-Māori, because it offers a tool with which to consider ideological processes and effects. In its typical Gramscian formation, hegemony is political, intellectual and moral leadership over allied groups. It is conceptualised as a relation of manufactured consent which is achieved by persuading a subordinate group to accept the moral and political values of the dominant group as their own. Hegemony involves the creation of a higher synthesis, a fusing of its diverse elements in order to achieve a collective will. In the hegemonic system ideology acts as cement which unifies the different elements of this collective will (Mouffe, 1979; Simon, 1982).

While Gramsci was a Marxist, his theory of ideology differs from classical Marxism in two significant ways. The first is his rejection of economism, in which the superstructure is regarded
as a purely mechanical reflection of the economic base. In other words, in economism, political developments are understood as the expression of economic developments. This leads to a view of ideological superstructures as epiphenomena, and as such, having no part to play in the historical process (Mouffe, 1979). For Gramsci, the assertion that “every ideology is “pure” appearance” (Gramsci, 1971, p. 376, emphasis in original) is erroneous. He concurred with Marx’s assertion that men gain consciousness of their tasks on the ideological terrain of the superstructures; “[i]deologies ... “organise” human masses, and create the terrain on which men move, acquire consciousness of their position, struggle etc” (Gramsci, 1971, p. 377, emphasis in original). However, he insisted that ideologies must be considered operating realities which possess efficacy; “material forces are the content and ideologies are the form ... material forces would be inconceivable historically without form and ideologies would be individual fancies without the material forces” (p. 377). For Gramsci, ideology has a material existence in the social practices of individuals, organising action and providing people with rules of practical conduct and moral behaviour (Simon, 1982). Ideologies are thus “realities, as real as the economy itself”, and as such, they play a crucial role in all social formations (Mouffe, 1979, p. 188).

The second way Gramsci’s understanding of ideology differs from Marxism is his challenge to reductionism in which ideology is regarded as a function of the class position of the subjects. The three principles of reductionism in relation to ideology are that: all subjects are class subjects, social classes have their own paradigmatic ideologies, and all ideological elements have a necessary class belonging (Mouffe, 1979, p. 189). Gramsci proposed instead that ideology operates across classes. According to him, the subjects of political action cannot be identified with social classes because the subjects of political action are the collective wills which “constitute the political expression of hegemonic systems created through ideology” (Mouffe, 1979, p. 189). Social movements have their own specific qualities which cannot be reduced to class struggles even though they are related to them (Simon, 1982). In order to achieve hegemony, an influential group must genuinely concern itself with the interests of social groups over which it wishes to exercise leadership in order to cement alliances between itself and those groups:

Undoubtedly the fact of hegemony presupposes that account be taken of the interests and the tendencies of the groups over which hegemony is to be exercised, and that a certain compromise equilibrium should be formed ... But there is also no doubt that such sacrifices and such a compromise cannot touch
the essential; for though hegemony is ethical-political, it must also be economic

... (Gramsci, 1971, p. 161)

Ideology has to be a synthesis which takes into account the unique historical traditions of a nation and the contributions made by the diverse social movements which are allied to form the hegemonic group. Opposing ideologies cannot just be swept aside, instead existing ideologies are transformed by preserving and rearranging some of their most durable elements (Mouffe, 1979; Simon, 1982).

In tracing New Zealand’s turn to culturalism, that is, to the inclusion of culture as an institutional category, I show how the interests of different social movements coalesced to form a new collective will from which biculturalism emerged and became institutionalised through policy. The following discussion focuses on three significant contributing factors. The first was the influence of cultural theory in New Zealand’s anthropology departments and in education in particular (Openshaw, 2006; Webster, 1998). The second was the global western phenomenon of a turn from class-based politics to identity politics (for example Friedman, 1994; Hobsbawm, 1996; Rata, 1996), and the third factor was the problem facing the state of an increasingly radical Māori protest movement which was especially apparent after the Māori Land March of 1975 and then the occupations at Bastion Point and Raglan in 1977-78 (Edwards & Moore, 2009; Poata-Smith, 1996).

**New Zealand’s turn to culturalism**

Culturalism goes by many names: cultural relativism, neotraditionalism, ethnic identity politics, cultural essentialism and biculturalism, but all share the belief that the most fundamental characteristic of a person is their culture, and that identity should be recognised politically. For Edwards and Moore (2009) culturalism is the ideological world view that sees the fundamental division within humanity as being based on a narrow perception of cultural-ethnic differences (p. 48). These fundamental human divisions are understood as arising from historical cultural difference based on an unspecific and mythical primordial past (Poata-Smith, 1997, p. 167). Cultural theory, which underpins culturalism, assumes that culture is a pre-determining factor in the progress that a society makes. New Zealand contributions in the area of cultural theory are found in the work of influential anthropologists Joan Metge (Metge, 1976; Metge & Laing, 1978) and Anne Salmond (Salmond, 1982, 1985). Schwimmer, to whom the first use of the term ‘biculturalism” in New Zealand is usually attributed, was in 1970 advocating for the need for bicultural teachers because of the primacy of culture. “[I]t is not always realised to what extent
culture determines the perception of an ‘experience’” (Schwimmer, 1970, p. 76, emphasis in original).

The turn to culturalism was not unique to New Zealand. Anthropologist Adam Kuper (1999) has traced the origins of culturalism or cultural essentialism to a major project in post-war American cultural anthropology which saw the definition of culture shift from something to be described, interpreted or explained, to being a source of explanation in itself. The outcome was an authentic, local way of being different that both resisted globalisation and materialism, while at the same time making the generalisation of human experience impossible (Barry, 2001; Kuper, 1999).

In tracing the influence of culturalism in the New Zealand education context, Roger Openshaw (2006), has argued that New Zealand’s size, isolation and susceptibility to overseas influences allowed small groups of academics and educationalists to exert a disproportionate influence. This, in time, was to have significant impact on educational policy and practice. Professor Ralph Piddington, Foundation Professor of Social Anthropology at the University of Auckland (1950-1971), established the first Māori Studies Department in New Zealand in 1962 and played a key role in both introducing the concept of biculturalism and training both pākehā social anthropologists and senior Māori scholars. Many of the latter group went on to lead Māori Studies Departments throughout the country (Webster, 1998). Pākehā educators, confronted with a growing contradiction between their beliefs as educators and the reality of an increasingly unequal society, were receptive both to the particular brand of culturalism being promoted, and to a new generation of Māori activists within teachers’ colleges and the Department of Education (Openshaw, 2006).

The education sector has continued to demonstrate a deep commitment to biculturalism. The response by sector to the New Zealand Curriculum Draft for Consultation (2006), which was to become the document that would replace the 1993 New Zealand Curriculum Framework, illustrates this commitment. The draft curriculum surprisingly omitted any reference at all to the Treaty of Waitangi, and its only reference to biculturalism, found in the Principles section, rather innocuously read, “[a]ll students experience a curriculum that reflects New Zealand’s bicultural heritage and its multicultural society. Students who identify as Māori have the opportunity to experience a curriculum that reflects and values te ao Māori” (Ministry of Education, 2006a, p. 9).
The omission of reference to the Treaty of Waitangi was not met by silence. In fact, in the analysis of submissions made during the consultation round it was noted that “the most common theme that emerged was the absence of the Treaty of Waitangi and the related issues of te reo Māori, biculturalism and Māori concepts and content” (Watson, Bowen, Tao, & Earle, 2006, p. 19). The largest number of submissions were received from submitters directly related to the education sector. Concern was focused on about the lack of priority and status given to te reo Māori and the absence of reference to the Treaty of Waitangi (p. 22). The NZEI (the primary schools teacher union) in its submission, made clear its unquestioning support of biculturalism as an appropriate ideological basis for a New Zealand curriculum:

To value and share our history, culture and traditions is to recognise our uniqueness and identity as a nation. New Zealanders must understand and appreciate what it is to be a bicultural nation. Biculturalism must be both visible and addressed in the New Zealand Curriculum. NZEI wants to know why the Treaty of Waitangi has been excluded from the curriculum draft and the implications for te reo Māori in schools. (Watson, et al., 2006, pp. 22-23)

The submission from Teacher Support Services from the Christchurch College of Education echoed a similar concern regarding the lack of direct reference to biculturalism stating “[u]nbelievable there is NOTHING about the development of New Zealand as a bicultural society” (Watson, et al., 2006, p. 22). Acknowledgement of the principles of the Treaty of Waitangi and biculturalism were duly reinstated as part of The New Zealand Curriculum.

The shift from class to identity politics

The turn to culturalism reflected a broader global shift from class to identity politics. The rise of new social movements from the 1960s onwards was a phenomenon shared by many countries in the west. Identity replaced class as gay liberation, feminist and nationalist groups became more politically organised. In New Zealand this included Māori cultural revivalist movements (Roper, 2005).

Advocates of identity politics proposed the ‘tripod’ theory of exploitation, in which race, gender and class are the separate but equal pillars of human oppression. This ideology can be seen as a variant of post-modern approaches to struggle which does not afford primacy to any form of oppression or identity, so the left no longer regarded class as its primary concern. Consequently, the Marxist view which identifies racism, sexism and homophobia as subordinate strategies of oppression which complement and intensify the dominant relationship of class oppression within
capitalism was rejected (Edwards & Moore, 2009). Elizabeth Rata and Roger Openshaw (2006) describe this shift as follows:

In the new understandings of identity politics, it was no longer the proletariat who experienced the oppression of capitalist exploitation. Instead victimhood, the result of oppression from colonisation, the patriarchy and ‘Western’ culture generally, was the preserve of ethnic groups, indigenous peoples, women, gays and religious minorities. (p. 10, emphasis in original)

The turn to identity politics was supported by the liberal left’s new middle class. Characterised by both goodness and power (Gouldner, 1979), this group’s new middle class status left it ambivalent towards the polemics of class politics. Goodness and power constitute a paradox for this group. On the one hand, an abstract idealistic universality or ‘goodness’ was built into the modernised emancipatory project as a response to a world that had endured experiences such as the holocaust and Hiroshima. On the other hand, the ‘power’ or political aspirations of the new class, was grounded in its privileged economic position (Rata, 1996). Rata (1996) proposes that the goodness and power paradox the new middle class experienced resulted in guilt which would fuel a commitment to the new class humanists’ bicultural project.

The acceptance of colonial guilt was one of the characteristics of pākehā new middle class supporters of biculturalism. In acknowledging New Zealand’s strong historical links with the Christian missionary endeavour, Openshaw (2006) contributes a further layer to the ‘goodness’ dimension of this group. Drawing on the work of Abercrombie, Hill and Turner (1986) who have examined the role of confession in encouraging individuals within modern societies to monitor themselves through a conscience of guilt, Openshaw (2006) suggests that from the 1980s onwards conversion to biculturalism assumed a quasi-religious quality. He observes that during this period many pākehā new class educators rejected their Western heritage only to be “captivated by the symbolism and ritual of traditional Māori culture; a process entailing the assumption of personal guilt through confession that marked the conversion to biculturalism” (Openshaw, 2006, p. 114). Openshaw is not the only commentator to note this quasi-religious dimension to biculturalism. Historian James Belich (1990) refers to an “odour of sanctity” (p. 204) surrounding the Treaty in the late 1980s and notes it had become deified by some academics to the point where it was “both infallible and omnipotent” (p. 204). In a similar vein, after visiting New Zealand in 1998, academic Tara Brabazon (1999) noted both an unquestioning acceptance of biculturalism along with a lack of debate about the status of culture.
During the 1980s the word pākehā began to denote the assertion of a Pākehā\textsuperscript{13} ethnicity in response to the Māori activism of the 1970s (King, 1985; Spoonley, 1988, 1991). Many who used the self-referent Pākehā were the new middle class professionals. The term Pākehā was used in a conscious way to signal that group’s belief that their identity was constructed by their interaction with Māori (Bell, 1996; Spoonley, 1988). The claim to ‘being Pākehā’ involved a dual project, expressing both solidarity with Māori political aspirations while aiming to assert Pākehā rights and cultural distinctiveness (Bell, 1996).

However, while some pākehā claimed the self-referent Pākehā, others vehemently rejected the politics that accompanied ‘being Pākehā’. The scorn of some pākehā for their fellow Pākehā is illustrated in the content of a provocative magazine article written by Carroll Wall in 1986. In this article she describes “the guilty liberals hang bone carvings around their necks, adopt Māori spellings of their names, call New Zealand Aotearoa and flock to the Te Māori exhibition as if it will assuage their guilt” (Wall, 1986, p. 36).

Ironically, during a similar period there was a move by many Māori to distance themselves from pākehā/Pākehā as part of the decolonising process. Activist Donna Awatere for example, urged Māori to “withdraw from white culture” (Awatere, 1984, p. 102) and elaborated on their need as colonised people to undergo a process of decolonisation of mind and culture.

The previous section has shown how the influence of culturalism and the shift from class to identity politics created a kind of “de facto alliance” (Rata & Openshaw, 2006, p. 10) between the members of the identity movements (themselves intellectuals of the liberal left) in support of biculturalism. The third major influence, and arguably the key economic imperative leading to the institutionalisation of biculturalism, was Māori activism. In a Gramscian analysis, it is formation of these alliances that explain the ascendance of a hegemonic group, and the cement which holds these alliances together is mutual support for a particular ideology.

\textbf{Māori activism}

Māori activism, the contours of which were described in chapter three, was the other factor which contributed to the establishment of a culturalist state framework by the Fourth Labour Government. By 1986 the combined effects of continuing socio-economic inequalities and pressures for greater Māori autonomy, were threatening to cause a state legitimization crisis. The

\textsuperscript{13} I am using the word here in capitalised form to differentiate between pākehā as a general term to denote New Zealand born people of European descent, and Pākehā as a politicised ethnic category.
state response was to increasingly direct the systemisation of Māori tradition towards Māori self-administration and the enhancement of its own bicultural image (Sissons, 1993).

Gramsci’s theory of hegemony views the dominant framework of ideas in any society as a social construct. Its role is to establish legitimacy in the superstructure of society, including political structures, and in the mode of production, the base structure (Edwards & Moore, 2009). This framework of ideas contributes to the maintenance of social cohesion while at the same time acting to defer threats or challenges to the capitalist accumulation process. However, for Gramsci a hegemony of ideas in a capitalist society does not simply involve a top-down process in which ideas descend from the ruling class and the state. The dominant set of ideas in a society also represents a consensus developed from competing forces in society and “the recognition within the state and ruling class that sometimes it must co-opt both the ideas and individuals from those movements that challenge the framework of elites and the state from outside” (Edwards & Moore, 2009, p. 57). It is in this way that threats to the capitalist accumulation process are able to be deflected.

The shift in state ideology under the Fourth Labour Government can be understood as an attempt to foster social harmony and cohesion between Māori and non-Māori in response to the inadequacies of the previous models of assimilation and then integration. It was also partly a response to the rise of new social movements and the turn of the Pākehā political from class politics to identity politics. By co-opting key elements of the new social left the state moved to divert them from a more radical and possibly anti-capitalist course (Edwards & Moore, 2009). It has also been argued that within both the new social movements and the Māori nationalist movement there was an ascending and conscious aspiring middle class (Edwards & Moore, 2009; Rata, 2000) and that by fostering the growth of capitalist and middle class layers among disenfranchised groups, including Māori, the state was able to restrain Māori radicalism by co-opting its radicals into the system (Edwards & Moore, 2009; Poata-Smith, 1996).

**The national-popular will**

In order to achieve hegemony, an influential group must concern itself with the interests of social groups over which it wishes to exercise leadership because the relationship is one of consent not force. Gramsci understood the struggle for hegemony as an influential group’s attempt to articulate to its discourse all the national-popular ideological elements (the national-popular is the expression of the people-nation). For him, a successful hegemony is one that is able to create a “national-popular collective will” (Gramsci, 1971, p. 130) which occurs when a unifying
principle of an ideological system can articulate enough of the national-popular elements to this principle. In doing this the hegemonic group or alliance appears as the representative of the general interest (Mouffe, 1979).

I have suggested that three main national-popular elements or influential social movements contributed to the eventual institutionalisation of biculturalism within the state sector. The unifying principle that enabled the creation of a national-popular collective will was the shared desire of the different groups for social justice. Key ideas underpinning culturalism are, that not only does a person’s culture define them, but that different cultures cannot be compared and judged as more or less worthy. This led to a new way of understanding the problems confronting Māori. It was believed that those problems could be solved by supporting and strengthening Māori culture, thus achieving social justice. Issues of fairness and justice were also at the heart of the land and language rights causes Māori activists championed. Supporters of identity group politics framed their struggles in terms of freedom from oppression, whether it be from colonisation, the patriarchy, Western or hetero-normative culture. Biculturalism, as discussed in chapter three was originally a progressive project heavily informed by social justice rhetoric (Renwick, 1986) which was the unifying principle enabling the state and influential Māori leaders to form a hegemonic alliance.

**Post-colonial theory**

Postcolonial writers view culturalism very differently, although it does not necessarily follow that all postcolonial writers view biculturalism in a positive light. Dominic O’Sullivan (2007), for example, views biculturalism as inherently colonial and argues that it positions Māori as the “junior partner” of the Crown (p. 3). Post-colonial theory is the product of resistance to colonialism and imperialism (Young, 2001) and is predominantly based on the work of Edward Said (1978) and Frantz Fanon (1967). Postcolonial theory refers to the “academic, intellectual, ideological and ideational scaffolding of the condition of decolonization” (Jasen & Nayar, 2010, p. 1). It is claimed that intellectual and political leaders among Non-European minority groups or ‘natives’ in countries like Asia, Africa, and South America, by interrogating colonial practices in these movements generated ideas that eventually coalesced into a body of thought within academic practices. This body of thought came to be known as post-colonial theory. The theory itself refers to “a mode of reading, political analysis and cultural resistance that negotiates with the native’s colonial history and neocolonial present” (Jasen & Nayar, 2010, p. 4, emphases in original).
Decolonization, the central concern of post-colonial theory, is generally regarded as the process whereby ethnic or ‘native’ groups strive to secure economic, political and intellectual freedom from the dominant European ruling class. Decolonization “seeks freedom from colonial forms of thinking, to revive native, local and vernacular forms of knowledge by questioning and overturning European categories and epistemologies” (Jasen & Nayar, 2010, p. 3), and is regarded as a critical methodology.

Post-colonial theory in the New Zealand context is usually referred to as *kaupapa Māori* theory and usually references seminal works by Graham Hingangaroa Smith (1997) and Linda Tuhiiwai Smith (1999). Similar to claims made by post-colonial writers in other contexts, the Māori revival of the past thirty to forty years is understood as an organic response to the material and psychological effects of colonisation in order to revive traditional, more humane communities. Impoverishment, marginalisation and the disturbed psychological states experienced by many Māori are regarded as the consequences of colonization (Rata, 2004a). The Māori revival is explained as the rejection of this colonial inheritance, and *kaupapa Māori* theory urges Māori to replace Western culture with traditional Māori ways of thinking and being in the world. Māori educationists such as Russell Bishop (Bishop, 1996; Bishop & Glynn, 1999), Kathie Irwin (2002), Tuakana Nepe (1991), Sidney Mead (1997) and Leonie Pihama (2001) have been influential writers promoting this approach.

The theory itself is concerned with the effects of colonisation and the process of decolonisation. However, it offers little in the way of explanation of why resistance, or the desire to be decolonised happens at a particular time in history. In the New Zealand context this resistance appears to be understood as a sort of impatience, whereby at ‘grass roots’ level Māori people were no longer prepared to accept inequality and impoverishment and began to rise up and reject their history of colonial oppression. But what was significant about the 1970s that enabled this to happen? After nearly 150 years of colonial history the theory does not explain why the revival could not have happened say fifty or even eighty years earlier. There is little evidence to suggest that the inequality and impoverishment that many Māori people were experiencing in the 1970s was new, and it is even less reasonable to imagine that before this time Māori people were not aware of inequality.

While decolonization is regarded by post-colonial writers as a local process, an alternative view is that changes at the local level occur as the result of contemporary global economic changes. Anthropologist Jonathon Friedman (1994), who theorises cultural identity using a global systems
approach, proposes an explicit relation between expanding and contracting hegemony and cultural dissolution and integration:

... growing empires tend to increasing cultural homogeneity, via the relation between elite identity and its effect on subordinate populations. In periods of decline the inverse process sets in. A dominant civilised or modern identity no longer fulfils its own demands and people seek alternative identities that can be found among the cultural traditions that were repressed or superseded by the dominant modernity. (Friedman, 1994, p. 38)

Hence in times of declining hegemony space opens up for the expression of alternative identities, which may be religious or ethnic. Not only do alternative identities emerge, but new local elites also appear in the process of class reconfiguration.

In this approach local liberation and identity movements are not caused by a rejection of colonization, as suggested by postcolonial writers, but by local elites regrouping in the new world order (Friedman, 1994; Harvey, 1989; Overbeek, 1990; Wallerstein, 1991). In the global market economy of late capitalism a new middle class emerged as a result of the increased role of knowledge and information as a valuable means of production (Hunter & Fessenden, 1992). In the New Zealand context, members of this class included cultural elites who were university educated and went on to lead the cultural revival movements of the 1960s and 1970s (Rata, 2005). When economic conditions worsened this group held on to their newly acquired positions by reshaping cultural revival movements into political movements. It is argued that post colonial theory has enabled these elites to conceal their own material and political interests within the language of decolonization, ethnic liberation and cultural revival (Babadzan, 2000; Friedman, 1994; Rata, 2003a; Turton, 1997; Van Meijl, 1999; Wallerstein, 1991).

**Criticism of culturalism**

In drawing attention to the dual and multiple ethnic identities within New Zealand’s population, Bromell (2008) makes a case for the inappropriateness of ideologies based on essentialised categories and of policies and programmes based on race. Culturalism is the idea that culture determines individual and collective identities and is accompanied by the language of claims and rights (Grillo, 2003). This leads to the criticism as expressed by Levine, that “a culturally-based story of claims and rights .... [can] all too easily slip into examples of essentialism where notions of partnership readily become lost in a competition for resources” (Levine, 2005, p. 105).
Elizabeth Rata (1996, 2000, 2004b, 2005, 2011b) has written extensively on this theme, describing the processes by which culture and ethnicity were merged in order to secure political recognition on the basis of the distinctive ethnic identity of the Māori neotribe. This, she refers to as neotribal capitalism which refers to the “view of modern tribes as organizations of capitalist accumulation that are legitimised through a ‘neotraditionalist’ ideology that recreate present-day class relations in precolonial terms” (Schroder, 2003, p. 435). One of Rata’s main concerns is the way the neotraditionalist ideology of revived and romanticised communalism actually conceals the self-interested class character of the ruling elite (Rata, 2004b).

This leads to an even more serious concern, the potential threat of the increasing power of the neotribe to New Zealand’s liberal democracy. The recognition in legislation, policy and service delivery during the 1980s that Māori had certain rights under the Treaty of Waitangi and that this ought to be recognised by the state, confirmed that there were two sorts of citizenship in New Zealand. One of these is the set of rights and protection afforded to all individuals by a liberal-democratic state, and the other set of rights are those rights that are associated with being Māori, specifically as members of iwi and hapū, and the rights specified in article two of the Treaty relating to resources, including land, fisheries and taonga. Mason Durie’s (2003) recommendations for a new constitutional framework is based on the identification of two separate socio-political organisations based upon race origins and is justified according to culturalist beliefs (Rata, 2004b). Rata (2004b) insists that there is incompatibility between the non-democratic race-based neo-tribal structure and the democratic institutions of New Zealand and questions how both forms could be accommodated within one nation.

Cultural essentialism or culturalism has other detrimental effects. Scholars involved in the Treaty process have raised concerns at the ways in which cultural restitution can freeze Māori history into a retrospective utopia (Oliver, 2001). Tracey McIntosh (2005) raises concerns about how traditional Māori identity markers generate pressures on individuals to conform to prescribed cultural norms and can exclude some Māori who struggle to prove their “Māoriness” (p. 45). In a similar vein Belinda Borell (2005) describes the rise of new Māori hegemonies and how this causes problems for some Māori attempting to establish a secure Māori identity based solely on particular criteria of Māori culture like knowledge of Māori language, tikanga and whakapapa.

While a strong Māori ethnic identity has continued to be developed, the desire that some pākehā had to develop a Pākehā ethnicity lost its drive by the late 1980s. Rata (2005) argues that strong ethnic categories could only be developed at the expense of weakened national identity. The increasing promotion of strong ethnic boundaries and move to retribalisation being promoted by
Māori leaders was a rejection of the bicultural ideals of diversity within national unity held by Pākehā supporters. Consequently many Pākehā self-referents gave up the term, replacing it instead with the term New Zealander.

Hence, there remains a problem in finding a suitable name for New Zealand’s largest ethnic group. Statistics New Zealand does not use pākehā but instead uses the label ‘European’. For many this label is inadequate because it does not denote an ethnic group but a collection of countries. Spoonley (1993) argues that nationality does not replace a specific ethnicity, yet Callister (2004, p. 5) notes that in 2001 over 89,000 individuals recorded a ‘New Zealander’ response to the ethnic origin question in the Census of Population and Dwellings (p. 5). One of the problems that arises from the move to allow people to self-identify as a New Zealander is that it does not sit easily with concepts of Treaty partnership between two distinct peoples. The Statistics New Zealand Review of the Measurement of Ethnicity which was released mid-2004, noted this was one of the objections to the acceptance of the category New Zealander which came from those classified as Māori interest groups or individuals (Statistics New Zealand, 2004).

The relationship between culturalism and the Māori language

The convergence of the Pākehā turn to identity politics and the increased Māori activism of the 1970s which coalesced around a number of issues including the place of te reo Māori in schools, resulted in the emergence of a common purpose amongst both Māori and Pākehā activists to revive the language. Those efforts were concentrated in early childhood education with the establishment of kohanga reo (Rata, 1996). In addition to providing support to the kohanga reo movement, many committed biculturalists, including teachers, began learning the Māori language believing that “in a society that professes to be bicultural, members of each culture ought to be fluent in each other’s language” (King, 1985, p. 192).

At this times it appears that a commitment to reviving the Māori language was a way that Pākehā could demonstrate their support of biculturalism and make tangible amends for the wrongs of the past. In the post-colonial version of history, the dominant pākehā group acted consciously to rob Māori people of their lands, their culture, and their language, especially through the process of education, hence the process of de-colonisation entails supporting Māori people in their return to their traditional roots, which includes the revitalisation of their unique language.

Not everyone has agreed, or been comfortable with the idea of pākehā bilingualism. Benton (1981) expressed concern that pākehā bilingualism could result in Māori people losing control of
their own language causing a crisis of identity, echoing similar unease voiced by Māori academic Sidney Mead in 1972:

The problem is whether Māoritanga\textsuperscript{14} properly belongs to the Māori minority of New Zealand or whether it is the legacy of all who claim to be New Zealanders. On the Māori side there are some of us who claim that Māoritanga is for Māori only, that the language is for Māori speakers only and that our culture is our business...there is the question of trust. Can the Pākehā of today be trusted with Māoritanga? Nevertheless, there are many Māori people who do not regard Māoritanga as being theirs only and are quite prepared to share it. But even this liberal-minded group are in two minds on the issue: sometimes they genuinely welcome the Pākehā into the fold of Māoritanga and applaud their efforts in learning the language, but at the next moment are beset with fears that eventually the Pākehā might take over their culture too (Mead, 1997, p. 50).

The prospect of decoupling language and ethnicity appears to lie at the heart of this concern. As Stephen May (2012) carefully explains, “while language may not be a determining feature of ethnic identity, it remains nonetheless a significant one in many cases” (p. 9, emphasis in original). Hence, he notes, in contemporary political conflicts, “particular languages clearly are for many people an important and constitutive factor of their individual and at times, collective identities” (p. 9, emphasis in original). In other words, the politics of ethnicity includes a process of ethnic boundary marking and language may be used as one of those boundary markers.

Ethnicity can be regarded as a social and political resource and ethnic groups as specific interest groups (Harrison, 1999; Hobsbawm, 1996; Nagel, 1994; Roosens, 1989; Van Meijl, 2009). This instrumental view of ethnicity is perhaps best summarized by Peter Worsley, “Cultural traits are not absolutes or simply intellectual categories, but are invoked to provide identities which legitimize claims to rights. They are strategies or weapons in competitions over scarce social goods” (Worsley, 1984, p. 249). Viewed in this way, it can be argued that the Māori language can contribute to strengthening a Māori ethnic identity which in turn secures access to group rights. These group rights were established when Māori tribes were reconstituted as economic corporations or neotribes in political partnership with the government in the 1980s.

\textsuperscript{14} Māori culture which as it is used here includes the Māori language (my translation).
Māori language as a boundary marker – protected by the Māori middle class?

Earlier in this chapter I discussed the process by which a conscious and aspiring middle class element of the Māori nationalist movement was co-opted by the State into its system. While the Fourth Labour Government justified biculturalism as necessary in order to reduce social and economic disadvantage, promoting the view that the problems of ordinary Māori could be solved by a return to Māori culture, it has been argued that the placement of the Treaty of Waitangi at the centre of policy and legislative agenda led to the emergence of an elite group of Māori lawyers, bureaucrats, entrepreneurs, union officials and political leaders (Cronin & Duncan, 1999). While the culturalist model has benefitted this middle class which has increased in size (Callister, 2007; Lashley, 2000) there are significant and increasing numbers of Māori experiencing hardship and poverty. Between 2000 and 2004 this group increased from 7 to 17 per cent (Callister, 2007). In fact, as argued by Poata-Smith (1996) the emphasis on culture and identity as crucial factors in the struggle for socio-economic equality has been “an unmitigated disaster for the vast majority of working-class Māori” (p. 110). On the other hand, biculturalism has created employment within the state sector for a middle class Māori elite who have knowledge of Māori customs and language (O'Sullivan, 2007).

The culturalist model is premised on an essentialised view of ethnicity. As noted by Van Meijl (2009) it is widely assumed in New Zealand that marae practices are foundational for Māori identities, hence the ability to perform a role in Māori ceremonies, and in particular to take part in ceremonial speech-making constitute part of the essentialised model of Māori identity. Despite the discourse that establishes genealogy as the primary determinant of tribal membership and tribal definition (Mahuika, 1998), those who are Māori by blood but are unable to speak Māori or who are unfamiliar with traditional Māori practices and customs struggle to be considered a ‘genuine’ Māori (Borell, 2005; McIntosh, 2005; Van Meijl, 1999), especially by those who are invested in protecting and promoting an identity that enables ethnic boundaries to be clearly established.

If the ability to speak te reo Māori is viewed as a boundary marker, this contributes to an explanation of ambivalent or negative attitudes towards pākehā bilingualism. To complicate matters further it appears as though knowledge of the Māori language is increasingly viewed as valuable cultural capital by middle class Māori. This means that the ability to communicate in Māori is not only a boundary marker between Māori and non-Māori, but within the Māori ethnic group operating as a class marker. In a 2008 magazine article about the Māori middle class, one of the women interviewed claimed education was the burning issue among the Māori middle
classes. She noted that there were increasing numbers of Māori parents that she knew with “top notch” qualifications of their own, saying “I can think of at least a dozen parents in our schools’ Māori units with post-graduate degrees” (Courtney, 2008, p. 39). In 2004 a group of Māori language experts launched Te Panekiretanga o te Reo, a programme run with Te Wānanga o Aotearoa for “Māoridom’s top language exponents” who are “shoulder-tapped” (Tahana, 2008) in a bid to take students’ language skills to higher levels. The programme is “unashamedly for middle-class Māori people and many of them are younger and many of them are very successful. Not just in the Māori language but also in their career” (Tahana, 2008).

A nationwide Te Puni Kokiri (Ministry of Māori Development) survey about the attitudes, values and beliefs of New Zealanders towards the Māori language revealed a subgroup identifying as Māori who believe that Māori language and culture should be exclusive to Māori people. This group “strongly believes that Māori language and Māori identity are inherently linked” (Ministry of Māori Development, 2009, p. 36). Te Puni Kokiri has administered this survey four times since 2000 and the percentage of Māori who have fitted into this group has fluctuated but on average is just over 20 per cent. Without further information it is difficult to know the extent of the influence of this group, but significantly, the survey establishes this group, of all the groups identified, as most likely to have post-graduate qualifications (Ministry of Māori Development, 2002).

It is not surprising then, that in a recent survey conducted by Research New Zealand which asked participants how New Zealand could best ‘show its face’ either within its borders or to the world, the most polarising response was related to the possibility of making te reo Māori compulsory in New Zealand schools. While 30 per cent of those surveyed wanted te reo Māori as a mandatory part of the curriculum, 28 per cent strongly disagreed with the idea (Davison, 2012). Without knowledge of the reasons those surveyed might give for their responses, it is not possible to provide an explanation of the survey results. However, it is possible to argue that this polarised response contributes to evidence of a tension that lies just below the surface of New Zealand society relating to Māori language and its use.

**Concluding comments**

This chapter has theorised the ascendance of biculturalism as an ideology and its relationship with Māori language. I have shown how beliefs about the use of the Māori language are related to the broader social and political aspirations of different groups. Returning to the theme of chapter three, it is important to remember that while biculturalism has been locked in by policy
as “a legitimation of the Māori language and elements of culture in public institutions” (O'Sullivan, 2007, p. 30), the ideology of biculturalism has continued to evolve. The bicultural relationship between the Crown and Māori has been challenged, particularly by supporters of the indigeneity discourse who see institutional biculturalism as a “curb on a fuller self-determination because it is not concerned with furthering autonomy, or with Māori development in its own right for its own purposes” (O'Sullivan, 2007, p. 30). Changes and challenges to the ideological framework of biculturalism result in different attitudes towards Māori language use by non-Māori, especially when Māori language is viewed as an ethnic identity marker.

These broader influences provide a way of understanding the ambiguities or tensions evident in education policy which were identified in the previous chapter. The ambiguities are caused by a policy corpus which attempts to accommodate different ideologies. The narrative of ‘partnership’ which underpins the relationship between Māori and pākehā is set alongside policy which seems to imply that Māori language education is more useful and meaningful for Māori students because it strengthens their ethnic identity.

Up until this point the aim of this thesis has been to provide an explanation of the lack of clarity and ambiguity in education policy relating to the purpose of Māori language education for non-Māori students. I have done this by theorising the relationship between ideology and policy. Political and economic movements influence ideology which is then materialised through policy. The third stage in critical policy analysis is the integration of empirical research to show how policy operates in the lives of real people. In this case, the purpose of the empirical research is to illustrate the effects of current Māori language education policy on the beliefs and perceptions of a group of students learning Māori in mainstream secondary schools. The following chapter further elaborates the purpose and methods of the empirical research and introduces the participants.
Chapter 7: Introducing the empirical data

The earlier chapters of the thesis have explored the problem of lack of clarity in education policy relating to the purpose of Maori language education for non-Maori students by theorising the relationship between the ideology of biculturalism and the purpose of Maori language education for different groups. The thesis now turns to an analysis of empirical research data as the third stage in the critical policy methodology I have employed. The study is located within education sociology so in its broadest sense it is concerned with the relationship between a particular aspect of society and education. Specifically, it is concerned with the changes in the way biculturalism is understood and enacted through policy and the way this potentially excludes non-Maori from meaningful engagement with the Maori language.

One of the criticisms of policy research is that it tends to displace both the people who ‘do’ policy and those who confront it, and as a result there can be a “deafening silence at the heart of those busy abstract texts” (Ball, 1997, p. 270). The inclusion in this thesis of empirical data in the form of interview material makes space for the voices of policy subjects. ‘Peopling policy’ (Ball, 1997; Nielsen, 2011) both enables us to explore the effects of policy on people’s lives and also gives us insight into the different ways people engage with policy narratives. The methodology I have employed is a critical methodology, that is to say, it is concerned with how power relations are operationalized through policy (Rata, 2014). From this perspective, including interview material in the study is very important. As noted by Pero (2011) “attention to how people engage with policy can help shed light on policy processes and how they can be influenced, challenged or resisted” (p. 223). Empirical data thus contributes in a number of ways to policy research and when integrated, as it is in this methodology, with both theory and policy analysis, enables “comprehensive critical engagement with the operation and consequences of curriculum policy” (Rata, 2014).

Later in this chapter I will return to the research participants and introduce them in more detail, but first I want to explain how the interview material is analysed so that it contributes to an understanding of the effects of bicultural and Maori language education policy. The theoretical approach I have taken in this study has meant a focus on the processes by which an ideology becomes hegemonic and the part policy plays in these processes. In this approach, which draws from both Gramsci and anthropology of policy, hegemony is conceived of as unstable. This means that while biculturalism may appear hegemonic in education policy, it is less stable than its appearance suggests. Gramsci’s view of hegemony is that it is the result of a fragile equilibrium maintained by a constant and complex process of negotiation between various
interest groups. Likewise, an anthropology of policy approach views policy as a narrative continually in the process of translation and contestation (Shore & Wright, 2011). As ideas about problems and ways of thinking about an aspect of life are articulated in policy and travel from space to space interacting with people and institutions, they are re-translated. Each time this occurs, space is made for contestation and re-negotiation of those ideas and accompanying practices. This is an important idea because the implication of this is that the problem of the ambiguity in policy that this thesis is concerned with, is not only the result of tension that exists as a result of different understandings of bicultural ideology, but also that those different understandings are struggling for ideological dominance in different spaces.

The view that policy creates sites of contestation in each new space it comes into contact with also conceives “an active role for the governed” (Shore & Wright, 2011, p. 12) in these spaces. This is a quite different approach to that which assumes subjects are docile bodies passively constructed by the policies acting upon them. Instead subjects are viewed as being active in either their contestation or support of a way of thinking about the world as they come into contact with these ideas.

This conceptualisation presented me with a challenge when considering the interview material I had collected. If I was going to accept the view of policy as existing in a state of on-going contestation in all the spaces it influences, and agree that policy subjects sometimes refuse to ‘know their place’ and actively negotiate and redefine the terms of the policy that acts upon them (Clark, Newman, Smith, Vidler, & Westmarland, 2007), I could not assume participant interview responses could be understood as faithfully reflecting a particular policy narrative. Instead I had to think of a way to analyse the interview material that took into account the Gramscian notion of ideological processes and the anthropology of policy view of active policy subjects. In short, I needed an analytical device or tool that would enable a nuanced approach that took into account the complex ways ideological processes play out in policy spaces.

In order to do this I began by conceptualising a student’s learning environment as a policy space and a site of ideological contestation. I then returned to Gramsci’s ideas about ideological processes in order to consider the way that students might engage with policy within that environment. Gramsci stresses that ideology organises action. For him all men are philosophers because all people have some conception of the world and this particular view of the world has corresponding rules of practical conduct and moral behaviour. Ideology for Gramsci is equivalent to a religion understood “in the secular sense of a unity of faith between a conception of the world and a corresponding norm of behaviour” (Gramsci, 1971, p. 326). What is
interesting about Gramsci’s conception of ideology is that it is expressed on two different terrains, as explained by Chantal Mouffe (1979):

In effect Gramsci considers that a world view is manifest in all action and that this expresses itself in a very elaborate form and at a high level of abstraction – as is the case with philosophy – or else it is expressed in much simpler forms as the expression of ‘common sense’ which presents itself as the spontaneous philosophy of the man in the street, but which is the popular expression of ‘higher’ philosophies. (p. 186, emphases in original)

Gramscian common sense can be understood as the uncritical and largely unconscious way in which a person perceives the world, often confused and contradictory. It is important because it is the terrain upon which the lived consciousness of the masses is formed, and as such it is the terrain upon which all political and social ideologies must compete. So, while ideology depends on a solid, coherent philosophical elaboration, in order to enter into and influence the directions of social interaction, it must ground itself in the everyday, practical and lived consciousness of the population (Russell, 2012).

This Gramscian view of ideological processes explains how a particular way of thinking about one aspect of life, having become encoded in policy, is able to eventually enter other domains (outside the activities of the state) and become “a diffused and prevalent way of thinking in everyday life” (Wright, 1998, p. 9). In order for this to happen, ideology must appear as natural, spontaneous and taken-for-granted common sense. Furthermore, it needs to be congruent enough with an individual’s experience of the world so that it appears as “the traditional wisdom of the ages” instead of revealing its true nature as “deeply a product of history” (Hall, 1996, p. 431).

I have argued that students’ schooling experiences take place within a particular policy space. Part of the work policy does is to provide charters for action which create new sets of relationships between individuals, groups and objects (Shore & Wright, 1997) in different spaces. Chapter five showed how some of those relationships are framed within the discourse of biculturalism. The work policy does can be considered successful when a particular view of the world and corresponding social practices become common-sense. While there is a need for caution in order to avoid taking an over-simplified and instrumental policy approach by attributing a direct cause and effect relationship between policy and what people say about their experiences within a particular policy environment, I claim that policy does influence peoples’ perceptions, or their common-sense views of the world.
However, the subjects that policies act upon are not merely passive players obediently enacting ‘charters for action’ without question or comment. While policy subjects may not be aware of processes of subjection occurring around them, they do sometimes answer back, questioning external constructions of the subject in the formation of their own identities (Shore & Wright, 2011). In order to achieve dominance ideologies must compete on the common sense terrain. This understanding of ideological processes presented me with a challenge. If ideologies are contested on the common-sense terrain of individuals which is understood to be largely unconscious, how would I be able to identify this process at work in the interview material?

A way forward came to light as I continued to read. I was particularly interested in the crucial question posed by Shore and Wright (2011) “when does a policy lose its authoritative and hegemonic power to define a people or problem?” (p. 18). Although this is not the question I am trying to answer in this research, it is perhaps the next logical question to consider after considering how policy contributes to the hegemony. They refer to a number of studies which suggest there are three stages in the process of “puncturing the aura of government policy” (Shore & Wright, 2011, p. 18). Intended subjects first become cognisant of the processes of subjection occurring around them. Second, they refuse to accept this image of their subject position and its corresponding norms of behaviour, and finally they become aware that others share their concerns and mobilise to contest the policy collectively. Research suggests that the first phase of this process is initiated by events which occur that destabilise the “taken-for-grantedness” of established ideas (Shore & Wright, 2011, p. 18). This process typically happens when governments require people to “alter how they see themselves as governed subjects” (Burchell, 1991, p. 119). As Nikolas Rose (1999) explains, this can introduce an “awkwardness” into what is normally experienced as “timeless, natural, unquestionable ... interrupting the fluency of the narratives that encode that experience and making them stutter” (p. 20).

This seemed to me to be a plausible description of resistance to a particular policy or policy narrative. However, I was interested in what I perceive to be more subtle and individual engagements with policy, but the idea of awkwardness in a narrative seemed very useful, especially as I thought about the problem I was trying to solve, that is, how I might identify the contestation of ideology on the largely unconscious terrain of common sense.

I decided to develop this idea of awkwardness, beginning with the proposition that awkwardness can occur prior to any large-scale events. Burchell (1991) proposes that it is an action taken by a government that is immediately confronting which results in people questioning how they see themselves as governed subjects. However, because ideology is never stable or fixed, it is in a
constant state of contestation, even if that contestation goes largely un-noticed by individuals. It follows then that awkwardness can occur at any time, even if it is just a fleeting experience and does not result in organised and mobilised resistance to a policy direction. If we take a Gramscian view, awkwardness, which results in stutters in legitimating narratives, can be understood as manifestation of the struggle for dominance between competing ideologies on the terrain of common sense. Because of its largely unconscious nature, common sense is often confused and contradictory. Consequently these stutters tend to go un-noticed on the conscious, abstract, or in Gramscian terms, *good sense*, terrain of the individual. However, to say that the stutters tend to go un-noticed by an individual does not mean that they do not exist.

This idea seemed to me to offer possibilities for the analysis of my interview data. I have argued that Maori language policy relating to non-Maori is symbolic. That is, it is vague and unclear and has a primarily strategic function which is to contribute to the legitimation of biculturalism. Hence, the effects of this type of policy are largely ideological as opposed to material. The purpose of the interview data is to illustrate the ideological effects of policy on non-Maori learners of Maori language. Developing the concept of *stutters* in legitimating narratives as the manifestation of a struggle for dominance between competing ideologies on the terrain of common sense enables a means of identifying parts of a policy narrative that could be considered more successful in terms of the work it is doing in maintaining ideological dominance and also which parts, if any, were being more actively contested. Although Rose (1999) uses stuttering and awkwardness to describe the same phenomenon I have separated these out and theorise that individuals operate in one of three states of awareness of ideology on the terrain of common sense. These three states are *faith, stuttering* and *awkwardness*.

**Faith**

I have taken the term *faith* from Gramsci’s conception of ideology which is equivalent to “a religion understood in the secular sense of a unity of faith between a conception of the world and a corresponding norm of behaviour” (Gramsci, 1971, p. 326). If we take the view that ideology is competing for dominance on the terrain of common sense, a particular ideology has in fact won the battle when it has become naturalised in the everyday, practical and lived consciousness of the population. When individuals no longer challenge a particular way of understanding an aspect of life or its corresponding values, perceptions and rules of conduct, an ideology can be considered hegemonic. In order to identify faith in the analysis of the interview data I looked for examples of correspondence between a policy narrative and participant perception or belief. At
times this perception or belief was supported by participants’ lived experiences but in many cases participants made truth claims that did not come from their own experience.

**Stuttering**

I argue that *stutters* in a narrative signal the presence of competing ideologies, but what distinguishes stuttering from awkwardness, is that the stutters go un-noticed by the narrator. Hence stutters unconsciously reveal contradictions in, or contestations of, a narrative thread that, in Rose’s (1999) words, “interrupt the fluency” (p. 20) of that narrative. Stutters suggest that while an ideology may be in ascendance, it is being challenged either by the lived experience of an individual which is not entirely congruent with the narrative, or by a competing idea. As I analysed the interview data, some examples of stuttering were salient as participants expressed contradictory ideas within a particular topic of discussion without noticing. As I progressed with the analysis I also began to notice some larger-scale stutters, in particular the stutter that was evident as students tried to reconcile some of their lived experiences of Māori language engagement with their beliefs about biculturalism.

**Awkwardness**

I have claimed that stuttering is evidence, at an unconscious level, of an ideological struggle for dominance, but *awkwardness* occurs when an individual fleetingly, but consciously notices the stutters. While I am using Gramsci’s notion of common sense as the uncritical and largely unconscious way a person perceives the world, this unconscious perception is at times punctured by moments of conscious clarity, during which an individual questions the fluency or the coherence of a narrative. While stuttering can be characterised as ‘not noticing’ the incoherence of a narrative, awkwardness is the result of ‘noticing’ and not being able to resolve the disjuncture satisfactorily. I was able to identify awkwardness in the participant responses without difficulty because of the more conscious nature of this state. Participants at times actively questioned aspects of their involvement with Māori language or the meaning of biculturalism itself. In this way it was possible to identify moments when an ideological strand articulated by policy was being challenged.

In the early stages of the thesis I have argued that changing understandings of biculturalism are influencing the beliefs about Māori language use by non-Māori students. I have theorised that ambiguity in policy relating to the purpose of Māori language learning for this group is the manifestation of ideological struggle as a result of these changing understandings, and by the need for bicultural education policy to appear inclusive. The interview data illustrates the effects
of that ambiguity on a group of students. Using the analytical device of three states of awareness enables us to get in close and observe the way these real people are engaging with strands of policy narratives in their everyday lives. In particular it enables us to observe in greater detail the way a group of Māori language learners are attempting to make sense of their Māori language learning experiences and their attitudes towards, and understanding of, biculturalism.

The research participants

At this point I would like to introduce the group I just previously mentioned. While chapter two detailed the methodology used in this study, including the methods used to collect the interview data, I think it is useful here to be reminded of who the participant group includes and how this group was selected before their voices emerge in the following chapters.

The participants fall into three broad categories – junior students still at school, senior students still at school, and adults who were no longer at school but who had learnt Māori up to senior level (year 12 or 13) while they were at secondary school. All of the participants are or were involved in Māori Immersion Level 4 (b) programmes in mainstream schools. The choice of the three categories was deliberate on my part when I was planning the research. I thought that it would be interesting to see if there were any noticeable differences between participant beliefs about, and experiences of, learning Māori at different stages in their schooling. I aimed for a fairly balanced number of participants in each category but other than that, the sample was random. I did not look for a particular ratio of males to females, or a particular representation of participants from different ethnic groups. Instead I decided that I would include any student or adult who agreed to participate until I had found 20 participants, a number which I had settled upon as being sufficient to generate rich data while also being manageable in terms of access and analysis once the data was collected. I believed that by taking a fairly random approach to sampling, the participants as a group would more genuinely reflect the make-up of many Māori language classrooms in central Auckland secondary schools. The participants self-identified their ethnic affiliation/s on a background information sheet that they were asked to complete before the interview began. All participants have been given a pseudonym to protect their identity.

Junior students

The junior student participants were all in year 9 which is the first year of secondary school. Students are typically aged 12 or 13 at the beginning of year 9.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alice</td>
<td>female</td>
<td>NZ European</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amber</td>
<td>female</td>
<td>NZ European</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Junior    male    NZ European/Samoan
Leah     female    NZ European
Mele     female    Tongan
Paul     male    White African (South African)

**Senior students**

The senior student participants were either in year 12 or year 13, so in their final two years at secondary school. Students are typically aged between 16 and 18 at these year levels.

Ana    female    Tongan
Helen  female    Tongan
Katalina    female    Tongan
Karishma    female    Indian
Langi  female    Tongan
Michael    male    Tongan
Natalie    female    NZ European/American Indian
Sarah    female    NZ European

**Adult participants**

The adult participants ranged in age, but were either in their twenties or early thirties. All of the participants in this group were either participating in, or had completed tertiary education. I should note here that while this was a characteristic the group shared it was unintentional and not a planned part of the research design.

Amanda    female    NZ European
Celia   female    Niuean
Jess    female    NZ European
Jordan  female    NZ European
Nicole  female    NZ European
Sina    female    Samoan

**Concluding comments**

In this chapter I have explained the contribution of the research data to the overall study and introduced the approach I have taken to the analysis of the interview material. I have argued that because Māori language policy is symbolic as far as it relates to non-Māori learners of Māori language in schools, the work that it does is largely ideological. Employing the analytical device of three states of awareness - *faith, stuttering* and *awkwardness* enables a means of identifying the moments when participants can be seen supporting or contesting ideology. Ideology is articulated through policy narratives so this approach to the data enables us to see how the participants in the study engage with the strands of policy narratives relating to the purpose of Māori language education. Furthermore, it enables us to see some of the effects of those
engagements with policy narratives on the beliefs and perceptions the participants have about Māori language and biculturalism. In the latter part of this chapter I introduced the participants who took part in the study - in the following chapter their stories begin.
Chapter 8: The purpose of learning Māori language

The purpose of the inclusion of empirical data into the critical policy methodology I am employing is to illustrate the effects of policy or policies. The first part of the thesis has provided an analysis of a policy corpus relating to Māori language education in order to highlight the ambiguities surrounding the question of the purpose of Māori language for non-Māori language learners in mainstream secondary schools. In chapters five and six I theorised that this ambiguity is the result of a policy corpus which attempts to accommodate different or changing understandings of bicultural ideology. In current policy the narrative of partnership between Māori and pākehā which underpins bicultural education policy is awkwardly entangled with Māori language policy. I describe the entanglement as awkward because Māori language policy is trying to serve two different functions simultaneously. Bicultural education policy, which is legitimated by the Treaty of Waitangi, justifies and protects the provision of Māori language education opportunities in schools and is also the justification for its separate funding stream. The main goal of Māori language education policy as it is articulated in policy documents is to strengthen the ethnic identity of Māori students. However, the bicultural narrative requires Māori language education policy to appear inclusive, that is to include non-Māori, but there is a lack of clear goals about the purpose of their inclusion in Māori language learning.

The thesis now turns its attention to the participants and makes space for their voices as they talk about their experiences learning in learning environments shaped by a policy corpus that has ambiguous goals. As explained in the previous chapter, I use the analytical device of three states of awareness, faith, stuttering, and awkwardness in order to achieve a more nuanced understanding of how a group of mainstream secondary school students make sense of the policy narratives that influence their learning environment and how they mediate those narratives and their own lived experiences. The responses of the adult participants who learnt Māori language while at school but who, at the time of the interviews were either involved in tertiary education or employment, are also included here. These responses provide valuable insight into the experiences of individuals as they moved from the school environment where their engagement with Māori language learning appeared to be safe and inclusive, to environments where this was not always the case. The awkwardness that appears in their narratives as their sense making of lived experiences challenges their common sense understanding of biculturalism, and provides

---

15 This was described in chapter one. In 2012, Māori Language Immersion Level 1 students were funded at $917.53 per student (GST exclusive) while Level 4 students were funded at $58.59 (Ministry of Education, 2013e).
evidence of a broader ideological struggle, especially in relation to the question of who can rightfully use the Māori language.

The core concern of the thesis is the lack of clarity in Māori language education policy about the purpose of Māori language education for non-Māori learners, so this is where I began with the interview data – the purpose of learning Māori. I was curious to find out the reasons non-Māori students would give for choosing to learn Māori language at school, and how this might relate to the policy narratives I had been exploring. Because of my own personal history and engagement with Māori language learning and teaching, when I set out to interview participants I predicted that they would articulate links between biculturalism and learning Māori language. That is to say, I anticipated that their interest in learning Māori would stem from a commitment to the bicultural relationship. I also expected to find some awareness of the precarious state of the Māori language and perhaps a desire to contribute to improving this situation. I was surprised to discover a complete absence of the types of responses I had predicted. Instead, participant responses fell into two main categories. One reason they gave was that learning Māori would be useful to them in the future in terms of employment. The other was an interest in what I eventually decided to call ‘relationship building’. This chapter begins with a discussion of the more pragmatic reason, that of the perceived usefulness of the Māori language for future employment, then continues with a discussion of the relationship building theme in the latter part of the chapter. Each section follows the same broad structure: a brief description of the relevant policy narrative, followed by examples of the different states of awareness on the terrain of common sense I identified in my participants’ responses.

**Usefulness for future employment**

*The New Zealand Curriculum*, as part of its rationale for including Māori language in a schools learning programme, clearly states that learning te reo Māori can improve future employment prospects for students - “[b]y learning te reo Māori, students are able to... broaden their entrepreneurial and employment options to include work in an ever-increasing range of social, legal, educational, business, and professional settings (Ministry of Education, 2007, p. 14).

Without evidence it is difficult to establish whether indeed this statement can be considered true, and as far as I know evidence substantiating this claim does not exist. Little is known about the prevalence of bicultural practices in the private sector. Chapter five included a brief discussion of the problematic notion of Māori businesses and enterprises, and the claim that the ability to speak Māori language is an asset “both for those who wish to work within these businesses and
for those who wish to do business with them” (Ministry of Education, 2009d, p. 14). However, the institutionalisation of biculturalism into the state sector means that both Māori language and Māori cultural practices are likely to be more visible in these workplace environments.

Since the 1990s, a Māori dimension has typically been incorporated into state practices and national symbols (Durie, 1995). During this period Māori names were adopted for government departments, Māori language and protocol became increasingly visible at ceremonial occasions, and official reports were printed in both Māori and English (Poata-Smith, 1996; Spoonley, 1993). These developments have “increased the saleability of Māori identity, knowledge and expertise” (Sissons, 1993, p. 107).

Biculturalism, as it is enacted in state institutions, is not merely about symbolism, but it undoubtedly incorporates an element of performance. Māori ceremonies and the language that is used as part of these ceremonies are experienced more frequently, as over and over again expressions of the bicultural relationship are publicly performed. The performance dimension is important because performance has the power to “materialise that which it imagines” (Werry, 2011, p. xxxiii). As described by Werry (2011) “[i]nsofar as it is witnessed and ratified by an audience, realised in the bodies of its performers or in the transformation of space, it acquires a measure, albeit contingent, of actuality” (pp. xxxiii-xxxiv).

Durkheim argued that civil ritual (as distinguished from church or religious ritual) is often developed by secularised nation-states to strengthen or inculcate nationalist feelings. As explained by anthropologist Eric Kolig (2004), the use of ritual in the political sphere:

... means deliberately drawing on one specific functional aspect of ritual, namely its power to evoke certain sentiments and to instil certain politically useful notions. Thus ritual is an ideologising mechanism for transforming political intent into useful sentiments and sentiments into ideational structures of significance. (p. 98)

A recent newspaper article claimed government-funded organisations have spent approximately $52,000 on powhiri since 2009 (Johnston, Hill, & Robinson, 2012). It is not the amount of money that is spent which is significant here, but rather the implication that powhiri are increasingly seen as the most natural and appropriate way to welcome employees into public service. Māori ceremonies are incorporated into events at both national and local government level, the type of event ranging from reopening of the heritage Tepid Baths in Auckland (Gibson, 2012), to marking the beginning of sporting events such as the 2012 Rugby World Cup. The
ceremonial expression of the bicultural relationship is hence increasingly visible in the everyday lives of many New Zealanders, either as participants in such events or observers, perhaps from the comfort of home watching the reporting of such ceremonies on the television.

My own observations based on my experience as a secondary school teacher, lead me to suggest that the increasing visibility of Māori language and protocol at ceremonial occasions which occurs in broader society, is increasingly mirrored in the everyday fabric of school life. For example, new students and their families may be welcomed to the school with a powhiri or whakatau ceremony. Likewise, new staff members or visitors may be welcomed the same way. Formal prize giving events may incorporate a Māori dimension, and it is not uncommon to hear of new school buildings being opened by means of a traditional Māori blessing held at dawn.

The extent of an individual’s exposure to these symbolic bicultural performances may contribute to a sense of faith in the usefulness of knowing some Māori language as potentially advantageous for that individual when seeking employment in the future. The following section discusses the notion of usefulness as it was expressed by participants in the different states of awareness of faith, stuttering and awkwardness.

**Faith**

A number of the school-aged participants expressed an unquestioning belief that learning Māori would be an advantage for them in the future, in particular by improving their future employability. On the whole, this belief was rather vaguely expressed, in that the participants did not offer any detail about how their knowledge of Māori language could contribute to future employment prospects. Katalina (year 12) remembers thinking learning Māori would be useful because later in life it can help you get jobs and stuff. Alice (year 9) expressed a similar certainty that knowledge of the language would be an advantage for her it’s an official language of New Zealand so it’s going to help me.

Given the commitment of the education sector to supporting bicultural ideology, it is perhaps not surprising that several participants identified the education sector as the area where knowledge of the Māori language was most likely to be useful to them in the future. Three participants were interested in a career in teaching, including Karishma (year 13) who aspires to teach in the Early Childhood Education (ECE) sector. Karishma had definite ideas about the usefulness of Māori language in education:

*If you’re a teacher or early childhood teacher then having knowledge about the Māori culture and knowing how to speak some things or something in Māori*
would be an advantage cause you can interact with children who are actually Māori and help them.

Here Karishma is not considering that her knowledge of Māori language will make her more marketable in the future, but rather that the skill itself will enable her to perform her job well. Implicit in Karishma’s response here is an assumption that Māori children are speakers of the Māori language. I found the unconscious assumption that people of Māori ethnicity are also speakers of Māori, which was made by several of the participants, fascinating and I will return to it later on in the chapter.

Karishma’s beliefs about the importance of learning Māori are likely to be influenced by the fact her mother is also an ECE teacher who *knows basic Māori, she had to do it during her course.* Paul (year 9) has a mother working in the tertiary education sector and he was quite clear that some knowledge of Māori was going to be useful for him, having noticed *at mums work when they give speeches they have a speech in Māori.* Michael (year 12), at the time of the interviews, had recently changed his language option from Japanese to Māori because of his desire to join the police force in the future. The advice he had received both at school and from home was that knowledge of Māori would be the more useful language.

The increasing visibility of Māori ceremonies in the public sector, which for some of the participants meant in their private or school life, may explain their faith in either the marketability of Māori language skills, or the usefulness of the skills themselves, in a particular type of employment. Less predictably however, two of the participants believed that Māori language would also be useful in the private sector. Natalie (year 13) aspires to be a lawyer - *I always wanted to do law and I always thought practising law in New Zealand, Māori would be really useful,* and Celia (adult), despite going on to become a primary school teacher had earlier aspirations of a career in the media. She recalls, *I thought it might be a really good skill for me to have if I was interested in going into media in New Zealand - that it might be a skill that would be an advantage for me.*

I have identified the above participant responses as illustrating faith because participants did not offer any details or explanations with regards to how their knowledge of Māori language could advantage them or broaden their future employment opportunities. While they volunteered usefulness as a reason they chose to learn Māori language and held this belief with quite a strong sense of certainty, this was not a belief substantiated by real evidence provided by their own lived experience. The exception to this was Karishma who had some knowledge of how Māori
language might be used in a specific workplace, because her mother was working in ECE where she herself hopes to work in the future. In the examples given above it is possible to identify a correspondence between the policy narrative which suggests that learning Māori language will “broaden [learners] entrepreneurial and employment options to include work in an ever-increasing range of social, legal, educational, business, and professional settings” (Ministry of Education, 2007, p. 14), and the participant’s own beliefs.

**Stuttering**

Interestingly, with regards to the perceived usefulness of learning Māori language as expressed by the participants, I was not able to identify any instances of stuttering that is, the unconscious articulation of conflicting ideas. As already mentioned the research participants fall into two categories, those still at school and those who learnt Māori language at school but were in employment or further education at the time of the interviews. This is relevant because when looking for examples of different states of awareness in my participants responses around the idea of the usefulness of Māori language for employment or future employment, the responses fell quite neatly into the two categories of faith and awkwardness. Those who were still at school gave responses illustrating faith, while those who were no longer at school gave some responses which illustrated awkwardness. A very simple reason probably explains the lack of stuttering found in the responses of the school-aged participants. As they were still at school they were yet to experience employment or higher education hence there was nothing yet in their lived experience which challenged their beliefs, even at an unconscious level. The adult participants, having moved to different environments after leaving school, had experiences which caused awkwardness – that is to say their experiences caused them to ‘notice’ the disruptions or interruptions to the dominant ideological narrative.

**Awkwardness**

I had predicted that the adult participants might express some doubt about how useful their knowledge of Māori language had been in broadening their employment opportunities, and in fact, they did so. They tended to respond to the question of usefulness by talking about their eventual realisation that the Māori language was less widely used than they had believed, an awareness that for some was confronting enough to alter their perceptions quite considerably. Perceptions about the use of Māori language surfaced as an important part of the research data so while I mention it here briefly, it is the focus of the following chapter. Likewise the confronting experiences some of the adult participants described were significant enough to warrant their own separate chapter and are the subject of chapter eleven.
One of the adult participants, Sina however, did provide a clear illustration of a moment of awkwardness that she remembered from when she was a year 9 student. While I have characterised stuttering as not noticing the incoherence or interruption of a narrative, awkwardness is the result of conscious ‘noticing’ of this break in the coherence of narrative. Sina’s description of her choice to learn Māori was pragmatic and influenced by her mother’s perception that it would be an advantage for her when seeking employment in the future:

It wasn’t my choice. I never wanted to do Māori. I wanted to do something like Spanish, that seemed interesting to me and I kind of wanted to take Latin as well. At our high school before the Year 9 started they had an options evening. They had all the teachers from the different optional subjects come in and talk about their subject and the person who was talking about Māori he had a really good speech. He was just talking about how relevant it is and he said to a lot of employers, just in New Zealand, Māori is really important and especially being a language of New Zealand. I was with my mum and she said that I should take Māori so with her I was kind of yeah - I didn’t really - I was kind of reluctant I guess - because I wanted to do Spanish but yeah - so she encouraged me to take it and so I took it.

Although Sina conceded to her mother’s wishes, she was neither enthusiastic about the prospect, nor convinced her choice would deliver on the promise of better career opportunities. I think I was thinking in those terms that I didn’t know how it would help me because no-one speaks it, so what are you going to do? Sina obviously found it difficult to reconcile the teacher’s perception of the usefulness of the Māori language with her owned lived experience which caused her to believe that no-one speaks the language.

**Relationship building**

The participants on the whole seemed to hold some similar beliefs around the idea that engaging in Māori language learning had a relationship building dimension. This relationship dimension was not specifically mentioned by participants when I asked them at the beginning of the interview about their reasons for learning Māori. However, later in the interview, and particularly in response to considering the benefits of learning the language, these beliefs surfaced. If we recall the notion of policy as charters for action which provide guides to behaviour and contain implicit messages about how individuals should relate to each other (Shore & Wright, 2011), this relationship building dimension to Māori language learning is
significant. Participant responses illuminate a number of core beliefs about how non-Māori ought to relate to Māori, and the role that Māori language can play in contributing to this relationship.

As I have shown in chapter five, students learning Māori language in mainstream secondary schools are doing so in a particular policy environment where a number of policy documents and auditing technologies play an important part in materialising ideology by shaping beliefs and practices. While the data does not reveal how deeply the ideology of biculturalism might be embedded in the practices of different schools, there was considerable consensus among the school-aged participants that they believed learning Māori would strengthen their relationships with Māori people. In essence, the relationship they aspire to is their version of the bicultural relationship that policy assumes exists. This assumption is apparent in The New Zealand Curriculum (Ministry of Education, 2007) which acknowledges the principles of the Treaty of Waitangi and the bicultural foundations of Aotearoa New Zealand.

Faith
Chapter six discussed the New Zealand state’s turn to culturalism under the Fourth Labour Government, and how a detrimental effect of this turn has been the tendency to view Māori as a homogenous and easily identifiable ethnic group. This has meant that despite the reality of a large number of New Zealanders with dual or multiple ethnic identities (Bromell, 2008; Callister, 2003), and the increasing call from Māori themselves to have the complexity of their ethnic identity recognised, including intra-iwi differences, there is still a tendency to think of Māori as a homogeneous group (Royal, 2012) at the level of common sense. One of the salient assumptions made by the school-aged participants about Māori people was that if a person is ethnically Māori, that person also knows the Māori language. This assumption will be explored further in the following chapter. Here, I mention it because it appeared to follow as a matter of logic that, having assumed that Māori people are Māori language speakers, a way of building a positive relationship with those people was by learning and understanding their language.

This is clearly articulated by several participants including Natalie (year 13) - *I think it would give you a better relationship with the Māori people being able to understand their language.* Not only does she appear to make the generalisation that Māori people are users of the Māori language, but she also makes the connection between improving relationships by understanding the language of the other. Alice (year 9) made a similar statement, clearly referencing a distinct separate group with her use of the pronoun ‘their’. *It would be nice to speak their language and be able to communicate with them in their language.* Paul (year 9), when asked to consider what
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it would be like to be able to speak Māori with a Māori person, responded I think they’ll like it, someone likes it if they can talk to you in their native language.

A common word used by the participants when considering Māori language learning by non-Māori was ‘respect’. An opinion expressed by many of the participants was that learning the language of another culture (the word frequently used to mean ethnic group) was a gesture of respect. Helen (year 12) makes this very point, echoing some of the other participants with her assumption that Māori people are also speakers of Māori, I think it’s all about respect. If a Māori person comes up to you and says something to you and you just stand there and stare at them - you don’t know what to say - yeah, respect. Ana (year 12) developed this idea further by explaining that learning the language shows respect for a body of cultural beliefs, not just the language itself. [It shows] that you do care and give respect for those who have passed away, yeah, it shows that you’ve got respect for them and for, like, what they think about their land. Natalie’s response seems to really capture the essence of an institutional type of biculturalism, her use of the word ‘appropriate’ suggesting a correct way of behaving - I thought that living in New Zealand I thought that it’s appropriate that we know the basics - we have a basic understanding of their language, at least the pronunciation. It’s just respect.

Several of the school-aged participants were familiar with part of the wider bicultural narrative and spoke of injustices done to Māori people in the past. Alice (year 9), for example spoke about some work she was doing in social studies and how she had learnt how they forced Māori to speak English and they wouldn’t allow them to speak Māori. Paul (year 9) had also learnt in social studies that a long time ago they used to beat Māori children for speaking Māori in schools. Karishma (year 13) too had learnt that in schools Māori language, to say anything in Māori, it was, like, not allowed and you’d be punished for it.

It is likely that knowledge of this narrative contributed to the belief among the participants that learning Māori was a respectful thing to do. As she considered her sense of New Zealanders attitudes towards Māori language Sarah felt that the problem with New Zealanders is I don’t think they respect it enough. In addition to respect, participants spoke of fairness in relation to attitudes towards Māori language. Alice (year 9) felt very strongly that Māori people are the native people of New Zealand and Māori [language] shouldn’t have to be taken over by any other language. Sarah (year 12) was also very concerned with fairness. In her view many New Zealanders simply don’t know enough history to be able to understand the injustices that Māori people have suffered in the past:
They don’t understand, like with the Treaty they don’t understand – they just see the government giving all this stuff to Māori – they’re like oh that’s so unfair, all our taxes are going to that – that kind of stuff. But they don’t understand how badly they were treated.

This sense of what is fair is deeply part of the bicultural narrative. If we recall that many people understand that biculturalism is regarded as a partnership between two groups, it is easy to see that notions of fairness are essential to the ideology. A partnership simply is not a real partnership if there is not fairness between the groups. This sense of fairness includes the place of Māori language in society. According to Amber (year 9) it wouldn’t be fair if the language were to die out. Ana (year 12) provided a nice example of the importance of fairness in her response to the possibility of Māori language loss among Māori people:

I always say that New Zealand is the land of the Māoris. I find it sad because it’s like, their home and they were here first, started everything. I would feel the same way if I knew that people were coming over to Tonga and trying to change our ways, I would find it really sad.

Because of my own personal experience and my developing awareness that some groups of people appeared to view Māori language as an ethnic boundary marker, I was also really interested in finding out from participants whether they ever felt any discomfort telling Māori people that they were learning Māori language. At the time of preparing my interview questions, it had occurred to me that some students might have limited social interaction with Māori people so I included a question about the extent of their interaction. The responses of the two questions read together revealed that school-aged participants had a strong and idealised sense of Māori that was not based on their own lived experience. Some of the school-aged participants said they had a Māori friend or friends. For others, the only interaction they had with Māori people was at school in their classes. Two things became apparent to me as I was considering the interview responses more carefully. First, the school-aged participants had fairly limited opportunities for interaction with Māori people in terms of the number of Māori people they were interacting with. Second, despite these real and lived interactions with Māori people, the school-aged participants differentiated the people they knew from an idealised sense of Māori. Katalina (year 12), for example, talked about members of her extended family who are half Māori but they’re not really involved in their culture. They’re really westernised. It is apparent that Katalina accepts that members of her family are ethnically Māori, however, they do not appear to represent her understanding of what it means to be ‘culturally’ Māori. I did not notice this idea at the time of
the interviews, so did not have the opportunity to tease the idea out further. However, as I was considering the possibility of the existence of an ‘idealised Other’ I noticed another connection, exemplified here in an exchange I had with Amber (year 9):

Interviewer: *Have you had much involvement with Māori people and their culture?*
Amber: *Well I’ve had quite a lot of friends. But it’s not like they would teach me their culture.*
Interviewer: *But you would have gone to their homes?*
Amber: *Yeah*
Interviewer: *Have you had much opportunity to go to marae?*
Amber: *I’ve been to about four before, like for school camps.*

Most of the school-aged participants, when I asked them about their experience of Māori culture, referred to school trips to a marae. As I was talking to Amber I had the sense that despite having a number of Māori friends and interacting with them in their homes, for her, Māori culture existed somewhere else. This prompted me to ask her the question about opportunities to go to a marae and consequently I was unsurprised by her response. Many of the school-aged participants said they had been on school trips to marae when I asked them about their experience of Māori culture and while many of them claimed to have Māori friends or families, their sense of Māori culture appears to be informed by their experience of ‘performed’ Māori culture.

The combination of these two factors, that is the limited number of Māori people the school-aged participants claimed they interacted with, and their experiences of Māori culture as marae-based seem to have contributed to an idealised sense of what it means to be Māori. The question of what it might be like to speak in Māori with a Māori person was hence fascinating in what it revealed about the participant’s sense of this ‘idealised Other’.

Most of the school-aged participants were confident that Māori people would both like and appreciate their effort to learn Māori language. Ana (year 12), for example, thought it would *make them feel happy knowing that other backgrounds [are interested] and like, I’m willing to learn more about them.* Langi (year 13) agreed, *[they would] feel good because like another culture can speak their language and so did Katalina. [They would] probably be pretty glad and stuff, other people are getting to know their culture and are willing to speak.*

The idea of ‘getting to know’ another culture through language learning seemed to be an important idea and reminiscent of the phrase in *The New Zealand Curriculum* (Ministry of Education, 2007) referring to the journey towards shared cultural understandings. This was
perceived by students as a potentially positive outcome of language learning, captured here in Karishma’s (year 13) response. *I think it’s interesting, or you know, nice to know that people from another culture learn that culture and the language and can talk to someone from that culture.* What is also implicit in both the curriculum statement and the participants’ responses is that a distinctive and separate Māori culture exists.

It appears that learning the language is considered ‘nice’ because it contributes to relationship building. Michael thought that if he was talking to a Māori speaker of Māori in their language the relationship would *probably be more respectful and we’ll like bond more* -“*oh this is a brother*”. The idea of bonding or closeness was echoed by Mele (year 9) who thought that by learning Māori language you could be *more in touch with Māori people and considering that they are the indigenous people of New Zealand then that would be cool.* She went on to explain that *when you learn someone else’s language you kind of become part of that culture.* Natalie (year 13) had a less than romantic sense of the relationship between Māori and Europeans, but, like the other school-aged students, was adamant that language learning provided a means to improve the relationship between the groups. *I know some people have stereotypes about Māori ... and I think it would break a few stereotypes that Māori have about Europeans, that way, by showing that you understand them.* What seems apparent in this group of responses is that participants perceived a distance of sorts between themselves and Māori people, and that language learning could potentially close that distance.

In this section I have attempted to illustrate a number of common sense assumptions the school-aged participants held about both Māori people and the attitudes Māori people might have towards their engagement with Māori language as learners who are outside the culture. These students were operating in the state of faith on the terrain of common sense. There was nothing in their narratives that suggested stuttering, that is, their conception of the world did not appear to be challenged in any way by their lived experience. Three themes came through very clearly, two of which correspond with ideas that can be found in policy. The first is that Māori people exist as a separate and distinct group with their own identifiable culture and language. The second is that a good relationship can be achieved between Māori and non-Māori, if non-Māori learn about the culture and language of Māori people. The final theme that came through from many of the school-aged participants was their sense that Māori people would be very pleased to know non-Māori were able to communicate with them in Māori.
Stuttering

There was no sense of doubt about the desirability of non-Māori using the Māori language among the school-aged participants. However, the adult participants seemed aware there was some unspoken question surrounding their knowledge of, or right to use Māori language. A stutter that occurred in part of Amanda’s narrative reveals this doubt:

I don’t talk about my identity ... on practicum I didn’t say that I was pākehā and I think it actually does a disservice to the pākehā and to the non-Māori in your class because they lose out on that example and that role modelling and for those Māori to realise that pākehā are also interested in the sort of bicultural process. So it is kind of uncomfortable. I’ve never felt embarrassed telling people that I’m learning Māori or teaching Māori, most people are very shocked and surprised but you know I’m used to it now.

This is a good example of an unconscious disjuncture in an individual’s narrative. From a Gramscian perspective we can regard this disjuncture or stutter in Amanda’s account as evidence of beliefs or ideologies competing at the level of the subconscious. Amanda’s familiarity with biculturalism is evident in her use of the term pākehā and reference to the bicultural process. She wants to be a role model, particularly for other pākehā, as a non-Māori speaker of Māori, but at the same time there is some of discomfort that she feels that stops her from talking about her ethnic identity. This short extract finishes with Amanda asserting that she has never felt embarrassed telling people about learning or teaching Māori, not appearing to notice that the claim is at odds with her reluctance to reveal her ethnicity.

Jordan, also an adult, had a similar stutter in her narrative which is almost imperceptible. Like Amanda, she claimed not to have ever experienced discomfort telling Māori people about her identity or her ability to communicate in the Māori language.

They said “a pākehā speaks more Māori than me” kind of thing. They were just joking about it. Yeah it was good. I had good relations with a lot of them. Yeah some knew. A lot of them were really excited, stoked that I had made the effort, and they were encouraging their kids to do the same and that kind of thing, yeah. But I didn’t exactly say I speak Māori. I wasn’t broadcasting it or anything.

What makes me believe this is a stutter, insignificant as it may appear, is the hesitance that seems present in the last two sentences. Throughout most of the interview Jordan was adamant that she had only had positive experiences with Māori people in relation to her knowledge and use of
Māori language. Yet some counter-knowledge, operating at the level of her unconscious caused some hesitation about sharing this aspect of herself – she recalls not exactly saying she spoke Māori.

**Awkwardness**

Awkwardness occurs when an individual is aware of a disjuncture between his/her lived experience and a dominant ideological narrative. The dominant ideological narrative of biculturalism, as it appears to be experienced by the school-aged participants in this research, is that positive relationships can be created between Māori people and non-Māori through the learning of Māori language. What seems apparent from the data is that when students leave the school environment they are sometimes exposed to some very different attitudes.

Amanda, who was training to be a secondary school Māori language teacher at the time I interviewed her, and was very interested in the bicultural process, describes her memory of the difference between school and university:

*At school lots of students in the class were non-Māori so it was quite normal. You didn’t have to pretend you were Ngati Kahungunu or, you know, if you were from Tonga that was fine. It was just as cool if you were from Burma or pākehā but at university that wasn’t the case.*

Her recollection of school was that it was a safe place to be open about your ethnic identity as a learner of Māori language. However, when she got to university her experience was different, and in her words, puzzling:

*There were others that looked like they were pākehā, they kind of were pākehā but of course they were Ngapuhi or something like that which I wasn’t. I would say that I was Ngati Pākehā and people laughed and it was the first time I’d experienced that and it sort of puzzled me.*

This moment of awkwardness seems to have occurred when the familiar ideological narrative of bicultural inclusion that enveloped her experiences at school was interrupted by a very different response to the disclosure of her ethnicity.

Sina and Celia, also adults, experienced similar negative reactions from some Māori people to their knowledge or use of Māori language. Sina recalled a time when she and her mother were talking with a Māori family they had just met:
I think it was my mum who told them when we met them, “oh my daughter has done Māori all the way through high school and she can speak Māori”, she was just trying to make a connection and then I think they were kind of yeah they weren’t really happy about it. I don’t know why not. I don’t know if it’s because, I know that their Māori is like, they can say phrases and stuff but not like speak it, so I don’t know if they were annoyed about it because I’m not Māori and I learnt it.

Sina is able to hypothesise about what might have caused this surprising reaction. As a year 9 student you may recall, she did not want to learn Māori because her experience of the world had led her to believe no-one speaks it. Unlike the school-aged participants who were interviewed, when she was at school, she did not have the sense that all Māori people were Māori speakers. In the statement above she is drawing on this understanding and concluding that Māori people who don’t know Māori might be annoyed with her as a non-Māori for learning the language. This experience of a negative attitude towards non-Māori learning Māori language interrupts the dominant narrative that influences the school environment expressed in *The New Zealand Curriculum* which claims “[a]ll who learn te reo Māori help to secure its future as a living, dynamic, and rich language” (Ministry of Education, 2007, p. 14, my emphasis).

Inclusive and exclusive forms of biculturalism have been discussed earlier in this thesis. It is useful to remember at this point that while I have argued that the purpose of Māori language education for non-Māori is not clearly expressed in curriculum documents, the understanding of biculturalism itself continues to be one of inclusion in mainstream settings. Celia (adult), who is Niuean, learnt Māori language while attending a mainstream secondary school. She is now a primary school teacher working in a bilingual unit. She described some of her experiences of a more exclusive approach to Māori language and culture in this setting:

*There are some people who are very, I’ve got to say, very precious about their culture, everyone is - and with Māori there’s that, I don’t know – I’ve experienced that no-one else understands and no-one else can teach [the language]. I mean no-one else as in non-Māori, like only Māori know Māori.*

This is a very different attitude to the one she experienced as a secondary school student, and has been at times confronting in her professional life as a teacher:

*One day a kid said to me my mum says you’re not Māori and you shouldn’t teach us Niuean things … I don’t know, I think she just didn’t like me because I’m not*
Māori. Which I understand, I’m not offended by it but it’s a bit disheartening to think that there are people, Māori people who just think it can only be Māori people in the language and teaching the language, especially when I have non-Māori kids in my class and so I just think about them and think well if you don’t want a non-Māori teacher does that mean you don’t want non-Māori kids in your child’s classroom as well?

The awkwardness for Celia arises from her commitment to the Māori language and to her support for an inclusive form of biculturalism which for her means the inclusion of non-Māori students in Māori language learning. However, there is a disjuncture between her understanding of the purpose of her work and her experience of a different set of attitudes. Out of all the participants interviewed, Celia was the only one who seemed at times to be moving back and forward between awkwardness, as a state of noticing an issue in the dominant narrative, and actually beginning to consciously question or challenge that narrative. Her last question about whether there is a place for non-Māori teachers or students in a Māori-medium classroom is an example of conscious contestation of an ideological narrative.

Interestingly, while the adult participants had experiences that led them to notice the effects of different ideological narratives at work, only one of the school-aged participants seemed aware of a counter narrative to the one of bicultural inclusiveness. Sarah (year 12) actually used the word awkward (in a different way to the way I am using it) to describe what it was like for her at times in her Māori language class:

> Sometimes it’s a bit awkward because like the other day Whaea\textsuperscript{17} was talking to us about how school children weren’t allowed to speak Māori and she was talking about the government and stuff – and it was a little bit awkward because it was like the pākehā who did that, and I am [pākehā].

As discussed earlier in this chapter, other school-aged participants were familiar with this particular narrative, but Sarah was the only one who self-identified with the group pākehā and this caused her some discomfort. She went on to describe her sense that Māori people had some feelings of resentment towards pākehā. I think maybe there is a little bit of like hate towards pākehā because they have done all these things to the Māori that were not good. I think maybe it does come through.

\textsuperscript{17} Used here as a respectful term for a female teacher
Sarah’s experience of an account of history taught in her Māori language class, combined with her awareness of her ethnicity, is an illustrative example of awkwardness. The dominant policy narrative in mainstream secondary schools is that everyone is welcome to participate in Māori language learning. However, Sarah is aware of another narrative that challenges this dominant narrative. The counter-narrative she articulates is that past injustices have caused Māori to resent pākehā, and this resentment still exists.

**Concluding comments**

This chapter has discussed two of the reasons that the research participants gave for wanting to learn Māori language at secondary school. The most common reason participants gave was that they thought the language would be useful for them in the future when they thought about their employment aspirations. The other reason they gave in less direct terms, was what I consider to be for relationship building purposes. Both the discussion of the perceived usefulness of Māori language and the relationship building aspect of Māori language learning revealed a deep internalisation of the dominant bicultural ideology by many of the participants. In fact, participant responses exemplifying the state of faith were the most frequent in terms of their appearance. In a Gramscian sense, this would suggest that bicultural ideology is currently strongly hegemonic among this group. Participants spoke of their trust that knowing some Māori language would be of benefit to them, their sense of fairness, of the need to respect Māori culture and language, and their belief that their learning of Māori language would help them establish positive relationships with Māori people. If we regard policy as charters for action which are able to influence the way people and groups relate to each other, then it is possible to claim that among this group bicultural education policy is working very successfully.

As I was looking carefully at the research findings discussed in this chapter, two things became apparent to me. The first was the strong and idealised sense that the participants had of Māori people as a distant Other. Their lived experiences of friendships or interactions with the Māori people were clearly separate from their notion of a group of Māori people who are fluent speakers of Māori language and deeply involved in noticeably different cultural practices to their own. This separation is neatly expressed by Sina (adult) who says, *if I split it in two, the interaction I have had with Māori people, it’s quite high, but it’s Māori people who are in Auckland. In terms of culture its quite low.*

The second was an almost complete absence of references from participants to a desire to learn Māori language in order to be able to communicate in Māori. Likewise while some expressed
concern about the possible further decline of the Māori language, not a single participant made a connection between this concern and their own involvement in language learning. Both of these observations are significant in what they reveal about the common-sense understandings of the participants, and both of these observations have implications when considering participants’ perceptions of Māori language use in broader New Zealand society. These perceptions are the focus of the following chapter.
Chapter 9: Perceptions of Māori language use

This chapter, as the title suggests, is a discussion of the participants’ perceptions about the extent of Māori language use. During the interviews one of the questions I asked my participants was about their sense of how widely Māori language is used. As I mentioned in the previous chapter, I had expected that they would be familiar with concerns about the future survival of the language and that perhaps this would contribute to their desire to learn Māori language. I explained to participants when I asked this question that I didn’t expect them to know as a matter of fact about the use of Māori, but rather that I was curious about their impressions. This question generated a lot of unexpected data and it was in fact this unexpected data that caused me to start thinking much more about the relationship between policy and ideological processes in the early stages of the study.

The responses to the question of perception of Māori language use contributed to the impression that I mentioned in the previous chapter - that some of the participants had a strong but idealised conception of Māori culture. One of the characteristics of this idealised group is that they are fluent Māori language speakers. Of course there are fluent speakers of Māori living in New Zealand, but the reason I have identified this conception as idealised is that the participants imagined this group; it was not a group that they were able to describe as result of their lived experiences. I also began to notice more and more an absence of references from participants, to a desire to learn Māori language in order to be able to communicate in Māori. I wondered whether there was a relationship between these two ideas that I noticed running through the data and whether policy might be implicated in such a relationship.

As discussed in chapter five, the policy corpus that envelops the school environment creates a narrative which refers to, and supports, the notion of two distinct ethnic groups which constitute the bicultural partnership relationship. These policies and their attendant auditing technologies have significant influence on practices within schools which give authority to this narrative. One of the distinguishable or boundary marking features of the group referred to as ‘Māori’ is their knowledge and use of Māori language. The frequent public performance of powhiri or similar ceremonies in schools could very likely contribute to a student’s belief in the existence of an exaggerated number of fluent Māori speakers. In the following discussion, a number of participants identify schools as a place where a person would be likely to hear Māori language being used. This seems to contribute to a sense for some, that Māori language use is widespread - a perception which seems to be strengthened by the existence of Māori television. For some
participants this provides further evidence of the existence of communities of fluent Māori speakers.

It is useful at this point to provide some context for the discussion by including here some of what is known about the current users of Māori language. The 2006 census figures showed a total of 131,610 speakers of te reo Māori. This was a small increase in number compared to the 2001 census data which showed a total of 130,485 (Waitangi Tribunal, 2011). While there was a small gain in actual numbers, when represented as a percentage of the Māori population, there was a drop from 25.2 percent of Māori who claimed to be speakers of Māori in 2001 to 23.7 percent of the population in 2006 (Waitangi Tribunal, 2011). In a thorough analysis of both the 2006 census figures and surveys conducted in 2001 and 2006 by Te Puni Kōkiri about the health of the Māori language, the Waitangi Tribunal Wai 262 report expressed concern in particular about the drop in the number of speakers aged zero to 14, concluding:

Current trends ... suggest that the ongoing gains being made with te reo are not offsetting the ongoing losses occurring as older speakers pass away. Moreover, the theoretically ongoing gains are in fact beginning to turn into losses amongst the crucial younger age groups who represent the future health of te reo. (Waitangi Tribunal, 2011, p. 436)

In short, the data indicates that while there are speakers of Māori language, they do not exist in large numbers, and there is cause for concern for the future survival of the language.

The Health of the Māori Language in 2006 report includes information about Māori language usage opportunities in the community. The report noted “high levels of Māori language usage in domains where Māori culture and protocols are dominant such as at marae, or during hui, or religious activities” (Te Puni Kōkiri, 2008, p. 31). Schools were also one of the areas where high levels of Māori language usage was reported, although this is likely to be inconsistent among different schools because some would have much higher levels if they are higher Māori Language Immersion level schools. However, I think it is worth noting the connection between Māori language usage in domains where Māori protocols are dominant.

The observation that I made earlier that many of the participants held an idealised conception of Māori people in which they are framed as fluent speakers of Māori, has an interesting effect. This community of fluent speakers, because they are imagined rather than a group of people the participants could interact with, were instead distant and inaccessible. While for many of the participants there was little doubt of the existence of these communities, there was also no way
they were able to access that community. It seems then to follow logically that participants would not refer to learning Māori in order to be able to engage in communication opportunities with this group of Māori language speakers, because they inhabit different places in the social imaginary of the participants.

The aim of the following discussion, which once again is structured around the states of faith, stuttering and awkwardness, is to explore the way the ‘two peoples’ narrative which is at the very heart of bicultural ideology, influences the participants’ perceptions of the use of Māori language. An observation that I will return to later in the chapter is that the younger the participants, the more likely they are to believe that that language is alive and well, and widely used. The older school-aged participants were less sure about this, and the adult participants generally speaking thought that the Māori language was not widely used at all.

**Faith**

The common sense view of many of the participants whose responses I have identified as illustrating a state of faith in terms of perceptions about the use of Māori language is that Māori language is being widely used. However, some in this group believed the opposite. I consider that both groups, despite their different perceptions, demonstrate a state of faith because there is no apparent evidence of contradictions or challenges to a dominant narrative in the way they talk about their common-sense understanding of the world.

The group who thought Māori language was likely to be widely used tended to have a strong idealised or imagined sense of a group of fluent Māori language speakers. I am identifying it as an idealised or imagined identity group because when I asked them about their experiences, it was apparent these participants had limited experience or no lived experience at all, of the group they were referring to. The participants themselves appeared oblivious to this. Leah (year 9), was sure that most Māori families were users of Māori language:

*I know that most families would use it around the house if they’re Māori most of the time. Then, also if they go to like birthdays and stuff they usually say most things in Māori if they’re Māori. Then, also when they go to maraes there’s all the stuff that’s in Māori.*

This is a very good example of idealisation. Leah told me that she has a step-father whose family is Māori. She went on to explain that her *step-dad is Māori but he can’t understand them [the rest of the family].* In this description of her step-father and his family, Leah appears to separate
her step-father out from the category of ‘Māori’. Initially she says her step-father’s family is Māori and most of the time they say stuff in Māori. Later she adds her step-father is Māori, but because he can’t understand the members of the family who use Māori language, it seems as though, in her mind, he doesn’t represent her idea of what it means to be Māori. It is Leah’s experience of the ‘Māori’ part of her extended family that appears to have contributed to her belief that most Māori families would use Māori language at home if they’re Māori. The fact that her step-father is ethnically Māori but does not know Māori language, or use any Māori language at home, does not present any challenge to the narrative Leah uses to express her world view.

Amber (year 9) also believed that Māori language is widely used in New Zealand because lots of people can know it, like different cultures in New Zealand. It is difficult to know what Amber was thinking about here, but it could be that she was referring to the fact she was learning Māori in a class consisting of students from different ethnic backgrounds. She told me she had some school friends who are ethnically Māori, but in her view she had not had much contact with Māori culture, explaining I haven’t had much contact because I’ve got a New Zealand European family and we don’t know that much. Despite her espoused belief that Māori is widely used, Amber found it more difficult to identify places the usage might be occurring. I don’t know a place – but maybe like for Māori families they would speak it in their home. Like Leah, Amber seems to have an idea of what a Māori family might be like, and that this largely imagined group are fluent speakers of Māori language who speak Māori in their homes, implying that they are first language speakers of Māori rather than English.

Some of the participants had the sense that their idealised group of Māori language users could be found in particular geographical locations, and identified these locations as ‘rural areas’ of New Zealand. Natalie’s (year 13) response exemplifies this. I think that in more the rural areas that Māori is used widely - I think it’s still quite common in the secluded Māori communities. But I’m not sure the extent of it. As Natalie herself recognises, she cannot be sure of the extent of Māori language use, but her perception of it being commonly used in rural, secluded areas of New Zealand was strong.

Helen (year 12), a Tongan student, echoed this general perception but the details for her were rather vague. Her perception of Māori language was that it is fairly widely used, but when asked where it would be likely to be used, she replied I think that they mostly speak it in areas where Māoris live. Given that Māori people live throughout New Zealand, I take this to be another example of a reference to a certain type of Māori person, one who is Māori speaking and in all likelihood deeply immersed in ‘Māori culture’.
This notion of ‘rural’ Māori as the idealised representatives of Māori culture appeared to be quite prevalent. Karishma (year 13) described Māori people living in rural areas as more, you know, strongly linked with the culture. Although Natalie has spent time in Northland the other participants who referred to ‘rural’ New Zealand had no personal experience of these rural areas. They described being born and raised in Auckland and did not report any experience of visiting or staying in rural areas for any period of time. For me, there was a sense among all of the participants operating in the faith state when considering Māori language use, that Māori language was being used but by ‘other people’ and in other places or spaces that they themselves cannot access or have little or no experience of.

The first place Mele (year 9) thought of, when I asked her to think of places where Māori language might be used was school. Usually at school, because that’s where people usually speak in Māori. Like other participants Mele believed that Māori language would also definitely be heard in places that she associated with Māori culture - definitely at powhiris and funerals. She was less sure about other places, saying hesitantly, I guess they’d use it at the parliament. In fact, beyond her certainty of Māori language use at powhiri, funerals, and school she was not at all sure where else Māori language might be heard. I’m not sure. All I know is school, definitely at school. Mele’s response is interesting because it echoes the same beliefs of many of the participants that there are Māori cultural practices that they have limited personal experience of, but that include the use of Māori language, and because she was adamant that Māori language is used in schools. Mele has had limited social interaction with Māori people, so her sense of where Māori is spoken is split into two. The first place appears to be where she believes it is used – at powhiri and funerals, and the second is where she has experienced it being used – at school.

Mele was not the only participant who had demonstrated this perception of Māori language, which appears to be influenced by both belief and experience. Michael’s (year 12) first response when I asked him who he thought mostly used Māori language was teachers. He then added, as an afterthought, koros. The responses of both Mele and Michael provide us with some evidence of the effects of both bicultural education policies and the auditing technologies that accompany them. Schools may or may not consider themselves committed to the bicultural relationship articulated in policy. However, whether as a result of their own choice, or through the effects of auditing technologies which are, in essence, systems of ‘checking up on practices’, they may implement a number of practices which demonstrate the idea of a bicultural relationship. Using
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18 Male elders (my translation).
Māori language in schools in ceremonies like the powhiri or in assemblies, or even in classrooms, reinforce the perception of a group of fluent Māori language users.

Although I didn’t check this with Michael at the time, his Tongan background and limited experience of Māori culture outside of school, leads me to believe that his sense of teachers and koros as Māori language users probably reflects his experience of school powhiri. ‘Koros’ is likely to be a reference to the men who perform the whaikōrero\textsuperscript{19} during the powhiri\textsuperscript{20} ceremony. Some schools have an affiliated kaumatua, or male elder, who supports the school by performing this task for them when required.

Not all the school-aged participants shared the same idealised view of Māori language use. Some were very clear that Māori language was not widely used at all. These participants also exemplify the state of faith because they do not express any disjuncture between their conception of the world and their lived experience. This group of participants were largely unaware of the history of Māori language revitalisation, and did not appear to refer to a particular narrative about the use of Māori language. Instead, they seemed to refer solely to their lived experience when considering the question. A finding that emerged from the data during the analysis was that some participants were unfamiliar with the idea of biculturalism, and did not appear to have had the same exposure to the ‘two peoples’ narrative. The relationship between biculturalism and the Māori language as expressed by the participants is the focus of the following chapter, but I mention it here because it is relevant to the claim I am making about the participants I am discussing operating in a state of faith. While this group of students were exposed to Māori language and culture at school, and were themselves participating in Māori language learning, they did not appear to be influenced by a narrative that might suggest the existence of a Māori speaking community elsewhere. Hence, they referred instead to their lived experiences when responding. Karisha (year 13), for example, responded I have seen Māori language and culture outside of school but it’s not very strong and it’s not very widespread, and Katalina (year 12) took her time when considering the question. Eventually she responded with Um, mmmm - not really... you don’t hear much.

Both of these participants seemed to reflect on their own experience, that is, what they personally had seen or heard as they considered the question. Langi (year 13) also appeared to be reflecting on her own experience at school when she replied not much, because like not many want to learn Māori and stuff. Earlier she had described the language situation in the following way nowadays

\textsuperscript{19} Formal speech (my translation).
\textsuperscript{20} Formal ceremony of welcome (my translation).
even Māori people are learning how to speak Māori and you can see that it’s kind of drifting away.

The participants whose responses demonstrate a state of faith on the terrain of common sense hence seemed to fall quite clearly into two categories: those who held a strongly idealised notion of Māori people as largely rural living, fluent Māori language speakers who probably speak Māori in their homes, and those who didn’t appear to know or be influenced by this idea. The students who did not have this sense of an idealised identity group, referred solely to their lived experience when considering their perception of Māori language use. Both groups however, can be said to be operating in a state of faith, because their perceptions about the world and their experience of it appears congruent. In the case of the students who referred to ‘rural’ Māori speaking communities, their perception is not challenged by personal experience of these communities. These communities are idealised in the way they are imagined and both their physical and imagined distance from the ‘imaginer’ ensures this narrative remains coherent and unchallenged.

**Stuttering**

There were some really clear examples of stuttering in the participants’ responses to questions around the use of Māori language. This seemed to arise out of a certainty that the Māori language was used widely, but this claim, however confidently made, could not be substantiated by evidence from the lived experiences of the participants. Stuttering in a narrative occurs on the largely unconscious terrain of common-sense, so the participants whose responses illustrate this state of awareness appeared unaware of the quite obvious contradictions in their responses. Unlike the much more subtle stutters identified in the previous chapter related to relationship building possibilities that might arise from learning Māori, the stutters that occurred in the responses related to perception of Māori language use were very apparent. This suggests to me that, while for some of the participants the dominant narrative influencing their perception of the world leads them to believe that Māori language is widely used by some groups, this narrative is being strongly contested by their lived experiences.

Leah’s (year 9) response captures this unconscious reference to two different narratives succinctly. *Well I reckon I’d like it to be used more widely, but I think it’s used widely, but maybe it could be a bit more.* As she is talking, she is unaware that she is articulating movement back and forth between two narratives – one that causes her to believe that the language is
widely used, and another that causes her to suggest that maybe it could be used a bit more, not noticing that there is a discrepancy between these two perceptions.

Paul’s (year 9) response to the question of Māori language use was a good example of stuttering, the stutters sometimes occurring in statements made close together, but also apparent when looking at statements made at different times throughout the interview. When considering Māori language use he initially responded *I know that not many people do speak like just Māori and I know it’s like – oh, not really - but it’s a dying language and its being kept alive definitely.* Here, he describes the language as dying, although he appears reluctant to say this, or not entirely sure of this idea (‘it’s like - oh, not really”). A little later on he seems more positive about the health of the language saying *there’s still opportunities to learn it at school and stuff, so it’s definitely doing well.* It seemed to be very important to Paul to keep returning to the more positive narrative of successful Māori language revival and increased use of the language. Twice he uses the word ‘definitely’ as if to reassure himself (or me?) of the dominance of this narrative in his mind. However, his lived experience also seems to offer a strong counter-narrative causing him to make contradictory statements such as, *no-one like goes up to each other and has a conversation but there’s definitely a lot of it everywhere.*

While the contradictions in Paul’s responses were obvious to me, he did not appear to notice them at all. Paul’s responses hence typify the Gramscian notion of ideological struggle taking place on the largely unconscious terrain of common sense. Paul’s common sense understanding of the world is currently telling him two quite different things, but the struggle has not yet caused any awkwardness or moments of conscious awareness of the contesting narratives.

Paul’s response exemplifies the contradictory nature of some of the participants’ responses about their perceptions around the use of Māori. Many of the participants claimed that the language is thriving, but were unable to substantiate this claim with first-hand experience. A little later on in the interview, Paul in fact provides an insightful description of Māori language use which helps to explain the contradictions in participants’ perceptions about the use of the Māori language. *It’s spoken more formally... Like at funerals, weddings and academics, just on the marae, you don’t normally see two people casually at the movies talking to each other in Māori, you don’t normally see that.* Paul’s experience of Māori language use, perhaps like other participants, is that it is used at Māori ceremonial occasions, where a distinctly different and observable Māori culture is performed, and his complete lack of experience of it being used by people as they go about their daily lives. Paul’s description mirrors the description of Māori language use that I referred to earlier in the chapter taken from *The Health of the Māori Language in 2006* report.
(Te Puni Kōkiri, 2008). This report noted the use of Māori language in predominantly Māori settings and its much lower levels of usage in community domains such as shopping, socialising or sports.

Alice (year 9), was unaware that there was any concern about Māori language dying out. When I told her that there had been some concern about this in the past and that some people were still concerned, she expressed surprise. In her mind the language has always just been there. Alice also believed that Māori people were likely to be Māori speakers. I always thought that people that were of the Māori culture were taught from when they were younger. It was interesting to observe Alice process her own response because, even though this was her immediate reply, she then paused for a while to think some more. Eventually she added it depends how they were brought up. I had the sense that Alice was trying to make sense of some contradictory thoughts she was having so I followed this response with my question about how widely used she thought the language was. Her response was fascinating:

Since one of the main languages is English, I expect that a lot of people have to speak English to other people that don’t know Māori. So it might not be very widely used. But I’m sure it is still used.

Alice seemed to be working from the assumption that Māori people are likely to speak Māori but have to speak English in order to communicate with non-speakers of Māori, and this may result in it not being widely used. The contradiction inherent in considering a language both as alive and well and not widely used does not seem apparent to her. She briefly acknowledged that not all Māori might learn Māori in their home perhaps considering the reality of having Māori students learning Māori language in her class at school. Alice was also quite clear about where Māori was likely to be used, definitely on a marae - in homes where they do speak it, yet she herself did not have any close Māori friends and class trips were her only experience of the marae. Her perception of Māori language as being widely used in Māori homes and on the marae is hence not likely to be based on her lived experience.

Sometimes, the questions I asked as the interviewer appeared to cause a stutter. Participants began to answer in a state of faith, telling me what they believed to be true. However, when I probed a little further, they had difficulty answering, or edited their initial response. They appeared largely unaware of this as it happened. The following brief exchange with Ana (year 12) illustrates this:

Ana: I think it’s being used, like, everyday – we watch Māori television whenever we can.
Interviewer: *Who do you think uses it the most?*

Ana: *Probably just the Māoris*

Interviewer: *All of them?*

Ana: (pause) - *just some families*

Ana begins with confidence reporting her belief that Māori is being used every day. But as I ask for clarification, she begins to answer more carefully. In this short exchange she moves from claiming that Māori is being used every day (although she doesn’t say by whom) to a more considered and hesitant response that it is probably just being used by some Māori families. Ana did not appear to notice her shift from confident generalisation, to hesitance, but it was apparent to me as the interviewer.

Ana also refers to Māori television which I mention here because several of the participants referred to Māori television when they were thinking about where Māori language could be heard. Both the evidence of fluent Māori language being used on television, and their knowledge of Māori medium education seemed to influence the participant’s sense of the use of Māori language. This is neatly captured in Jordan’s response to the question of Māori language use. Jordan is an adult participant whose responses contained a number of stutters. In the example below she appears to be claiming that some fluent groups use the language widely, in fact *more than you think.*

*Whenever I flick it on, I’m always astounded at the number of people speaking Māori and the number of young people that look my age that are presenting the news or whatever, speaking with absolute fluency. And clearly they’ve come through Kura Kaupapa or whatever. So there’s a number of people out there that might not use it as widely as English is used but still have it ... On a day to day basis I suspect it’s more used than you think, but if you’re not in those circles you don’t see it.*

This belief appears to stem from her experience of Māori television and her knowledge of kura kaupapa schools. However, while she suspects it is used *more than you think,* she also concedes that there are a number of people out there who *might not use it as widely as English is used.* What appears to be present in Jordan’s response here is a competing narrative. On the one hand, the evidence of the language she hears on Māori television, and the accepted wisdom of excellent language proficiency among the graduates of kura kaupapa, cause her to believe that in
some circles a lot of Māori language is being used. However, she also has experienced a situation (which I will describe in the following section) where people she expected to be proficient at the language were not, and this may be the cause of some doubt, or the slight stutter that occurs in her response. For Jordan there is the possibility that Māori language might not be used as widely as English, even among proficient speakers. The other interesting thing about Jordan’s response is her reference to ‘circles’ of language users. Like other participants Jordan appears to have the sense that Māori language is being used widely and proficiently in other places that are somehow removed from her own experience. If you are not in those circles, you don’t see it.

Like some of the participants who demonstrated a state of faith when discussing their perceptions about the use of Māori language, Jess (adult) also mentioned school as a place where Māori language was likely to be used. However, a slight stutter is present in her response to a question about the health of the Māori language. Reflecting on her own experience of education she says:

*I would say definitely improved since I was at school like I mean primary school. Lots of the kids come in [to my workplace] and they are talking about learning Māori at primary and intermediate. So I would say slightly improving.*

It is interesting that Jess uses the word ‘definitely’ when considering her perception of whether the number of Māori speakers was increasing. School-aged participants Mele, Alice and Paul also used the word ‘definitely’ in relation to language use, which suggests that for some of the participants there is a feeling of certainty or belief that the language is alive and well, and being used. But despite her certainty at the beginning of the above response, hesitance creeps in for Jess as she continues speaking. Jess’s perception is that Māori language use has definitely improved since she was at school and the evidence she draws on is her experience of meeting children through her work who talk about learning Māori at school. However, something causes her to conclude that Māori language use is *slightly improving*. I asked Jess if she thought her perception of Māori language use was influenced by attitudes towards Māori language in her workplace. Jess is a social worker who works for a public sector health organisation. *Here there’s a strong push for it,* she responded when considering the visibility of Māori language in her workplace. When I asked her about her perception of how visible the language might be outside work environments like health and education, she replied, *thinking about jobs that my family members have, it wouldn’t be at all visible.*
A dominant narrative influencing the perception of the world that these participants have seems to be that Māori language is vibrant and strong among some communities in New Zealand. This narrative appears to be given authority by participants’ experiences of Māori language being used ceremonially, especially at school, and by the appearance of fluent Māori speakers on Māori television. However, for this group their lack of direct or lived experience with these communities of fluent speakers causes some doubts and hesitancies as they are speaking. The examples of stutters in this section are quite obvious in many places, although not noticed by the speakers themselves, which leads me to suggest that the narrative, which claims Māori language is in good health and used widely used by some groups, is being quite strongly contested by their lived experiences.

**Awkwardness**

The dominant ideological narrative that appears to influence the perceptions of some of the participants is that there is a group of people who can be identified as a culturally distinct group (Māori) and that one of the identifiers of this group is that members are fluent speakers of Māori language. Participants whose responses demonstrated a state of faith or stuttering tended to explain their lack of lived experience of this group by suggesting that this group lived ‘elsewhere’ - in ‘rural areas’ or ‘where Māori people live’. Participants whose responses I have identified as demonstrating a state of awkwardness were in this state because their lived experiences caused them to become aware of a disjuncture between those experiences and a dominant ideological narrative.

Adult participant Jordan, who learnt Māori throughout secondary school, was really surprised by what she experienced when she was working on her Master’s thesis and was doing research with iwi21 groups.

*One thing I was surprised about with both iwi was their lack of Māori. Very few of them spoke [Māori] at all. And when they got up in the marae they spoke in English because they had no reo. Yeah, that really surprised me.*

Like the participants whose responses have been discussed in the previous sections of this chapter, Jordan had an idea in her head of what Māori people living outside the city would be like.
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21 Tribal (my translation).
I would have associated people living within their tribal areas to be more in tune with their reo I guess. But that said, after taking the Māori Resource Management paper, I am aware of the colonialism and all that kind of stuff, so it’s understandable too. A lot of people there were of the generation that were discouraged completely from speaking it.

Despite the fact that Jordan had learnt about the history of Māori language and its decline, she was obviously still under the impression that the language was in a far more robust state in the tribal areas. Her experience of Māori people unable to speak Māori on the marae was quite unsettling, especially when she realised that her own ability in Māori surpassed that of the people she was working with. This made her feel awkward, I definitely felt awkward about it. While Jordan did not explain exactly what made her feel awkward she did recall that some people she was working with ‘joked’ that a pākehā speaks more Māori than me. Jordan’s knowledge of colonialism and a generation of people that were discouraged completely from speaking Māori language implies that she is aware of which group (pākehā) were responsible for discouraging Māori language use. This probably explains why she felt so awkward when she realised that she could speak more Māori than iwi locals on the marae, the place where most people expect to be able to hear Māori language being used.

Several of the adult participants were very realistic about their perceptions of Māori language use. In contrast to a dominant narrative expressed by some of the school-aged participants that Māori language is widely used, the adult participants described its use as tokenistic. Jess, for example, said I think dropping words into stuff is used quite a bit, let’s have some kai22, you know. But in terms of speaking conversationally I don’t know how widely that is apart from kids who are in kura kaupapa. Here we can see a now familiar reference to a group of Māori language users (kura kaupapa students in this case), but a realisation that for people outside of this group, the language is not being used widely at all for the purpose of conversation.

This idea of the language being used symbolically also appeared in the responses of Amanda and Jordan. Amanda thinks the language is not being used widely at all, rather, that it’s just used tokenly to be honest. Jess described her experience of Māori language use in her workplace.

We have Māori cultural leaders and we have waiata practice every two weeks and we are always doing powhiri and doing introductions and welcomes in Māori and often when I go somewhere else like not outside of work, and someone will start
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22 Food (my translation).
“haere mai” and start that way, that might be all they say in Māori but there’s some, even if its tokenistic but some use of the language.

Jess was not critical of these practices, but did concede that because of the strong push for Māori language in her workplace she was still able to use her knowledge of Māori even if it was just being able to use or recognise words. She no longer has the confidence to speak conversationally. When I asked about her experience of being able to use Māori language as an adult, she described it as being very employment specific. When I was studying, I worked in the Cheesecake Shop, I didn’t speak any Māori language there. For people of non-Māori ethnicity, it seems as though work provides an essential link to Māori language opportunities. Celia, a teacher in a bilingual primary school unit, had this to say about opportunities to use the Māori language: I don’t think I would have had similar opportunities [to speak Māori]. No, not unless whatever else I was working in directly related to Māori, I don’t think I’d have opportunities. Amanda also agreed that if she wasn’t working in her current position where she was able to have brief conversations with colleagues or send emails in Māori, she wouldn’t have many opportunities to use Māori language at all.

I am identifying these responses as demonstrating awkwardness, because while the participants seem to accept the situation, there is awareness among them that the language is not being used conversationally. The participants identify it being used in ‘token’ ways and that it is work place specific. This contests a narrative that says the language is alive and well, and can be found being used conversationally in communities of Māori language speakers.

The adult participants, who all felt they had some ability to communicate in Māori language about familiar everyday topics, seemed to feel they have no access to these communities and in fact some seem to doubt whether these communities exist at all. Sina had the following to say when she was considering her perception of Māori language use in New Zealand.

Organisations and stuff try and incorporate it but only like in little bits, like this thing will have a Māori title if it’s to do with Māori and having signs of doors and stuff and saying kia ora when you introduce yourself on the news or whatever but in terms of actually incorporating it into society, I don’t think it’s really working.

What Sina is describing very succinctly here is Māori language being used symbolically as a means of acknowledging biculturalism. This is particularly prevalent in the public sector where biculturalism has been institutionalised. Jordan, Jess, Amanda and Celia were, at the time of
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interviews, all working in the public sector. The awkwardness that their responses demonstrate is the result of a realisation of this ‘token’ or symbolic use of the language as opposed to its use as a living language for the purpose of meaningful communication.

For Sina, this awkward recognition that Māori language was not the living language she imagined it to be came while she was at school. She recalled some of her experiences at school.

> Every year we went on a trip to a different marae and we just spent time with the people there and learnt about their traditions and stuff and their history, but for me personally it was kind of like a history class instead of a living, like present day what’s happening.

For Sina there was something about her experience that made it feel like Māori language learning was learning about traditions and history, and not learning a living language. This might be because she is Samoan, and because she has grown up just being in it [Samoan language] and used to hearing it. I think it is possible to infer that Sina has a sense of what it is like to use a minority language in an English language dominant environment in a way she would perhaps consider meaningful.

Sina appears to have felt awkwardness throughout her language learning experiences both at school and at university, although she found it difficult to pinpoint the cause of this awkwardness.

> I didn’t really find it fulfilling...I think just for me I kind of feel there’s a difference between learning Māori in class and then like learning Māori as a Māori person and I just, I think that my learning of Māori is kind of missing elements like the Māori language is more than just something you can put in the classroom and then, I think it’s good because it means there’s more people speaking it.

Here it seems as though it is important to Sina that people are speaking the Māori language. Later in the interview she explains that through learning the language you are exposed to Māori culture and she thinks that it has relevance to being a New Zealander. However, she has a sense that her experience of Māori language learning is not authentic in some way:

> I think the way that we learnt it was just as a subject ... that’s how I felt - even at university and stuff, like it’s the same. It’s kind of, it’s not fake but it’s not the - for me in my head - it’s not like the real thing, whatever the real thing is.
Sina appears to be expressing a frustration here that despite her years of learning Māori, she does not seem to have learnt a language that enables her to communicate in ‘real’ ways with other Māori language speakers. She was very clear in her perception of the dominance of English language. She told me that she never gets to use Māori language for communication purposes because *even with Māori people we just talk English*. In addition, she suspects one of the main reasons the language has never been incorporated into society is that *no-one really wants to learn it*.

**Concluding comments**

Sina’s critique is important and draws our attention to the question of who in fact is using the Māori language and why? It would seem that for some of the participants the dominant narrative suggests that the language is alive and thriving, while for others their lived experience has caused them to believe otherwise.

In terms of available research about Māori language use in New Zealand, it is difficult to get a clear picture of the health of the language. While I quoted some statistics at the beginning of the chapter taken from the 2001 and 2006 census figures, Te Puni Kokiri have published the results of national surveys undertaken in 2001 and 2006 which present a different overall picture of the health of the Māori language and this makes it difficult to establish the state of the Māori language (Te Puni Kōkiri, 2002a, 2008). Winifred Bauer’s (2008) comprehensive comparison of all the statistics about health of Māori language taken from the 2001 and 2006 national surveys and the Māori language knowledge question in the 2001 and 2006 censuses, concludes that there is little evidence to suggest that knowledge of Māori language is strengthening rather than declining.

However, there is evidence beyond that offered by the interview data in this research of the existence of the narrative of a considerably improved Māori language situation. The Wai 262 report articulates strong concerns about this perception which they consider to be incorrect:

> The received wisdom is that the revival of te reo over the last 25 years is nothing short of a miracle. There is an element of truth in that. But the notion that te reo is making steady forward progress, particularly among the young is manifestly false. The Government bears significant responsibility for this misconception. (Waitangi Tribunal, 2011, p. 469)
The authors of the report attribute the responsibility for this misconception to claims made in the Te Puni Kokiri report on *The Health of the Māori Language in 2006* that Māori language status, knowledge and acquisition and use had all “improved markedly since 2001” (Te Puni Kōkiri, 2008, p. 35).

This is the dominant narrative which seems to have influenced the perceptions of many of the participants. Its dominance appears to be supported by the notion some of these participants have of an ethnically separate and distinguishable group called ‘Māori’. One of the characteristics of this group is that they are likely to be Māori language speakers. The interview data suggests that this dominant narrative is kept intact by the way the participants believe these idealised groups of Māori people exist in communities spatially separate from their known world. Whether those communities actually exist is not the point. What is important is the belief among some of the participants that Māori language is thriving in some communities and that those communities exist beyond the lived experience of the participants. In other words, they are imagined communities.

At the beginning of this chapter I noted the absence of references from the participants to a desire to learn Māori language in order to communicate, which stood out as odd to me, given that this might be a fairly common reason for beginning to learn another language. The discovery of the existence of this imagined and inaccessible community of Māori language users amongst some of the participants helps to explain the absence of reference to a desire to learn Māori language in order to be able to communicate in Māori. If Māori speaking communities are distant and inaccessible in the way they are imagined, then it seems to logically follow that students would not be learning Māori so that they could personally engage in communication opportunities in these communities. This sense of distance or separation emerged very strongly in the responses of many of the participants as they talked about their perception of Māori language use in New Zealand.

Policy is very much implicated in the creation and protection of a narrative that refers to the notion of two distinct ethnic groups which constitute the partners in the bicultural relationship. It seems from the interview data presented in this chapter that an outcome of this narrative is the perception that Māori language is used exclusively by, and is perhaps exclusively for Māori people. This sense of a shifting in perception is signalled in a concern raised in the Wai 262 report. I referred to this part of the report in chapter four, and it is worth revisiting it again here briefly. After noting that the most recent census reported a 15 percent decrease in the number of non-Māori able to speak the Māori language, they offered the following as a likely explanation:
... this may of course relate to increased awareness of what conversational Māori entails through exposure to Māori Television. However, it may also indicate that many non-Māori are abandoning the reo revival movement, in the way that those at the margins of interest and with less at stake are the first to leave movements that begin to falter .... A drop of such magnitude is, in any case, dramatic and should be a cause for concern or – at the very least – investigation. (Waitangi Tribunal, 2011, p. 462)

I claim that there is a least one other plausible explanation, and that is a developing perception, especially among young non-Māori, that Māori language is thriving but being used exclusively by Māori people. This could explain an increasing dis-engagement with the language, especially if accompanied by a perception that the Māori language is exclusively for Māori people. I discussed the shift in attitudes towards non-Māori use of Māori language by some groups in chapter four, referring to the unknown influence of “a degree of non-acceptance by some Māori of non-Māori learning te reo” (Waitangi Tribunal, 2011, p. 485). Like the writers of the report, I believe the decline in non-Māori speakers of Māori language is dramatic and warrants thorough investigation of all possible causes including the possibility of an increasingly influential narrative which seeks to exclude non-Māori from Māori language use. The effects of this type of narrative were evident in some of the responses of the adult participants in this study and their experiences are the focus of chapter eleven.

The following chapter however, further explores the idea of inclusive and exclusive biculturalism, which was introduced in chapter three, by focusing on the relationship between attitudes towards Māori language and biculturalism as expressed by the participants. I have argued that in the period of soft or inclusive biculturalism there was a closer relationship between biculturalism and the aspiration of bilingualism for both Māori and non-Māori. However, as the discourse of biculturalism shifted to focus more on bicultural structures, the state was identified as having a responsibility, via the education system, to actively contribute to Māori language revitalisation as part of its Treaty obligations. Biculturalism became the justifying ideology for the establishment of a separate Māori education system based on the notion of two distinctly different ethnic groups with different education needs. It was this shift that created the exclusive strand of biculturalism which emphasises difference. This shift has affected the perceived relationship between Māori language use and biculturalism and the following chapter explores some of those effects.
Chapter 10: Biculturalism and the Māori language

The focus of this chapter is the relationship between participant attitudes towards the Māori language and their understanding of biculturalism. This chapter takes a slightly different approach to the two chapters which have preceded it. In the previous chapters I identified particular themes or ideas that emerged from the interview data. Within each of these, I discussed examples of participant responses that illustrate states of faith, stuttering, and awkwardness in relation to their common-sense conception of the world. As I continued to work with the interview data I began to notice what I consider stuttering occurring on a larger scale, thematic level. Examples of stuttering were noticeable when I looked closely at what participants were saying about their attitudes towards the Māori language which are not congruent with their espoused beliefs and understandings of biculturalism itself. On the one hand, much of what participants said about the importance of the Māori language and how they would feel if the language was to be lost, suggests a commitment to some core tenets of bicultural ideology. However, when they were asked to share their beliefs and understandings about biculturalism, many of them expressed confusion or outright rejection of the concept. This chapter is largely structured around exploring this stutter.

It is useful here to briefly recall the Gramscian understanding of common sense as the terrain upon which a dominant ideology is constructed. It is also the site of resistance and challenge to this ideology. I have defined stuttering as the manifestation of the struggle for dominance between competing ideologies on the terrain of common sense. The stutter that I have identified above and will be focusing on in this chapter is significant. It was a stutter shared by many of the participants suggesting that there is strong contestation occurring on the terrain of common sense, even if the participants themselves are largely unaware of it.

Part of the work policy does is to provide charters for action which create and recreate new sets of relationships between individuals, groups and objects (Shore & Wright, 1997). Bicultural education policy helps to naturalise a particular view of the world with corresponding social practices amongst people within this policy environment. However, this is not a straightforward or predictable process. In earlier chapters of this thesis I have argued that there is little consensus about the meaning of biculturalism. In chapter three, in particular, I traced some of the different and overlapping ways that biculturalism has been understood over time, from a view of it as “the public recognition of the importance of two cultures, Māori and Pākehā, as central to the life of Aotearoa-New Zealand” (Mulgan, 1989, p. 28) to an understanding of biculturalism as the “power-sharing partnership between Māori and the Crown, based on the Treaty of Waitangi”
Policy as conceptualised by Shore and Wright (2011) articulates particular ways of thinking about an aspect of life, but as those ideas interact with people and institutions as they travel from space to space policies are contested and retranslated. Hence, while words about being bicultural or biculturalism, or references to the Treaty of Waitangi appear in policy documents, the meanings of those words, or the concept of biculturalism, are created or retranslated in each space these documents influence. Evolving understandings of biculturalism are one of the contributing factors to a lack of clarity and ambiguity in policy documents about the purpose of Māori language education for non-Māori students. This lack of clarity potentially enlarges the space for contestation and retranslation of the ideology that policy articulates.

The participant responses which I discuss in the following section demonstrate the ‘success’ of bicultural education policy up to a point. That is, it is possible to argue that their attitudes towards Māori language reflect support for aspects of biculturalism such as a commitment to fairness and social justice, or the protection of the Māori language as a taonga belonging to the indigenous people of New Zealand. However, other aspects of biculturalism are actively contested, most noticeably what could be described as the ‘exclusive’ nature of biculturalism. Many of the participants, for example, expressed the desire to extend to all New Zealanders equally the same courtesies of tolerance, respect and inclusion. The way many of them talked about biculturalism suggested a concern that it excludes groups other than Māori and pākehā from this kind of relationship.

I attended secondary school during the late 1980s and was at university during the early 1990s. While I did not know a lot about the Māori language situation while I was at school, I was aware that there were fears for the survival of the language. I cannot recall exactly when or how it happened, but at some point during my time at university I came to understand that there were a group of Pākehā people for whom a commitment to either ideas about social justice, or biculturalism itself, meant a decision to begin learning Māori language. As far as I remember this was for two reasons; the first was to demonstrate a commitment to a new kind of relationship between Māori and Pākehā, and the second was to contribute to Māori language revival efforts. My own personal experiences have thus resulted in an intertwining of ideas about social justice and my attitudes towards the Māori language. In his 1985 book Being Pākehā, Michael King suggested that “in a society that professes to be bicultural, members of each culture ought to be fluent in each other’s language” (King, 1985, p. 192). This statement reflects the beliefs I was
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familiar with. Because of this, I was expecting to hear echoes of this narrative articulated by my research participants, even though I suspected it would have some different twists. When I didn’t find it at all, it took me a little while to get over my sense of being totally perplexed by this absence.

As noted in the previous chapter many of the participants were unaware of fears for the survival of the Māori language, and this seems to be a plausible explanation for the absence of comments in the interview data expressing a desire to contribute to the future survival of the language. It was more difficult to try and explain the absence of conscious connections made by the participants between their beliefs about social justice and/or biculturalism and their attitudes towards the Māori language. What I am proposing as an explanation of this phenomenon is that core ‘durable elements’ of bicultural ideology have become deeply ingrained in the largely unconscious common sense understandings that the participants have about their worlds. However, other elements of bicultural ideology, those which have continued to evolve, are the ones they associate with the word ‘bicultural’. Some of the ideas that the participants associate with biculturalism are ideas that they reject or contest, all the while espousing positive attitudes towards Māori language and social justice. I think it is useful here to return to the discussion of the evolution of biculturalism in chapter three. While I am not suggesting there is a perfect fit, I propose that the ‘stutter’ that forms the core of this chapter is the result of contestation between ideological underpinnings associated with soft or inclusive understandings of biculturalism, and hard biculturalism, which can be understood as having an exclusionary element. The participants do not notice this contestation, hence the reason I am identifying it as stuttering.

**Attitudes towards the Māori language**

Unsurprisingly, given that all the participants I interviewed had chosen to learn Māori, the participants voiced positive attitudes towards the Māori language. Many of them referred to a special relationship between language and culture. Sarah (year 12) explained her understanding of this connection the following way. *When you learn Māori – it’s not just a language – it sounds really cliché. It’s kind of like learning a lifestyle - or like a way of thinking that’s very different.* As an afterthought, she added, *I’d be interested to learn French and see if you feel the same way.*

Paul (year 9) was also adamant that there was a strong connection between language and culture. *Language is one of the most important parts of the whole culture – it [Māori] should be mandatory to learn like Afrikaans in South Africa.* Several of the participants echoed a similar
belief that New Zealanders ought to know the Māori language. According to Langi (year 13), *it should be the country's language and people should know it*. Another idea expressed by several of the participants was the connection between Māori language and their sense of identity as a New Zealander. Jordan’s (adult) description captures this idea nicely, *Māori culture is New Zealand, it’s part of New Zealand, who we are as New Zealanders, you can’t escape it even if you wanted to*.

Sarah (year 12) articulated the same belief that Māori language and culture contributed to her sense of identity as a New Zealander. She also expressed another belief sometimes heard in New Zealand society, that of the lack of pākehā culture. For Sarah, learning Māori appears to help make up for what she sees as a deficit in her own pākehā cultural identity:

> *I think another thing about learning Māori culture and the language is that it makes you feel more like a New Zealander because in New Zealand I think a lot of Pākehā feel a little bit like that – they don’t really have their own culture – like there’s not really any culture ... Another reason why I probably feel really passionate about Māori is that it kind of gives me a culture.*

Sina (adult), when describing how she might feel if the Māori language was to be lost, also voiced the belief that it is the Māori culture that gives New Zealand a unique culture of its own:

> *Anything dying out is not good and especially because we have Māori people in New Zealand and that’s their language. Apart from Māori people or the Māori culture there’s not really anything that makes New Zealand special or stand out.*

The above examples reflect two ideas that are articulated in curriculum documents. The first is that language and culture are inextricably bound together and that learning a language enables access to a different way of understanding the world. This point is made in *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* which states that “[t]he reo Māori and tikanga Māori are intertwined, and so learning te reo Māori gives students access to te ao Māori (the Māori world) and to Māori world views” (Ministry of Education, 2009d, p. 13).

The second belief apparent in the participant responses given above is that knowledge of te reo Māori can contribute to a New Zealander’s sense of personal and national identity. While curriculum statements appear to avoid mentioning any relationship between Māori language and individual identity for non-Māori students, there is a clear statement about the relationship
between Māori language and national identity. *The New Zealand Curriculum* (Ministry of Education, 2007) makes the claim that:

> Te reo Māori is ... 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)

The participant responses above leave me wondering about the extent to which students may believe that New Zealand’s Māori culture and language is our only point of difference in the world.

**The possibility of language loss**

In the previous chapter I discussed the lack of knowledge of any concerns relating to the future survival of Māori language among the school-aged participants. While some of them acknowledged that hearing Māori language around them in their day to day lives was uncommon, they tended to believe that the language was being spoken in other places, by other people, rather than not being spoken at all, and hence in danger of extinction. Because I had assumed that participants would have some knowledge of the history of Māori language use and its decline, I expected that participants would talk about their concern for the language and perhaps their commitment to its revitalisation. I quickly realised that concern for the language’s survival was a new idea for many of the school-aged participants, but that asking them how they would feel if that were to happen in the future enabled them to articulate some of their core beliefs about the language.

A number of similar themes appeared in participant responses to the question of language loss. The notion of fairness was salient in many of the responses. Alice (year 9), for example said:

> I think it would be quite sad because they are the native people of New Zealand and it shouldn’t have to be taken over by any other language. In lots of other countries they still speak their natural language.

The idea that a native or indigenous group could lose their language or their right to speak their language seemed to ignite the participant’s sense of justice. Karishma (year 13), in trying to imagine a future in which the Māori language had died out, was indignant:
This is New Zealand and it’s you know, they are the indigenous people, it’s like they’re being seen as insignificant again and there’s no use for their culture. I mean this is their country and we might be citizens, like New Zealand citizens but you know, it’s their language and culture that’s been abolished.

For her, language loss for any group seemed like a distressing thought, and in her view would make that group feel unworthy and dispossessed:

When I say sad, I mean, just think about it, you’re in your own country and your language has just been pushed to the side and it’s not being given much importance so you’d feel upset and you’d just wonder what is this? What’s happening here?

Some of the participants who were speakers of other languages, like Ana (year 12), were especially empathetic:

I always say that New Zealand is the land of the Māoris. I find it really sad cause it’s like, their home and they were here first, started everything. I would feel the same way if I knew that people were coming over to Tonga and trying to change our ways, I would find it really sad.

Sadness was a word that was frequently used when considering the prospect of language loss. Celia (adult), in fact, got a little tearful when she tried to imagine a future without Māori language. I’d feel sad that no-one - I think it could only happen if no-one cared about it. I’d feel sad that no-one cared enough about it that it died.

Nicole (adult) shared Celia’s concern that New Zealanders may not care enough. As an adult who has studied both history and politics at university, she has a more sophisticated understanding of the effects of colonisation in terms of language dominance, and thinks more effort needs to be made to create a more just society:

It’s frustrating to think that a group can’t speak their own language in their own country. You sort of apply that somewhere else and you think what it would be like if all of a sudden, I don’t know, Malays couldn’t speak Malaysian or Cantonese or whatever they speak in Malaysia and they had to speak Hindi because there were so many people from India there. It doesn’t seem right. I think everyone should make more of an effort.
Other participants thought in terms of the loss of knowledge and damage that would be done to the culture if the language was lost. Leah (year 9) described this loss as follows:

> It’s kind of like the first thing that was spoken here. Then if that suddenly died out
> it’s like the kiwi dying out pretty much. So it’s kind of like all the history and stuff would die out with it and the later generations wouldn’t know about it and it would be really sad.

Both Natalie (year 13) and Jess (adult) made similar comments. Natalie thought that because language is such a huge part of people’s culture, for them to lose that would almost be like heartbreaking. Jess was able to elaborate on this idea a little further explaining that Māori language loss would be upsetting because it’s not just like - you can’t just translate it into English, it has some extra level of meaning with it which would be lost, so it’s more than just losing a language, its losing meaning as well.

Some of the participants simply didn’t believe that the Māori language could die out. In response to my statement that some people are concerned that the language is still in danger of dying out, Amber (year 9) told me quite calmly I don’t think it would die because it’s like part of New Zealand. She did add that, if it did, and she clearly didn’t see this as likely, it wouldn’t be fair. Amber was a year 9 student at the time of the interviews and I thought her age might explain her lack of knowledge, but surprisingly two of the adult participants did not appear to think the concern was realistic either. Jordan was confident, that due to population changes and her sense of the success of kura kaupapa, the language would not die out. *I think in 2050 isn’t the Māori population predicted to be like 30% of the population or something? And so with all these kids coming through from kura kaupapa you know it’s not going to die.* Amanda held a similar perception. I don’t think it can die out at this point because there are a lot of younger people that are learning it, yeah, so I don’t think that.

In summary, the attitudes that the participants seem to have towards the Māori language are positive. In their collective view it is fair and right that other groups and Māori people in particular are able to maintain and use their language. Participants talked about the importance of language to a culture, particularly because it enables the users of different languages to express different views of the world. Māori language seemed to be considered particularly valuable because it is understood to be a native or indigenous language. These attitudes of respect and inclusion seem to be very congruent with a conceptualisation of biculturalism as a partnership in which each partner values and respects the differences of the other.
Interestingly, there was one example of the stutter working differently. The examples above demonstrate participants’ positive attitudes towards the Māori language but reservations about the idea of biculturalism. On the other hand, Sina (adult) as you may recall, described her experiences of learning Māori with a sense frustration saying, *it’s not fake but it’s not the - for me in my head - it’s not like the real thing whatever the real thing is*. This seemed to be at the heart of much of what Sina seemed to be grappling with during the interview the question of what ‘the real thing’ is in relation to Māori culture and Māori language use. I regard this as a conscious challenge to an aspect of the dominant ideology, that is, the notion of two separate and distinguishable ethnic groups and cultural practice. However, when it came to the talking about biculturalism, Sina seemed at pains to demonstrate her support for the ideology:

*I think in New Zealand biculturalism is important because we have Māori as indigenous people and they’re still alive and in our society and because I think what’s seen as a New Zealand culture takes aspects of the Māori culture to build that culture, so I think because Māori are so important to New Zealand and how we New Zealanders see New Zealand, and even how other people see New Zealand. Biculturalism is important because we have to, all the other groups of people like Samoan people and other Pacific Islanders and Asian they are kind of like on the outside but in the centre is Māori and the dominant pākehā group. Yeah, I think that is important.*

I find Sina’s explanation of her claim that biculturalism is important fascinating because it is actually quite difficult to work out what her justification is for making this claim. She talks about Māori people as indigenous and *still alive* and contributing to a distinctive New Zealand culture, and this seems to be enough of a reason for her to state her support for biculturalism. This is surprising because Sina was a highly articulate and thoughtful participant, studying law at university. In the explanation she offers here, she appears to be operating in the state of faith. Biculturalism is generally understood to be a good and positive ideology especially in public institutions where it is deeply entrenched in policy. This includes in the tertiary education sector. Section 181(b) of The 1989 Education Act requires University Councils to “acknowledge the principles of the Treaty of Waitangi”, while the policies developed by the Māori Tertiary Education Framework (Ministry of Education, 2008b) operationalises the Treaty acknowledgement in a range of practices. Sina articulates support for this position in a very ‘faithful’ way, especially if we consider her description of how other ethnic groups ought to fit around the dominant Māori and pākehā groups. Sina is Samoan, and in her own words this puts her in a group that is *on the outside*, yet, she insists *that is important.*
Understandings of biculturalism

I was curious to find out what students believed or understood about the concept of biculturalism, so during the interviews I told the participants that New Zealand is sometimes described as ‘bicultural’ and asked them what they knew about that idea. As I have mentioned previously, I was unprepared for the confusing array of responses to this question.

Several of the younger participants didn’t recognise the word, or thought they had heard it before but were unsure of its meaning. Alice (year 9) told me I don’t really know the meaning of it, but I’ve heard it before. Helen (year 12) hadn’t heard the word before and when I explained some of the ideas associated with biculturalism, she said apologetically I don’t really get it. Both Langi (year 13) and Mele (year 9) understood that it referred to more than one culture but gave fairly vague definitions. Mele understood biculturalism as learning more than one culture, while for Langi, the question was confusing and in the end she declared that biculturalism meant many, many cultures. Junior (year 9) recognised that it was a word that referred to two groups. It’s like having two cultures or whatever.

Other participants wanted to correct my statement that ‘New Zealand is sometimes described as bicultural’. Nicole (adult) flatly rejected the notion of New Zealand being bicultural. It’s an ideology I think, of how a society with two different cultures could be. I don’t think New Zealand is bicultural. Or that we’re heading that way. Amber (year 9) paused for a while, before responding:

I would think more of multicultural. We’re doing that in social studies at the moment. So I’ve read quite about what it means to me and we’ve been thinking it’s kind of like accepting others and the way of like living in the same area. Just accepting others and not being racist.

Katalina (year 12) also gently challenged the idea of New Zealand as bicultural, saying I know people say the main is Europeans and Māoris but I reckon like New Zealand has turned into all sorts of races here.

Overall there seemed to be a lot of confusion amongst the school-aged participants who did recognise the term bicultural. They appeared to have difficulty distinguishing between biculturalism and multiculturalism. When I asked Paul (year 9) about biculturalism his first response was to describe something that sounded more like multiculturalism. [In New Zealand] there’s a lot of different culture. A lot of people from different parts of the world are here and
there’s no like racism to them, no major groups or anti-culture. As with some of the other participants, I then shared some simple explanations of biculturalism. This was difficult, because part of my research interest was to find out participants’ understandings of the word and I didn’t want to give them anything they might consider to be the ‘correct’ definition. I tried to limit myself to saying that the word referred to a relationship between two groups in New Zealand. For some, including Paul, this seemed to jog their memories and they were able to talk in a more focused way about biculturalism. After I mentioned the idea of two groups, Paul continued it’s about two cultures surviving, co-existing together in a country. Leah (year 9) struggled to talk about biculturalism and multiculturalism, and her comment was fairly representative of the confusion around these ideas. The lack of clarity in participant thinking was often reflected in sentences that were quite difficult to make sense of. Leah, for example, saying it’s multicultural now which it kind of is getting to now, but I still think that it would be mainly bicultural because of the first two cultural groups that came to New Zealand.

While I stated at the beginning of this chapter that I was interested in the broad stutter that seems present as participants talked in dissonant ways about their attitudes towards the Māori language and their understandings of biculturalism, there is also evidence of considerable awkwardness within their responses about biculturalism. Some participants, like Leah, appeared unable to ignore their knowledge of the increasingly multicultural make-up of New Zealand society, while at the same time seemed to feel they needed to acknowledge a perhaps ‘correct’ or ‘right’ view that New Zealand was also bicultural. I will return to this idea later in the chapter, but before doing so I want to discuss the responses of the participants who openly questioned or challenged the understanding they have of biculturalism.

Problems with the idea of biculturalism

As I noted earlier, participants who questioned or challenged biculturalism as they understood it, seemed to be most concerned with its exclusive nature. By this, I mean, that the way they understood biculturalism appeared to be that it was a relationship between two ethnic groups or ‘cultures’ and that somehow this relationship excluded people from other ethnic groups. Even among the younger participants, this concern was present. Alice, for example, was in year 9 at the time of the interviews. She commented, well, New Zealand is a place where there’s a lot of culture, it shouldn’t just be the two, it should be like everyone.

Sarah (year 12) was also concerned about the fact that there are more than two ethnic groups living in New Zealand, and that biculturalism only referred to a relationship between two groups:
Yeah, that is the problem. I think maybe [we need] triculturalism. I think the problem with biculturalism is it kind of seems like there’s either the English route or the Māori route. So I think definitely there needs to be more sort of mixing together.

Sarah’s response was very much framed by her thoughts about language use and education. Understanding what she meant by triculturalism and her comment about the English or the Māori route helps contextualise this response. When Sarah made this comment during the interview, I suspected what she was meaning by triculturalism was, in fact, bilingualism. This was in part because she went on to say it is important to know English. But I think it is also important to be able to speak other languages as well. What I find interesting about Sarah’s response, is her sense that, even if she is thinking about biculturalism in terms of types of education opportunities, she sees those opportunities as following very separate routes. Sarah also acknowledges that it is important to know other languages, her use of the plural languages appearing to be very deliberate, and returning our attention to her initial concern that biculturalism only refers to two ethnic groups.

Karishma (year 13) was quite hazy about the meaning of biculturalism but understood in a broad kind of way that the word refers to a relationship between Māori and European. She was clear that for her the idea ought to be replaced by multiculturalism:

Well I don’t know how it’s relevant to me cause I think it should be multicultural not just bicultural, cause I’m neither European or Māori, so I just think it should be multicultural. I mean this is just my personal opinion, but you know, all cultures, you know, it doesn’t matter if you’re Māori, European, Indian, Polynesian doesn’t matter what culture you’re from, you should be able to accept one another.

Again here, as in other responses, there is an apparent confusion between the meaning of biculturalism and multiculturalism. Karishma identifies the concept biculturalism as meaning Māori and European accepting one another, yet clearly believes this acceptance of other cultures should be a way all cultures behave. Karishma dismissed biculturalism as not relevant to her because, quite simply, she is not European or Māori.

As I progressed through the interviews, I became more curious about this idea of the relevance of biculturalism to the participants who were not Māori or European/pākehā. Where I sensed some hesitance, I tried to probe a little further by sharing this concern over relevance. This didn’t
necessarily lead to lengthy responses from the participants, but some seemed relieved to be able to acknowledge that it was difficult to understand how biculturalism might be relevant to them. Katalina’s (year 12) response is a good example of this:

Interviewer: Some of the other people I have spoken to have said the idea of multiculturalism is more relevant to them, because if you are not in the Māori or European group, where do you fit?

Katalina: Yeah that’s what I was thinking. I was like, what should I say?

Natalie (year 13) also thought that we ought to think differently about biculturalism in New Zealand. Similar to other participants she appeared to understand biculturalism as two cultures respecting one another and felt that this needed to be extended to include all cultures:

_I think I see New Zealand as more now a multicultural society. Because there are so many – I mean I would love to see that those two are the main importance, but so many people have emigrated here that there are so many different ones, you have to respect all the different cultures._

Here, again, we see the desire to acknowledge that two are the main importance followed by an almost apologetic statement about a reality which demands that we respect all the different cultures now living in New Zealand.

This theme of the changing face of New Zealand society requiring a different way of thinking about that society is taken up by Jordan, one of the adult participants:

_Well to me bicultural is what New Zealand was a hundred years ago. I think of it more as a society level thing, you know, because back a hundred years ago it really was - there were Māori people and New Zealand Europeans and that was it. But now New Zealand European or if you want to use the Māori expression pākehā, it’s not what it was. Now we’ve got Polynesians and huge Asian populations and refugees. So now we call it multicultural. So to me bicultural was and we’re not bicultural anymore._

Another adult participant, Amanda, expressed several concerns about the idea of biculturalism, one of which being who exactly the two groups are that the bicultural relationship exists between:

_Who is the Crown you know, is that the Queen? The government is not really the Crown. It has evolved so much that we need a new term and it’s not pākehā_
because we’re dwindling. We’re not the ones making babies in this country. Māori
don’t just fit into the Māori group either any more. There are so many inter-
relationships, biculturalism is a little bit problematic for me. I live in Howick...all
my neighbours are Chinese and so I’m more likely to say “ni hao” in the morning
to my neighbours than “kia ora” so it’s kind of, I guess, embracing all those
aspects of who we are as a country.

Here Amanda challenges the reality of the ‘two clearly separate and identifiable groups’ upon
which bicultural ideology has as its foundation. Her sense that the reality of the ethnic makeup of
New Zealand society is much more complex than ideology suggests is supported by research
(Callister, 2004, 2006; Kukutai, 2004). Furthermore, Amanda also acknowledges the increasing
number of people belonging to other ethnic groups who now live in New Zealand. Her
experience of living in Howick where her day to day reality is living among Chinese neighbours
causes her to acknowledge that biculturalism is a bit problematic.

Celia (adult) was openly quite critical of the idea of biculturalism. Her understanding of the
meaning of biculturalism is that it is the idea of two distinct cultures combined into one place or
area. Interestingly, at the beginning of her discussion of biculturalism, she identified herself as
bicultural, explaining ‘I’m bicultural because I’m a Niuean born in New Zealand. However, as
she continued to talk, she returned to a more typical understanding of biculturalism:

The partnership between Māori and English or pākehā...that’s how I understand
the use of biculturalism in New Zealand, it’s between two cultures and those two
are Māori and European, a partnership in New Zealand only between Māori and
pākehā and no-one else.

Her criticism of biculturalism centred on its exclusive nature:

You just think - where does it leave everyone else? Biculturalism in New Zealand,
the Māori and the Crown which is Māori and pākehā, and then there’s all these
others ... so all the other cultures maybe just have to fit around whatever the
Māori and the Crown decide what’s good for New Zealand.

Celia, remember, was at the time of the interviews, teaching Māori in a primary school bilingual
unit. In some ways her story best illustrates the broad stutter that I have been describing. Her
commitment to the Māori language is strong, so much so that she has chosen to work in Māori
medium education, despite her Niuean ethnicity. Yet despite her commitment to the language
and its continued existence in New Zealand society, she expressed deep concerns about the idea of biculturalism. *Even though I’m heavily involved in Māori culture - I don’t know. It’s confusing - because I’m not included in the biculturalism but I’m involved.* It may not be apparent from the written text, but Celia was clearly thinking hard about these ideas, and trying to clearly express what seems to me like her sense of simultaneous inclusion in and exclusion from aspects of the Māori world.

**Within theme awkwardness**

The previous section has illustrated the way some of the participants actively and consciously contested or challenged a dominant narrative. They tended to understand biculturalism as a special relationship between two ethnic groups or cultures, and understood the foundation of that relationship was respect for one another’s culture. Understood this way, they felt that it was only right and fair that this same cultural respect was extended to everyone. While some participants did not appear to be able to differentiate between biculturalism and multiculturalism, there was evidence of support for the dominant narrative, despite the reservations that some participants expressed. I decided to regard this as evidence of a state of awkwardness because participants who did this critiqued biculturalism consciously. Despite this critique, they tended to return to the idea of biculturalism as a good thing as they continued to talk.

Sarah (year 12) for example, despite her advocacy for triculturalism, and her concern about a separate Māori and English route concluded by saying *I think definitely biculturalism is really important.* Amber (year 9), who began by saying that she thought it was inaccurate to describe New Zealand as bicultural, ended up saying that she thought biculturalism was quite important. *I think it would be quite important, like so we don’t really shut someone else out. If we’re bicultural then it’s even.* When I asked her about how she saw the relationship between biculturalism and multiculturalism (which I concede is a complex question to pose to a year 9 student) she was unable to answer.

Adult participant, Nicole, was initially adamant that New Zealand was not bicultural, nor heading towards biculturalism. And yet as she continued to speak she made reference to a future in which she imagined New Zealand being bicultural. *I’m thinking more about the future and what I would like New Zealand to be like, where it is a more bicultural society and where Māori is more dominant and we can use it every day.* Her use of the word ‘more’ which she uses twice implies that she does think New Zealand is a bicultural society, despite the limits of that
biculturalism. Not only does she acknowledge the existence of biculturalism, she goes on to make a short speech about the importance of biculturalism, especially in New Zealand politics.

I think it’s really important in New Zealand politics to remember that and to be aware of it all the time because it’s an acknowledgment that the dominant way of doing things isn’t the only way and that in New Zealand there is another way and it’s been here much longer and that those people have a right or New Zealanders have a right to explore that frame of knowledge or that sort of; those tikanga\textsuperscript{25} to make policies and laws and decisions.

The irony here is that if New Zealand as Nicole claimed, was not bicultural, at least in the imaginary of public institutions, she would not be able to make this speech. Quite rightly, Nicole stated that biculturalism is an ideology and in this part of her response she articulates some of the key beliefs which constitute the ideology.

Faith

Overall, participant responses on the topic of biculturalism frequently revealed individuals to be in a state of stuttering or awkwardness when it came to making sense of their understanding of the word, their lived experiences and their attitudes towards the Māori language. There was however one participant who demonstrated a state of faith in relation to the concept of biculturalism.

Jess (adult) was able to very clearly articulate both a comprehensive explanation of biculturalism and her support for the concept. At the time of interviews Jess was working as a social worker for a public health institution. Her response demonstrates a state of faith, she does not challenge or doubt any part of the dominant narrative that legitimates biculturalism and in fact she can reproduce the narrative with ease:

I think it’s understanding two cultures and being able to operate comfortably within either and that doesn’t just mean the language, that means like world view. Alongside that I also think in terms of linking that to the Treaty. I think there’s a responsibility of active protection, and particularly in this work here, being bicultural I understand that this place is a mainstream organisation so in talking with Māori whanau I would understand that it’s a shift in culture, not for all of them but a lot of them to come here - so putting in an extra effort to engage them,

\textsuperscript{25} Māori customs (my translation).
understanding that there are two cultures and that we can try and be as bicultural as we can but still it's mostly white faces here. That’s my understanding of it.

Institutions are conceptualised here as the creation of a dominant, western, ‘white’ tradition which is culturally foreign or strange for a lot of Māori. For Jess, biculturalism is about accepting and acknowledging this fact. I wanted to hear from Jess what she thought about the concept of multiculturalism, given she was living and working in Auckland which is a very ethnically diverse city. She was very clear that biculturalism had to come first. Because Māori were here first and it’s respectful - and you know like multiculturalism is important but how can you have that if you don’t have biculturalism?

Again, this is one of the very common arguments made when the issue of biculturalism versus multiculturalism is raised. Chapter three briefly traced the outline of this vexing issue caused by the multiethnic nature of New Zealand’s population. The New Zealand Curriculum attempts to accommodate biculturalism by acknowledging “the bicultural foundations of Aotearoa New Zealand” while also claiming that it reflects “New Zealand’s cultural diversity and values the histories and traditions of all its people” (Ministry of Education, 2007, p. 9). This policy narrative thus suggests that both ‘-isms’ can be accommodated without difficulty. I asked Jess how she viewed the relationship between biculturalism and multiculturalism and she replied:

I think the whole thing of seeing different cultures is understanding parts about what they do and respecting each other and knowing differences and not assuming that they’re the same while also acknowledging similarities. If you can do that, between Māori and pākehā when there’s all this historical and political crap that goes on, those lessons can be applied in a slightly different way in terms of a multicultural society.

What is interesting here is that Jess is able to state a position without stuttering or awkwardness. The detail of how the lessons of biculturalism can be applied in a slightly different way to a multicultural society is not given, but rather the idea that one contributes or strengthens the other is accepted as a simple truth.

Concluding comments

I have argued in this thesis that bicultural education policy is to a large extent a symbolic policy in that the work the policy does is to help naturalise a particular view of the world in which a partnership exists between two distinct groups - Māori and pākehā. I have explained the ‘stutter’
explored in this chapter as the result of different interpretations or understandings among the participants of the meaning of the term biculturalism. The difficulty that arises from a policy that is symbolic such as this one, is that there is no shared understanding of the meaning of the symbol when you try to dig down to the level of detail and practice. Participants had very positive attitudes towards Māori language and generally believed that Māori language is an important part of Māori culture and should be valued and respected. To lose it would be sad, heartbreaking even and not fair. In relation to their attitudes towards Māori language there was a shared narrative that could be described as exemplifying soft or inclusive biculturalism. In this narrative Māori language is viewed as contributing to a unique New Zealand identity as described by Sarah (year 9), and worth repeating. *I think another thing about learning Māori culture and the language is that it makes you feel more like a New Zealander.*

Yet when asked about biculturalism directly, participants had difficulty with the term. As a group they had different understandings of what it meant ranging from not knowing at all, to a sense that it referred to a relationship between Māori and pākehā. The challenge for many of the participants and the cause of a significant ‘stutter’ was the difficulty in reconciling what some of them perceived to be an exclusive dimension of biculturalism with the social reality of New Zealand society. While *The New Zealand Curriculum* claims that it “values the histories and traditions of all its people” (Ministry of Education, 2007, p. 9), it was clear that some of the participants were not sure if biculturalism was appropriate given their experience of the multicultural (multiethnic) nature of New Zealand. The question raised by Celia is important. *Where does it [biculturalism] leave everyone else?*

The ‘stutter’ apparent between attitudes expressed towards the Māori language, which appears to represent deeply internalised values of fairness and inclusiveness, and a view of biculturalism as exclusive, exemplifies the problem of symbolic policy. Bicultural education policy presents the impression of something tangible, but the word bicultural is understood differently by different people. For the participants who understood bicultural as having an exclusive dimension, the concept of biculturalism was problematic and some were actively questioning the legitimacy of the term while simultaneously engaged in Māori language learning and adamant that Māori language is important. These two sets of beliefs appear to sit at odds with one another, and I think it is significant that the participants were operating in a state of stuttering as they discussed their thoughts about both Māori language and biculturalism. Stuttering is the ‘not noticing’ of competing ideologies, and I suggest that it is the ‘not noticing’ of potentially irreconcilable elements that keeps the myth of biculturalism intact. But it is not always possible to remain in a state of faith or stuttering. The following chapter focuses on the experiences of some of the adult
participants. These participants were involved in confronting experiences causing them to really take notice of different attitudes, particularly related to their involvement with Māori language. The next chapter explores the effects of these confronting experiences.
Chapter 11: Leaving Dreamland

*I was just unaware, completely unaware of the baggage associated with it ... I had just been in this dreamland until that point I guess.* (Jordan, adult)

In the previous chapters I have focused on identifying examples from participant responses which illustrate a state of *faith, stuttering, or awkwardness* as participants talked about their experiences, beliefs, and attitudes about the Māori language and biculturalism. I have made connections between their responses and policy narratives relating to biculturalism. In this chapter I consider the effects of sustained or extreme awkwardness which occurs when an individual consciously notices inconsistencies between their experiences and a dominant legitimating narrative. In the previous chapters, examples of awkwardness have tended to be fleeting or momentary in nature, but in the participant narratives I discuss in this chapter the awkwardness is sustained and more difficult to ignore on a conscious level.

One of the key ideas in this thesis is that part of the work that policy does is to both legitimate and sustain an ideology. It does this by influencing norms of behaviour and the way groups view themselves and their relationships with other groups (Shore & Wright, 2011). I have argued that students learning Māori language in mainstream secondary schools are doing so in a policy environment that works to sustain the narrative of the existence of a bicultural partnership between Māori and pākehā. The inclusion of Māori language learning opportunities in schools is justified by reference to the ‘protection’ principle of the Treaty of Waitangi. For schools, offering Māori language learning opportunities can be viewed as evidence of a commitment to biculturalism. In addition schools may perform or enact biculturalism in other tangible ways such as the incorporation of powhiri or other Māori tikanga into school practices. One of the effects of this is that for the group of participants in this study at least, Māori language learning at school appears to be experienced in a depoliticised environment. That is to say, the school-aged participants seemed unaware of different beliefs relating to Māori language education for non-Māori students and did not experience any discomfort as a result of their participation in Māori language education. The experiences of four of the adult participants which are the focus of this chapter illustrate how protective the school environment is in terms of sustaining the myth of harmonious bicultural relationships. This small group of participants experienced quite different attitudes towards their involvement in Māori language than those they had experienced at school. This chapter is a discussion of the effects of those confronting experiences.

Following Gramsci, I have argued that because common sense is the terrain on which the lived consciousness of the masses is formed, it is also the terrain upon which political and social
ideologies must compete. The states of stuttering and awkwardness provide evidence of ideological struggle on this terrain. The state of awkwardness suggests that despite what might appear to be a hegemonic policy environment, it is useful to remember that ideology is not stable. Individuals within a policy environment sometimes ‘answer back’ and question the dominant narrative. While Gramsci’s notion of common sense is that it is an uncritical and largely unconscious way a person perceives the world, I have conceptualised awkwardness as the state which occurs when an individual consciously notices inconsistencies between their experiences and a dominant legitimating narrative. This may only happen fleetingly, or the inconsistency may become more noticeable for longer periods of time demanding some sort of resolution between competing ideas. So what happens at this point? Or to use Jordan’s word, what happens when you leave *dreamland*?

Initially I had assumed that there would be two possible outcomes as a result of this contestation of ideology. Either an individual accepts the dominant ideological narrative and returns to a state of faith in which there is correspondence between this narrative and his or her perception of the world. I had thought that the alternative to this state of faith would be an increasingly conscious contestation of the dominant narrative. Shore and Wright (2011) provide a description of several stages in a process of contestation which can eventually lead to a policy losing its authoritative and hegemonic power. It is worth mentioning again here what those stages are. First, intended policy subjects become cognisant of the processes of subjection occurring around them. Second, they refuse to accept this image of their subject position and its corresponding norms of behaviour, and finally they become aware that others share their concerns and mobilise to contest the policy collectively. In the ideological battle on the terrain of common sense, I thus assumed only two outcomes for an ideology attempting to defend its hegemonic status; victory (in the form of a state of faith) or loss (collective contestation of a policy).

What I discovered as I was looking at the data from my adult participants was that there is at least one other possible outcome, that of withdrawal. It seemed that for some of the participants, when faced with confronting experiences which meant that they could no longer ignore their awareness of competing narratives, they found a way to withdraw from the issue. They did this by silencing themselves, or by creating a narrative of somehow being neutral in a highly politicised environment. In many ways I happened upon this discovery as I wasn’t looking beyond what I consider to be the ‘pre-conscious contestation state’ as I considered my participant data. However, the following stories that my participants shared seemed too important to omit, even though initially I was not sure how to make sense of what these stories illustrated in terms of ideological processes. It became apparent that I needed to consider another
alternative to a return to faith or conscious contestation as outcomes for ideological struggles, and enabled me to understand the data differently.

Before I begin discussing these stories or narratives I want to signal a slight change in method in this section. Whereas in the previous chapters I have organised the data around themes and used examples from a pool of participant responses to illustrate states of awareness in relation to a dominant ideological narrative, here I organise my discussion around each adult participant who appear to be demonstrating some sort of withdrawal. This is because each participant ‘withdraws’ differently and the manner of their withdrawal is better understood within the context of their individual experience and narrative. Consequently I include here longer excerpts of interview responses and include my own observations on a person by person basis.

**Jordan**

Jordan talked about her experience of completing a Māori Resource Management paper at university with a lecturer whom Jordan referred to as an activist. This is how Jordan began her story:

> That was actually a huge learning curve for me, because up until now I’d learnt Māori sort of as an interest subject and because I’ve got an interest in sort of early Māori, you know, contact Māori and like pre-European Māori culture and stuff. I’ve never really been involved in the debate of the twentieth century and twenty first century. So she was just all against the foreshore and seabed and all this stuff that’s affecting Māori today that I just hadn’t been aware of. I suddenly felt so ignorant, because I had been quite sheltered until that point. So I took that paper and felt a bit overwhelmed, but I continued it.

Two things strike me about this part of Jordan’s narrative. The first is her acknowledgement that she had been quite sheltered in the past. Jordan learnt Māori throughout secondary school, and I have suggested that one of the ways biculturalism education policy influences the way students experience Māori language in schools is that it appears depoliticised. Her sheltered experience of Māori language learning in school, and her ignorance of contemporary debates relating to Māori issues, meant that up until taking this course she had not had to resolve any confronting ideas. The sudden exposure to a very different narrative about the world was obviously difficult for Jordan:
I just remember feeling overwhelmed at the time - it was more just how completely in the dark I’d been this whole time. Because I had never sought that knowledge and had never been involved in this activist environment. And suddenly all these apparent sort of - what’s the word - wrongs were done by the pākehā to the Māori people and suddenly I was made aware of all these terrible things that had happened and she was incredibly biased. If you wrote an essay that didn’t agree with what she said, be prepared to burn it. You know what I mean?

Jordan’s image of being completely in the dark ... this whole time is an apt description of the way ideology influences the way we perceive the world. Up until this point in time, Jordan seemed to be unaware of the narrative of the colonisation of Māori by pākehā and the effects of that narrative on individuals. It appears as though this narrative caused the lecturer to behave in ways that led to Jordan describing her as an activist (she didn’t elaborate her reasons for referring to her lecturer this way). What Jordan clearly understood was that her lecturer was convinced by the ‘rightness’ of her own narrative, and as a result, was incredibly biased to the point where Jordan felt she needed to support the ideological positioning of her lecturer so as not to fail the course.

Returning to the point I made a little earlier, Jordan had learnt Māori in what she had experienced as a very different environment:

I had learnt Māori to learn Māori. And I enjoyed the cultural elements of it, the tikanga and stuff like that, but I’d never, never tried to, well not that I hadn’t tried, I was just unaware, completely unaware of the baggage associated with it, that I just yeah I just had been in this dreamland until that point I guess.

I was interested in how Jordan felt about her knowledge of Māori language in this much more politicised environment and asked her to talk a little bit more about that. It is here that we start to see the way Jordan begins to withdraw from the issue. Clearly Jordan imagines this particular lecturer could have strong negative opinions about a pākehā learning Māori, so she removes herself from possible confrontation. She probably had her own opinions about these colonializing pākehā learning her language. But that was her own issue and I just sort of kept away from it.

I didn’t get the opportunity to ask Jordan how she kept away from the issue, so here I have to guess she probably silenced herself, that is to say, it seems unlikely that she would have volunteered information about her knowledge of Māori language with this lecturer, or engaged in
discussions about whether pākehā should be learning Māori. The other thing she appeared to do on a sub-conscious or common-sense level, was resolve any ideological conflict she was experiencing by identifying the issue as belonging to someone else, thereby withdrawing herself from the site of contestation.

Jordan referred to this strategy of withdrawal, although she did not identify it as a conscious strategy. I asked her how the experience with her lecturer affected her, and she was positive in her response, saying that doing the paper had made her much more conscious of, and interested in Māori issues. However, she was very clear that she wasn’t interested in taking sides. That said, I wouldn’t get into the debate myself probably because it’s just not my thing. A little later on, as she was talking, she repeated the same idea, saying that she kept away from Māori issues - it’s just not my area of expertise - I feel like it’s not my fight.

When I interviewed Jordan she was in the process of moving as she was about to start a new job. She told me that she could not find many opportunities to use Māori language and had been thinking of enrolling in a Māori language course at Te Wānanga26 saying that she didn’t need the lessons any more, [just] the oral contact. When I thought about Jordan’s non-existent opportunities to use Māori language, and her belief that the Māori language was in good health with all these kids coming through kura kaupapa, you know it’s not going to die, I could see how these things might work together to enable her to stay away from, or remain withdrawn from the issue of who can rightfully use Māori language. As a pākehā who is able to communicate reasonably well in the Māori language, I recognised Jordan as a participant for whom this question might be very pressing. However, my sense from Jordan was just the opposite, that for her, it simply wasn’t her fight.

Celia

Celia learnt Māori language as a subject for the five years of her secondary education. After completing her teaching qualification during which time she specialised in Māori medium education, she started teaching in a bilingual unit at a primary school. Her tertiary education and career choice have meant that, unlike Jordan, she has been unable to distance herself from competing ideologies which influence beliefs about who should be using, and in her case, teaching Māori language. At times Celia has been directly confronted by beliefs that differ from her own. A child in her class saying to her “my mum says you’re not Māori” was one such experience. She also recounted memories of her time studying at university where she

---

26 A Māori tertiary institution (my translation). Jordan did not identify which one.
experienced something similar. Celia recalls that she was aware of a range of attitudes amongst her classmates:

Celia: *When I studied at university they’d tease themselves and say “oh man you can speak more Māori than me and I’m Māori and you’re not”.*

Interviewer: *How did that make you feel?*

Celia: *It made me feel like, I don’t know. I just felt like it’s not my fault I know your language and you don’t ... I think I felt a lot of things and I didn’t quite understand whether or not they were serious or how serious they were with that comment. Or whether they hated me because of it, or ‘how dare you learn my language’.*

Interviewer: *Did you ever discuss that with anyone or raise it with anyone? Like, did you ever try and surface that concern?*

Celia: *No I didn’t because I thought that it wasn’t my problem, it was not my thing to surface. I think there is some similarity here with Jordan’s experiences and response. Neither of these women, when confronted with attitudes generated by a competing ideology, challenges nor contests that ideology. They don’t in fact ‘answer back’. Instead what they appear to do is withdraw, locating the problem elsewhere. Jordan, you may recall, says it’s not my fight, while here Celia says it wasn’t my problem, it was not my thing to surface. They do not however, withdraw in terms of their continued interest in using Māori language. To do so would suggest that the alternative ideology that they are confronted with achieves dominance. Instead they seem to resolve the tension for themselves by locating the struggle elsewhere, re-creating their understanding of their own position as somehow neutral. In addition, they silence themselves. Celia and Jordan do not vocalise their thoughts despite being aware that there is an issue or tension that they sense but which isn’t being spoken about. Celia described her experience of this awareness in her time as a bilingual teacher. It hasn’t been as bad as I thought it would be. No-one has actually said to me “don’t speak Māori you’re not Māori”. But sometimes I do – often I have felt that.*

Self-silencing seemed to be a strategy that several of the participants employed as a way of withdrawing from any debate or contestation. Despite the fact that she teaches in a bilingual unit, when I asked Celia about how comfortable she felt letting people know that she could speak Māori, she replied, *it’s not information about myself that I would easily volunteer.*
Jess had less to say about this issue because in her workplace (a public health institution) she feels very encouraged to incorporate her knowledge of Māori language and culture into her daily practice. However, even Jess seemed to have a certain reluctance to share this information about herself beyond the safety of her workplace.

*I guess it’s unusual for pākehā to know some Māori language and so it’s a point of difference between me and most other people ... I’m not sure if that would be in my top 10 things of how I’d describe myself.*

It is unusual for pākehā to know some Māori language beyond some familiar words and phrases. How unusual exactly is hard to ascertain. Despite the reference to census data which indicated a decrease of non-Māori speakers of the Māori language in the Wai 262 report (Waitangi Tribunal, 2011), I was unable to find this information published on the Statistics New Zealand website (Statistics New Zealand, 2013). When I made enquiries, I was informed by the information officer that she too was unable to see the data published on the website (Joanne Alexander, personal communication, 22 July, 2013). Jess made the above comment quite lightly and framed it using the idea of top 10 ways to describe herself. However, this comment stood out for me because earlier in the interview Jess had talked about how she felt proud that she was learning Māori when she was at school. Now, as an adult, it appears to be information that she is less ready to share about herself.

**Amanda**

A theme that emerged from the interview data which I mentioned earlier in this chapter is the sense that learning Māori language at school for many of the students was a comfortable, inclusive and in many ways depoliticised experience. Amanda recalls that learning Māori at school for her was a very positive experience:

*I think it actually influenced other subjects that I did because I was achieving so well it enabled me to feel more confident and more successful in other areas. [It gave me] a sense of belonging as well and a sense that my identity was important.*

Amanda wanted to continue learning Māori so when she returned from travelling overseas to attend university she enrolled in a Māori language immersion programme at the University of Waikato. She recalls that at university her sense of belonging changed a bit. When I asked in what way, she replied that she felt that she belonged less. She experienced feeling discomfort as she studied which one day culminated in a directly confrontational interaction:
The most significant point was when I was shouted at for speaking English. This woman who obviously had some really negative experiences with learning te reo and I guess to do with her identity as Māori from pākehā, I’m not really sure and she just shouted at me “kaua e kōrero Pākehā mai” [don’t speak in Pākehā/English to me - my translation], and I was like “oh crap” and I thought well, I’ve got two choices, I could cry, get all upset and never talk to her again, or actually if I sit next to her and only speak Māori to her and then she’ll get to know who I am and I can actually learn something from her which is what I did and when I approached her I think in my third year saying that I wanted to teach Māori did she approve, she thought it was great.

Unlike Jordan and Celia, who also experienced moments of confrontation with people who held different attitudes towards non-Māori engagement with Māori language, Amanda was unable to distance herself from the sense of being part of the confrontation. In Jordan’s case, although she was aware of possible negative attitudes, those attitudes were not articulated or directed at her personally. In Celia’s case, once it was a child repeating a parent’s comments and at other times it was passed off as a joke amongst her classmates. In these situations Jordan and Celia appeared to be able to distance themselves by convincing themselves that it wasn’t their fight or that it wasn’t their thing to surface.

In this case Amanda is unable to avoid the knowledge that the attitude is directed at her personally. Again we see a kind of silencing effect. Amanda does not express her feelings of being upset. She most certainly does not try to explore the reason for this attack with the person, although in her own thoughts she hypothesises that the woman obviously had some really negative experiences with learning te reo and I guess to do with her identity as Māori from pākehā. What Amanda chooses to do instead is to defer to this woman’s angry demand. She sits beside the woman in the future and only speaks Māori to her. Finally, after some time has passed, she seeks approval from the woman for her decision to become a Māori language teacher and gains it.

Amanda, like Celia, wants to continue with her engagement with Māori language and this means that for both women these types of confrontations are likely to be experienced again from time to time. It is thus plausible to hypothesise that these women have developed this strategy of withdrawing, or silencing themselves as a way of decreasing the possible frequency of confronting experiences. Amanda, who at the time of interviews, was enrolled in a teacher training programme, described how her earlier experience has affected her:
This year now I’m studying again and because of those experiences in the past I don’t talk about my identity and I had to almost pretend that I am Ngai Tahu. I don’t say I’m Ngai Tahu, I say I’m from Southland and they assume [I’m Māori].

This is not something she feels especially proud of, acknowledging that it doesn’t fully sit right with me. By not acknowledging her ethnicity when she is in schools, she thinks it does a disservice to the pākehā and to the non-Māori in your class because they lose out on that role modelling. Despite her commitment to Māori language and her support for biculturalism, or perhaps because of it, Amanda chooses to silence herself. Her withdrawal from the contestation between two competing ideologies enables her to continue with a course of action that she wants to follow while minimising the likelihood of open confrontation.

Nicole

Nicole had a slightly different strategy from the other adult participants I have discussed and at first I wondered about including her in this section. I have been exploring the idea of participants ‘withdrawing’ from awareness of ideological contestation by convincing themselves the problem they have become aware of is not a problem that they need to be personally involved in. In addition, they may employ the strategy of self-silencing in order to avoid confronting experiences. At first glance, Nicole seemed to be the one participant who had not experienced any discomfort or tension relating to her involvement with Māori language learning at university. However, as I thought more about her comments I felt more and more that she was aware of ideological contestation, but that she was able to close herself off from the effects of that contestation. I wondered if this was also a kind of withdrawal in that, while being aware on some level of contestation, she was able to withdraw emotionally, thereby avoiding experiencing any discomfort or tension. Nicole alluded to this ability early in the interview. It could be a bit about my personality type as well. I don’t really think I’m that good at picking up on if other people are judgemental of me and my decisions. Further on when she was talking more about her experiences at university she repeated the description of herself as insensitive to that sort of thing:

I was speaking to a lady last year whose daughter was going to Auckland and was doing Māori but she was finding it hard and she asked me, “did you find the people sort of funny towards you?” And I said “no, I only did one reo paper at Auckland”. But again I think I’m kind of insensitive to that sort of thing.
It was this comment that made me realise that Nicole was aware of ideological contestation. Even if she claimed to have no personal experience of it herself, it had been brought to her attention by someone else’s experience. Her strategy for coping with this contestation appears to have been making herself ‘insensitive’ to it, or ‘not noticing’, thereby withdrawing herself from taking an active role in the contest.

Nicole has aspirations of a career in politics and during her time at university took papers which enhanced her understanding of New Zealand history and politics. Consequently she had considerable knowledge of various narratives relating to colonisation and biculturalism. I was very curious to hear how she resolved her knowledge of New Zealand’s colonial history - in particular the narrative about Māori language loss, and her own pākehā identity. Nicole was very clear about her feelings. *I don’t feel guilty about [the past]. Perhaps because I’m doing my part to rectify it. I don’t know if I would feel differently if I hadn’t had an opportunity to learn Māori.*

I do not wish to over-attribute meaning to Nicole’s comments especially as this notion of ‘withdrawing’ was not something I was aware of during the interviewing process. I think however, in the light of her other comments, we may be able to read this as further evidence of Nicole’s ability to emotionally distance herself from the possibility of ideological contestation. She was firm and clear in her statement that she doesn’t feel guilty. Without further evidence it is difficult to know whether in this case a particular ideological battle has been won, or whether she has merely successfully found a way to remain withdrawn from the contest on the terrain of consciousness.

**Withdrawal and silence**

What the adult participants in this section appear to have in common is that when they left their secondary school environment, which was influenced by a particular interpretation of bicultural ideology, they experienced environments influenced by different ideologies. For some this resulted in quite confronting experiences. To use Jordan’s phrase, it was like *leaving dreamland* and waking up in a less comfortable place.

While chapters eight to ten are concerned with exploring and theorising how ideological contestation occurs on the terrain of common sense, this chapter has explored one of the outcomes of this contestation. As I noted at the beginning of the chapter, I initially assumed that at some point in the process of ideological contestation one of two outcomes would occur for individuals. Either an ideology would successfully defend or assert its hegemonic status and the
individual would return to a state of faith, or a counter-ideology would emerge and an individual would begin to actively and consciously contest the old ideology.

**Concluding comments**

This thesis did not set out to investigate this aspect of ideological processes, but there appeared to be sufficient evidence in the interview data to suggest that in the case of bicultural ideology and its relationship with questions of who can rightfully use the Māori language, there is another outcome. The responses given by the participants in the previous section suggest that when they experienced events which meant that they could no longer ignore their awareness of competing narratives, they found a way to withdraw from the ‘contest’. They did this by silencing themselves, or by dissociating themselves from the competing ideologies. Or, they created a narrative of somehow being ‘neutral’ in a highly politicised environment. The claim that the issue wasn’t theirs was repeated by some of the participants, even though by their very involvement with the Māori language, they are in fact deeply entangled in the ideological struggle. On the terrain of common sense however, this strategy of silence and of dissociation seems to offer an alternative to an acceptance of a dominant narrative they had experienced, which implies Māori language is for Māori people. A return to a state of faith, that is, a state of congruence between their own beliefs and that narrative, might necessitate a withdrawal from their involvement with Māori language. The alternative, sustained awkwardness, might lead to conscious and audible contestation. This might have a similar outcome, in that it could make it untenable for the individual to continue being involved with Māori language. Understood this way, the strategy of silence and/or dissociation offers an effective means of remaining involved with Māori language, while largely avoiding tension or confrontation.

This chapter concludes the analysis of interview data. The data has served the purpose of illustrating the effects of the way biculturalism policy is understood and enacted in practice. I have argued that policy materialises ideology through a number of institutional practices and this in turn influences the way students make sense of the world, and in particular the way they perceive Māori culture and the use of Māori language. The following chapter integrates the three stages of the critical policy methodology I have employed and draws some conclusions about what the study has revealed.
Chapter 12: Discussion

This study has provided an explanation of the lack of clarity surrounding the purpose of Māori language education in mainstream secondary schools for non-Māori students. It has theorised the way that changing or evolving ideologies relating to biculturalism affect the way different groups view the use of Māori language by non-Māori. Māori language education for Māori learners has the clearly articulated purpose in policy statements of strengthening Māori identity as Māori, but the purpose of learning Māori for other groups of learners is ambiguous. This ambiguity is understood by considering the ideological dominance of biculturalism in education, and the way that Māori language education policy as symbolic policy, works to support this dominant position.

The early chapters of the thesis identified a number of significant social forces that coalesced enabling the ideology of biculturalism to emerge. These include the influence of cultural theory in New Zealand anthropology departments and in education in particular (Openshaw, 2006; Webster, 1998), the global turn from class-based politics to identity politics (Friedman, 1994; Hobsbawm, 1996; Rata, 1996), and the problem facing the government of an increasingly radical Māori protest movement which was especially apparent after the Māori Land March of 1975 and the occupations at Bastion Point and Raglan in 1977-78 (Edwards & Moore, 2009; Poata-Smith, 1996). Gramsci’s notion of ideology as a synthesis which takes into account the unique historical traditions of a nation and the contributions made by diverse social movements which become allied to form the hegemonic group is a useful theoretical tool to explain the emergence of biculturalism. The shift in state ideology under the Fourth Labour Government can be understood as an attempt to foster social harmony and cohesion between Māori and non-Māori. It was also partly a response to the rise of new social movements and the turn from class politics to identity politics. In addition by co-opting radicals into the system, the state was able to restrain Māori radicalism (Edwards & Moore, 2009; Poata-Smith, 1996).

The early part of the thesis thus described the political and economic movements which led to the emergence of bicultural ideology. This ideology became institutionalised through the development of public policy. Once these policies were created, they were then able to be put to work by policy activists, materialising ideology in practice. However, it would be a mistake to overlook the fragility of this process. Although Gramsci (1971) claims that the “cement” (p. 328) that holds alliances together, enabling the ascendance of a hegemonic group, is mutual support for a particular ideology, he also recognised the fragility of these alliances. They are, in Gramscian terms characterised by a “continuous process of formation and superseding of
unstable equilibria” (Gramsci, 1971, p. 182). This means that policy, once created, cannot be confident of achieving its intended purpose. Contestation continues to occur as both institutions and groups engage with policy in different sites where those policies are interpreted and enacted. The contestation is the result of different actors or institutions wanting to make particular ideas ‘stick’. In addition, as I have argued in chapter seven, and what was evident in the interview data, policy subjects themselves actively engage with policy narratives. They do this through either contestation or support for a way of thinking about the world as they come into contact with the ideas that policy narratives contain.

The previous four chapters have analysed the interview material collected as part of this study. The purpose of including this data in the study has been to show the effects of the ambiguity in education policy relating to the purpose of Māori language education for non-Māori on learners’ perceptions about both Māori culture and Māori language. In the earlier chapters of the thesis I have theorised that evolving understandings of biculturalism influence the way different groups view the purpose of Māori language education. The ambiguity evident in policy can be understood as the result of an attempt to accommodate a number of different interests and views relating to Māori language use. However, an understanding of the ambiguity evident in policy can be deepened by further considering the symbolic nature of the policy itself.

Māori language education policy insofar as it relates to non-Māori learners is an example of symbolic policy. While symbolic policies carry little or no commitment to actual implementation and are not usually accompanied by any significant funding they can have powerful ideological effects. The interview data in this study provides empirical evidence of the effects of Māori language education policy. Because Māori language is very much a symbol of Māori culture, there is an important relationship between Māori language and the ideology of biculturalism in education. I propose that the primary purpose of Māori language learning for non-Māori language learners is not the development of communication skills but rather a means of ensuring that the ideology of biculturalism remains hegemonic.

Chapters three and four have traced the development of the ideology of biculturalism and its institutionalisation into the public sector via policy. In many cases these policies have significant material effects, and this includes bicultural education policy in the education sector. The successful 1986 claim made to the Waitangi Tribunal which established the Māori language as a taonga (a valued possession), and as such, guaranteed protection by the Treaty of Waitangi, had significant effects on the provision of Māori language education in schools and became the justifying ideology for the establishment of separate education system - kura kaupapa Māori. In
addition it increased pressure on schools to provide Māori language education programmes in schools. Section 61.3 of The Education Act 1989 requires that school charters contain a section that includes “the aim of ensuring that all reasonable steps are taken to provide instruction in tikanga Māori [Māori culture] and te reo Māori [the Māori language] for full-time students whose parents ask for it” (my translations).

In addition to the section quoted above which must be included in a school charter, section 61.3 states that the following also needs to be included in school charters; “the aim of developing, for the school, policies and practices that reflect New Zealand’s cultural diversity and the unique position of the Māori culture”. Writing school-based policies that “reflect the unique position of the Māori culture” is a considerable challenge because it is difficult to ascertain what that statement means. Consequently, in my professional experience as a secondary school teacher of Māori language, there is a tendency for schools to create policy statements which mirror statements made in the New Zealand curriculum which, for example, ‘acknowledge the bicultural foundations of Aotearoa/New Zealand’ or, ‘acknowledge the principles of the Treaty of Waitangi’. These kinds of policy statements are symbolic. They are vague and abstract and are difficult to implement in practice. While auditing technologies ask schools to provide evidence of bicultural practices, what that evidence might look like is ill-defined. ERO indicators for “[i]ncluding Māori students and whānau27” (which is related to the Treaty principle of participation) include “bi-cultural values are fostered” and “[s]tudents have opportunities to engage in cultural activities such as kapahaka, Ngā Manu Kōrero28”. Possible sources of evidence of these indicators include “[g]roup discussions, assemblies, Kawa29 eg. pōwhiri30, whānau feedback” (p. 44).

Māori language education programmes are hence valuable for schools when responding to auditing technologies, because they are one of the few tangible things that schools can present as evidence in order to demonstrate that they are supporting biculturalism and/or acknowledging the principles of the Treaty of Waitangi. This idea is reflected in the ERO publication Evaluation Indicators for School Reviews. Under the heading “[t]eaching to promote te reo and bicultural awareness” the single example indicator given is “all students have opportunities to increase their understanding of te reo and tikanga” (p. 25). There is a clear link articulated here between Māori language learning and the promotion of bicultural awareness. I have argued that Māori

27 Family (my translation).
28 The name of a national Māori language speech competition.
29 Marae protocol (my translation). A marae is a group of buildings and the surrounding space where traditional Māori ceremonies and meetings occur.
30 A formal ceremony of welcome that usually takes place on a marae.
language education policy operates as the symbolic policy which is representative of the larger symbolic policy it is nested within - that of biculturalism.

**The function of symbolic policy**

Symbolic policies can have a strategic function, legitimating a particular political view (Rein, 1983). In this case, bicultural education policy, and Māori language education policy are symbolic policies with considerable power. Their power lies in their ability to sustain and give substance to the educational myth of biculturalism. Throughout the thesis I have referred to the role of myth in society. Beeby’s (1986) notion of the educational myth which I described in chapter one, is a particularly apt way of conceptualising biculturalism. Beeby suggests that an educational myth gives purpose and direction to the educational endeavour. An educational myth is loosely defined, vaguely expressed and not fully attainable, but capable nonetheless of “powerfully affecting political and administrative decisions on education” (Beeby, 1986, p. 53).

Biculturalism refers to a set of ideas, which are within limits, interpreted in different ways by different groups. As Beeby points out, one of the benefits of an educational myth is that it is able to convey a sense of direction or common purpose while at the same time allowing enough space for different people to interpret the myth differently within reasonable limits. This enables a sort of fragile or “unstable equilibria” (Gramsci, 1971, p. 182), while maintaining an overall sense of social cohesion. It is generally agreed that national education systems fulfil a number of key functions and one of those functions to contribute to social cohesion. A shared myth has the capacity to contribute to this function because the social function of myth is to bind groups together thereby enabling social consensus (Halpern, 1961).

The myth of biculturalism has its origins in the discourse of social justice as described in chapter three. Beeby’s reflection on the great education myths of New Zealand describes how the second myth - the education of the whole child, “rode in on the back of the third myth” - that no child should continually fail in the education system, and “the two fused to become a powerful force in education for 30 years or more” (Beeby, 1986, p. 55). Beeby also refers to then Director-General of Education, Bill Renwick’s, assertion that equality of opportunity was no longer adequate for the conditions of the time and that the aim should be for equity, or equality of outcome. The myth of equity did in time came into its own and it is reasonable to suggest that the myth of biculturalism rode in on the back of the equity myth – fusing together in much the same way that Beeby describes the preceding myths. If we pause here to think of the way Gramsci considered ideology, as not disappearing entirely, but rather as containing durable elements which are
subsumed within later ideology, it is possible to argue that the power of biculturalism, in its mythical form, is that it contains values which have endured in the New Zealand education system, like equality, equity and justice. These shared values or aspirations contribute to a shared sense of purpose fulfilling their function as social bindings.

The educational myth of biculturalism contributes in another way to social cohesion by strengthening a sense of a New Zealand identity. The principles of the Treaty of Waitangi and the bicultural foundations of New Zealand are acknowledged as part of a group of principles in the New Zealand Curriculum which “embody beliefs about what is important and desirable in school curriculum – nationally and locally” (Ministry of Education, 2007, p. 9). Biculturalism is something uniquely New Zealand in flavour and character, and its inclusion in the New Zealand Curriculum contributes towards a curriculum which aims to affirm “New Zealand’s unique identity” (p. 9). The significance of education in perpetuating and sustaining a sense of belongingness to the nation has been emphasised by both Eric Hobsbawm in Nations and Nationalism Since 1780 (1992) and Anthony Smith in National Identity (1991). Kassimeris and Vyronides (2012) argue that, even now in the era of globalisation, which has created “an environment which operates in an eroding fashion for the nation-state” it remains evident that “national countries still treat education as an ideological tool for promoting nationalist specific goals of national unity, identity and cohesion” (p. 6).

However, it is important to remember the ideological underpinnings of myth. For Roland Barthes, a myth is a cultural product, and as such it has meaning conditioned by ideology (Leak, 1994). The ideological underpinning of a myth can be easy to overlook especially if the myth is powerfully sustained. In a useful discussion of myth and ideology, Halpern (1961) distinguishes between the two by looking carefully at the different social functions of each:

The social function of myth is to bind together social groups as wholes, or in other words, to establish a social consensus. The social function of ideology is to segregate and serve special interests within societies in the competition of debate. (p. 137)

Barthes’ conception of a myth as a cultural product conditioned by ideology helps explain the ambiguity evident in education policy when trying to identify the purpose of Māori language education for non-Māori learners. In its capacity as a myth, biculturalism needs to appear to include the interests and aspirations of as many people as possible. As a symbol of biculturalism there is evidence to suggest that Māori language is generally regarded positively among non-
Māori. The *Health of the Māori Language in 2006* survey reported continued increases in the value placed on the Māori language by both the Māori and non-Māori populations, and noted “that a significant majority of New Zealanders appreciate the contribution of the Māori language to New Zealand’s social fabric” (Te Puni Kōkiri, 2008, p. 33).

However biculturalism is also a powerful ideology, and ideology, as Halpern (1961) argues, functions to separate and distinguish between groups in order to serve special interests within society. Its mythical or mystical qualities tend to obscure this from people’s everyday understandings or common sense understanding. Terry Eagleton (2007) explains this process as follows:

A dominant power may legitimate itself by *promoting* beliefs and values congenial to it; *naturalizing* and *universalizing* such beliefs as to render them self-evident and apparently inevitable; *denigrating* ideas which might challenge it; *excluding* rival forms of thought, perhaps by some unspoken but systematic logic; and *obscuring* social reality in ways convenient to itself. Such ‘mystification’, as it is commonly known, frequently takes the form of masking or suppressing social conflicts from which arises the conception of ideology as an imaginary resolution of real contradictions. (pp. 5-6, emphases in original)

The notion of two separate and distinct ethnic groups which exist in a relationship of partnership underpins the ideology of biculturalism. Ability in Māori language can be viewed as an important marker of ethnic identity. As such Māori language ability can contribute towards strengthening a Māori ethnic identity, in turn strengthening boundaries between Māori and other groups. Articulating the purpose of Māori language education for non-Māori learners in policy thus presents a problem. Māori language needs to appear inclusive of and relevant to all students within the education system (or in the very least not operating in a conspicuously exclusive manner) in order to sustain the educational myth of biculturalism, while at the same time operating to strengthen the ethnic identity of Māori.

The problem is solved by creating a symbolic policy as far as it relates to non-Māori learners. The purpose of the policy, and indeed Māori language education itself for this group, is to sustain the powerful myth of biculturalism. It does this by working to enhancing a view of Māori people as ethnically and culturally distinct. Policy statements imply that this distinctiveness exists, for example, *The New Zealand Curriculum* claims that “[b]y learning te reo and becoming increasingly familiar with tikanga ... non-Māori journey towards shared cultural understandings”
In other words, through learning Māori language and customs it is implied that non-Māori may be able to increase their understanding of a distinctly different ethnic and cultural group to their own.

The creation of a symbolic policy enables a means of both acknowledging non-Māori learners conveying a sense of inclusion, and contributing to the sustenance of the myth of biculturalism by referring to the existence of an ethnically and culturally distinct group called Māori. It is symbolic because it has little to offer in terms of commitment to implementation. Beyond the policy statements themselves it is hard to find evidence of whether it matters or not if non-Māori are involved in Māori language education. Reports about the health and well-being of the Māori language in wider New Zealand society are almost entirely focused on the use of Māori language by Māori people (see for example Te Puni Kōkiri, 1998, 2002b; Te Puni Kōkiri, 2008; Waitangi Tribunal, 2011). This is mirrored by minimal reporting by the Ministry of Education about the involvement of non-Māori in Māori language education in comparison to the amount of data available about the involvement of Māori students which was discussed in chapters one and two. There are no goal statements to be found in policy documents which refer to increasing the participation of non-Māori in Māori language learning.

Symbolic policies, despite their vague and abstract goal statements (Rizvi & Lingard, 2010), are nonetheless potentially very powerful. In the case of Māori language education policy, nested within bicultural education policy (both of which I have argued are largely symbolic in relation to non-Māori students) the policies have powerful effects. The interview data that forms part of this study has enabled us to observe some of these effects on a particular group of learners. From an anthropology of policy perspective an important part of the work that policy does is to influence relationships between individuals and groups. I argue that this is primarily the function of symbolic policy in this case. In terms of bicultural education policy outcomes that might be evaluated, there are very few. However, the empirical data provides evidence that symbolic policy does considerable work legitimating the educational myth of biculturalism, and in doing so sustains the hegemonic status of the ideology of biculturalism. Policy institutionalises a particular world view and institutional practices are then able to shape perceptions, values and behaviour (Wright, 1998). In this way, certain understandings become embedded into the everyday common sense perceptions of people within a policy environment.
The effects of symbolic policy

The empirical part of this study investigated the experiences of non-Māori students learning Māori language in the policy environment described in the early chapters of the thesis. The experiences of the participants help us gain insight into the way they engage with policy narratives and support the claim that Māori language policy is symbolic as far as it relates to non-Māori language learners. The inclusion of a group of adults who learnt Māori language in mainstream secondary schools gives some sense of the environment beyond school and the effect of a different environment on the participants’ perceptions and understandings.

Several themes, which support my claim that Māori language policy for non-Māori is a symbolic policy which works successfully to sustain the educational myth of biculturalism, came through clearly in the interview material. The first was that for the participants in this study, involvement in Māori language learning appears to have very little to do with a desire to communicate in Māori. It seems unusual amongst a group of language learners to find an almost complete absence of references to a desire to learn Māori language in order to be able to communicate in Māori. This supports the assertion I made at the beginning of the chapter – that the purpose of Māori language learning for non-Māori is to ensure that the hegemonic ideology of biculturalism remains dominant, particularly because none of the participants appeared to notice this absence. Rather than working to promote the use of Māori language among Māori language learners, the existence of Māori language education programmes in schools and the inclusion of non-Māori students in these programmes works instead to support and sustain a ‘Māori as ethnically and culturally distinct’ narrative.

This is the dominant narrative which seems to have influenced the perceptions of many of the participants. The existence of a distinctive group referred to as Māori came through very strongly in the perceptions that the participants articulated about this group and in the frequency of the use of the pronoun ‘they’. The pronoun ‘they’ implies a separation or differentiation between the referent and the speaker. According to the participants one of the distinguishing features of this group is that they are likely to be speakers of Māori language. For some of the participants learning Māori language is a way of demonstrating respect for this group and improving cross-cultural relationships, nicely summarised here by Natalie (year 13) who said, “I think it would give you a better relationship with the Māori people being able to understand their language”. The views that Māori people would like the fact that they were learning Māori language, and that some knowledge of Māori language would enhance relationships between themselves and Māori, were fairly common among the school aged participants.
The view of this distinctly different group of Māori people as Māori language speakers was also common. Statistics about Māori language speakers in New Zealand indicate that only about 23 percent of Māori people are Māori speakers (Te Puni Kōkiri, 2008, p. 35), yet among the participants there was sense that most Māori people are Māori language speakers. Remember Leah (year 9) who thought that most Māori people would speak Māori in their homes? Incorporating cultural practices like powhiri in schools encourage the perception of a fluent Māori speaking community and likewise, many participants referred to the visibility of fluent Māori speakers on Māori TV as evidence supporting this notion.

What was noticeable in the participants’ responses was that they separated their lived experiences of friendships or interactions with Māori people from their notion of a group of Māori people who are fluent speakers of Māori language and deeply involved in distinctively different cultural practices to their own. It is worth repeating Sina’s description of this process here. “If I split it in two, the interaction I have had with Māori people, it’s quite high, but its Māori people who are in Auckland. In terms of culture it’s quite low”. Sina has a very strong impression of people who are ‘culturally’ Māori and they are not the people she typically interacts with, who are, however, ethnically Māori. The interview data suggests that this dominant narrative is kept intact by the way the participants believe these idealised groups of Māori people exist in communities spatially separate from their known world. Some of these communities probably do exist, but what is important here is that the participants have no lived experience of them. They are imagined or mythical communities.

Much of what the participants expressed about the importance of the Māori language and how they would feel if the language was to be lost, suggests a commitment to some core tenets of the education myth of biculturalism. Participants expressed ideas about fairness and respect, and some of them were mindful of injustices that Māori people have suffered in the past especially in relation to being discouraged from using Māori language in schools in the past. However, when they were asked about their beliefs and understandings about biculturalism, many of them expressed confusion or outright rejection of the concept. Those who were more familiar with the term also seemed more inclined to view biculturalism as an ideology. By this I mean that the use of the word challenged them to think about what they understood by its meaning and for several of the participants it was a concept they struggled with. In chapter ten I described the way some of the participants corrected me when I mentioned that some people describe New Zealand as bicultural, suggesting that multicultural was more appropriate. Other participants, and especially the adult participants were concerned about the way biculturalism was a relationship that excluded anyone not Māori or Pākehā from the relationship. In chapter ten especially, the
interview material indicates that at times fractures appear in the mythical façade of biculturalism exposing some of its ideological underpinnings and this presents a challenge to the participants.

I have argued in my analysis of the interview data that stuttering is the ‘not noticing’ of competing ideologies. Here I contend that it is the ‘not noticing’ of potentially irreconcilable elements of a narrative that contributes to keeping the educational myth of biculturalism intact. However, it was also clear from the data that participants did from time to time experience ‘awkwardness’ as a result of noticing or experiencing competing ideologies. In particular the social reality of their everyday lives challenged various dominant narratives. For some, the lived experience of a multi-ethnic, multi-cultural Auckland proved hard to ignore and knowledge of this reality unsettled the coherence of the bicultural narrative for them. Those participants who were more inclined to reflect on their own lived experience suspected that Māori language isn’t in fact thriving or commonly used and furthermore, wondered where ‘real Māori culture’ can be found.

Concluding comments

I have argued that by focusing on the symbolic nature of Māori language education policy for non-Māori learners we are better able to understand both the lack of clarity and ambiguity in policy statements and some of the effects of this policy on a group of learners or policy subjects. I maintain that the purpose of Māori language education for non-Māori is not primarily to strengthen the language or improve communication opportunities, but rather to sustain and legitimate the educational myth of biculturalism.

Employing an anthropology of policy approach in this study has enabled a focus on the effect of policy on social relations. The focus on social relations has been particularly useful in supporting the argument that the purpose of the symbolic policy in this study is to develop and enhance particular views and practices which strengthen the perception of Māori as a distinctly different ethnic and cultural group. It is generally understood that that education is one of the primary institutions of an individual’s socialisation and transmits cultural values which many regard as necessary for the preservation of social cohesion and order (Kassimeris & Vryonides, 2012), and a focus on policy and policy processes enable us to better understand how that socialisation occurs.

The educational myth of biculturalism is powerfully sustained by symbolic policy, which is legitimated by auditing technologies. These auditing technologies also function to deflect attention from their symbolic nature. By implying that evidence of bicultural practices can be
produced, the vague and abstract nature of bicultural policy statements are overlooked as practitioners attempt to produce such evidence for auditing bodies like the New Zealand Teacher’s Council or the Education Review Office.

Broadly speaking, the empirical data which constitutes part of this study, indicated that in the case of a particular group of learners, the school environment was effective in sustaining and enhancing the educational myth of biculturalism. However, the interview data also supported the claim that policy subjects are active in their engagements with policy narratives. They question, they ‘stutter’ and they ‘answer back’ as ideological battles occur on the terrain of their common-sense understandings of the world. In particular an increasing disparity between participants’ sense of social reality and the narrative of the educational myth of biculturalism causes moments or episodes of awkwardness for individuals as cracks open up in the facade of the narrative and the ideological underpinnings are more visible. For some of the participants this resulted in a shift to more conscious contestation of bicultural ideology.

I gave chapter eleven the title Leaving Dreamland because this seemed to capture the experience of participants who were awakened to the knowledge of different perceptions and attitudes relating to their involvement in Māori language. I think it is no coincidence that the group of participants who had these experiences were the adults in the study. Their very different experiences in a world beyond school illuminates the efficacy of symbolic policy in the school environment. The school aged participants were less likely to challenge the myth of biculturalism. Institutional practices such as the incorporation of Māori cultural practices like powhiri into school events, and the existence of Māori language classes are legitimated through policy and materialise bicultural ideology. The school aged participants appeared to accept this view of the world because it is given institutional authority and legitimacy. Beyond the school environment, individuals do not necessarily experience the same ideological coherence. The adult participants experienced different and sometimes competing ideological narratives, some which are the result of contested ideas about the meaning and purpose of biculturalism itself. The narrative that threatens to unsettle mythical biculturalism, that is the aspirational, shared vision type of biculturalism, is an alternative form of biculturalism, one that is exclusive in character and when legitimated through policy enables a group access to material resources on the basis of ethnicity. For non-Māori learning Māori this can mean confronting the knowledge that some individuals or groups do not want non-Māori using Māori language. Or it can mean recognising that there are tensions that exist about the role of Māori language in New Zealand society.
The interesting finding that emerged from the *Leaving Dreamland* data was that the participants chose to self-silence by not disclosing that they knew Māori language or by avoiding disclosing their ethnicity, or they dissociated themselves from involvement in ‘the fight’. I have theorised that this silence or dissociation allows this group of individuals to carry on with their involvement with Māori language if they wish to, while keeping the myth of biculturalism intact. The participants remain committed to their vague and abstract conception of biculturalism (i.e the myth), and what enables them to do so is their deliberate dis-engagement with biculturalism as ideology. There is something very powerfully compelling about the mythical version of biculturalism, a comforting sense of shared purpose or vision perhaps. It may well be that trying to consider a viable alternative is too unsettling and would involve facing difficult and uncomfortable questions.

Lauder et al (2004) have argued that a policy-oriented sociology must take up the task of holding governments to account and should also contribute to democratic debate about policy. They refer to the role social scientists, and sociologists in particular, can play as “expert witnesses” (p.5) within democratic conversations about policy formation and accountability. This study is an effort to take up this challenge and to provide insights into bicultural ideology which is deeply embedded in New Zealand state policy. As the thesis has demonstrated, policy has powerful effects, creating and legitimating relationships between individuals and groups (Shore & Wright, 1997). Symbolic policy not only functions in this way, but also functions to legitimate state myths. Taking up the challenge of the role as an “expert witness” (Lauder, et al., 2004, p. 5) in this study has meant carefully tracing the origins and effects of a very powerful state myth, the process artfully described by Eric Kolig (2004):

A state myth ... has to be a rich tapestry of carefully nurtured and manipulated half-truths, a well integrated narrative, oft repeated and ceaselessly embellished until with time and endurance it assumes the shiny patina of absolute truth. At that stage it takes an incisively critical as well as highly analytical approach to detect its real function of obfuscation and distraction. (p. 98)

Why makes the state myth of biculturalism so compelling? Kolig (2004) provides a plausible explanation; “[p]art of the [bicultural] narrative is the promise of a better nation: a nation not only free of guilt, but harmonious, a happy society without the scourge of racial tension (pp. 97-98). It is difficult not to feel compelled by this promise, but part of the role of an expert witness is to resist the lure of easy promises.
I want to conclude on a cautionary note. While symbolic Māori language education policy works effectively to sustain the educational myth of biculturalism, and the myth currently appears to be successful in providing a sense of direction in education, there may be an unanticipated cost for the sustenance of this myth. The interview data indicated that among young people there are distorted perceptions of the well-being of the Māori language. Given that evidence about Māori language revitalisation suggests that at best the decline has halted, but that there is still little improvement, the perception that the Māori language is alive and thriving has serious implications. Non-Māori language learners constitute one third of the cohort learning as-a-subject Māori in mainstream secondary schools. The precarious state of the language suggests that it would be wise to consider all learners of the language valuable for the contribution they can potentially make to Māori language revitalisation efforts. Instead, their involvement in language learning currently appears to be regarded as more useful as a means of embedding biculturalism deeply into the common sense understandings of this group. I suggest that the cost of this to the well-being of the language is not known, but is worth careful consideration.
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- I understand that I may withdraw from the research at any time up until and during the interview, without giving a reason and that I can withdraw my interview up until 1 December 2010.
- I agree / do not agree to be audiotaped (circle one).
- I would / would not like the opportunity to check the typed out copy of my interview (circle one).
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My name is Megan Lourie and I am inviting you to participate in a research project. I would like to interview you for about forty minutes, at a time and place that suits you, to ask you some questions about why you chose to learn Maori at school, what you experienced and whether you have continued learning or using te reo Maori.

With your permission the interview will be recorded. I will then type up the interview with the help of a transcriber who will have signed a confidentiality agreement. I will also take some notes during and after each interview in a journal. You can ask me to turn the recorder off during the interview, leave the interview, or not answer a question if you wish. Once the interview is transcribed you can check the transcript if indicate on your consent form that you wish to do so. The recordings and notes will be kept in a locked cabinet at University for six years, and then they will be destroyed.

You can withdraw from the research up until and during the interview, and you can withdraw your interview material up until 1 July 2011. I will not use your name or the name of the school you attended in any reporting of information however I cannot absolutely guarantee anonymity. If you agree to participate in this research could you please contact me in one of the following ways so that we can arrange a time and a place to meet.

Mobile: 021 254 0800 (text or call me)

Email: m.lourie@auckland.ac.nz
I have also attached a consent form for you to look at, I will ask you to sign a copy if this before we begin the interview if you choose to participate in the research.

Thank you very much for your time,

Megan

Enquiries about the research can be made to:

**Researcher:** Megan Lourie  
[m.lourie@auckland.ac.nz](mailto:m.lourie@auckland.ac.nz)  
mobile: 021 254 0800

**Principal Supervisor:** Associate Professor Dr Elizabeth Rata  
School of Critical Studies Education, Faculty of Education  
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Private Bag 92 601, Symonds Street, Auckland 1035  
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- I understand that I may withdraw from the research at any time up until and during the interview, without giving a reason and that I can withdraw my interview up until 1 July 2011.
- I agree / do not agree to be audiotaped (circle one).
- I would / would not like the opportunity to check the transcript of my interview (circle one).
- I understand I will be not be identified in any written report or oral presentation about this research however I understand that that anonymity and confidentiality cannot be absolutely guaranteed.
- I understand that a third party who has signed a confidentiality agreement will transcribe the audiotapes.
- I understand that data will be kept for six years then destroyed.

Signed: ______________________________

Your name: __________________________ [please print carefully]

Date: ________________________________

APPROVED BY THE UNIVERSITY OF AUCKLAND HUMAN PARTICIPANTS ETHICS COMMITTEE ON 19 May 2010 FOR 3 years, Reference Number 2010/193
Appendix G

TRANSCRIBER CONFIDENTIALITY AGREEMENT

Project Title: The beliefs and experiences of non-Maori learning te reo Maori in mainstream secondary schools.

Researcher: Megan Lourie

Supervisor: Associate Professor Elizabeth Rata

Transcriber:

I agree to transcribe the audiotapes for the above research project. I understand that the information contained within them is confidential and must not be disclosed to, or discussed with, anyone other than the researcher and her supervisor(s).

Name: _______________________________ (please print clearly)

Signature: __________________________

Date: ______________________________
Appendix H

Interview guide
(These questions was adapted slightly for the adult participants)

Background
- Why did you choose to learn Maori?
- Do you know any other languages?
- What do your family think about you learning Maori at school?
- What do your friends think about you learning Maori?

Experiences
- What is it like learning for you learning Maori at school?
- Do you ever use Maori outside the classroom/school?
- What do you hope to be able to do in the future with your knowledge of Maori language?
- Did you or have you ever felt uncomfortable telling people you are learning Maori?
- Have you had much involvement with Maori people?
- Have you had much opportunity to speak Maori with Maori people?

Awareness of the language
- Can you tell me what you know about the history of the Maori language in New Zealand?
- Do you think Maori is used very widely today in New Zealand?
- How would you feel if the language were to die out?

Beliefs
- What is your understanding of the term bicultural?
- Is the idea of biculturalism important/relevant to you?
- Do you feel as though the Maori language is part of your identity as a New Zealander?
- What would you say to other non-Maori people thinking about learning te reo Maori?

Are there any other comments you would like to make?
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