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Abstract.

This thesis represents the results of a three-year intervention study of a group of Māori language teachers, their pupils and Māori parent communities in the Northland region of New Zealand. The study was motivated by the problem of continuing low academic achievement for Māori students in state mainstream schools. The assumption that existing teaching outputs of Māori language were quite strong and so could be used to model improvements for other school subjects and teachers to follow for Māori students was examined. In fact this was found to be a mistaken assumption as serious problems were located for the teaching of the Māori language.

Two school policy areas were examined to locate possible solutions: Treaty of Waitangi policies in school charters and the operation of Māori Language Resourcing. It was found that the operation by school managements tended to exclude any active role for the Māori parent community.

An action research model of intervention was designed and implemented to offer teachers in-service assistance in the provision of practice examinations to help better prepare students in their school certificate written examinations. Teachers were also encouraged to work directly with their Māori parent communities in order to improve teaching, student learning and outcomes. A case-study demonstrates that a dramatic rise in pupil performance occurred when parents worked along side the teacher in the classroom.

The thesis argues that the nature of the Treaty of Waitangi provides a rationale for Māori parent participation, for direct involvement into school management (teaching issues) both for Māori students and the Māori language. It is concluded that a successful school for Māori students depends both the strength and shape of the tripartite relationship between the school, the home and the students.
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Chapter One:

Introduction.

There were two main aims for this research. The first was to support the recovery of te reo Māori in New Zealand. The second to support this recovery in a manner that would lead to higher school achievement of Māori pupils in their secondary school examinations. The research method assisted a group of Māori language teachers to make more use of their Māori parent community in the delivery of the Māori language curriculum. In order to do this the teachers themselves had to first research the problem of poor Māori student performance in their schools. The research objective was to provide an intervention model to assist professional colleagues in better teaching, improved learning and outcomes for Māori pupils.

The intervention was only possible, and only then effective, because of the prior and concurrent professional activity of the researcher. The high degree of collaboration and co-operation required is described at the beginning of Chapter Six. Four separate investigations were required during the first year of research the results of which are presented separately and successively in this thesis.

During the subsequent years the field research completed for this thesis demonstrated that higher achievement for Māori language pupils in secondary schools could be predicted if more attention is given to improving literacy skills in te reo Māori. But improving teaching methods and programmes in schools achieves only small improvements in the measurable performance of students. The current beliefs, behaviors and practices, ideas and methodologies of teachers are not now sufficient for further progress. This thesis argues that any improved academic performance for Māori students in mainstream schools is more likely to happen if the Māori parent community is directly involved in the learning literacy process. Being directly involved means that the Māori parent community is more than just mere supporters, but comes to function as co-managers of the delivery of the curriculum. Becoming co-managers gives definition to the concept of te tino
rangatiratanga (self-determination, see Grace 1997) for the implementation of the Treaty of Waitangi in schools.

Much has already been said and written about the very poor performance of Māori students in New Zealand mainstream schools. The Ministry of Education has continuously called for greater Māori parent community participation as a way of improving school performance outcomes for Māori (Brell 1997). But the notion of encouraging any such involvement within the state mainstream, school management context in order to improve academic outcomes has been unclear. This thesis will therefore demonstrate and define through a case study what the goals of greater parent participation can actually mean. It will argue the management of the delivery of the curriculum for Māori by Māori.

The problem.

Māori students in mainstream classes have a long history of poor performance over many generations in New Zealand schools (Stewart 1992). Across all measurable criteria of attendance and academic achievement there has long existed a wide gap between Māori and European student attainment. Nationally over eighty two percent of Māori pupils fail to qualify in high school (Davies & Nicholl 1993; Ministry of Education 1996a & 1996b & 1996c; Chapple & Jeffries 1997) at the seventh form (year 13) level. But in this particular research district in the far North of New Zealand nearly ninety percent fail as indicated by the retention rates of schools (see Chapter Three, Table 3:1).

The Ministry of Education terms the leaving point from school as the “retention rate” for pupils. It reports annually a Statistical Index (Ministry of Education 1996c), the rate at which all schools retain their pupils as a percentage of those who originally entered in their third form year. Originally these annual reports were introduced as “snapshot reports” by a former Minister of Education, Lockwood Smith. The report is no longer published annually as one volume, as

---

1 The Māori Education Commission prefers to use the term “general” rather than “mainstream”, see Brown 1998.
schools are individually notified of their progress. Thus, the very intention of first introducing the annual reports, to make information on schools more public, has now become more difficult. The obtaining of school performance data, both individually and nationally, proved to be a very difficult task for this researcher. Examples of the difficulty are detailed in Chapter Five.

The problem of such low retention for Māori students in schools has long been recognized by the various Government departments, teacher unions, school and parent groups, and academics. A previous research report (Stewart 1992) has listed over thirty major reports dealing with the problem of low Māori achievement. Over the last decade there has been at least one major report issued each year. Over the last five years there has been at least three issued annually. One of the first detailed analyses of the problems for Māori language teaching was written by Koro Dewes (1958). Another analysis written by Frank Solomon (1980) raised issues on Māori language teaching that continue to be current. But for all the many years of recognition and proposed solutions very little progress, if any, has been made in closing the achievement gap. The prospects for any rapid improvement in the near future seem unlikely (Chapple & Jefferies 1997).

Given that the majority of the Māori population is very young (Statistics New Zealand 1994), the expected population increase may exacerbate the problem if left unattended. The problem will be more acute in this research district (21 Northland secondary schools) as the Māori student population increase is more than twice the national average (Education Review Office 1998). It is still rapidly growing and still increasingly failing. The consequences of continual failure for Māori may well be intensified racial disharmony and protest, negative statistics and welfare reliance. This is an issue of social justice that must be corrected. It is also an issue of economics because as long as Māori achievement remains approximately half of what it should be, the cost of providing social welfare later in life is probably to be quadrupled.

But the problem is not just one of being able to successfully improve the education
attainment of Māori so as to improve Māori economics, welfare and racial harmony. Such targets were characteristic of the early reports into Māori education (Thomas Report 1943; Hunn Report 1960; National Advisory Committee on Māori Education, NACME, 1970). There is also the extreme difficulty of retaining a language and culture that is so very close to extinction. The two problems are closely connected (Cummins & Swain 1994; Hastings 1992). Observations recorded in field notes during this research indicate that there still exists a lack of commitment by school management teams to promote the learning of the Māori language to bilingual competence with the English language. School managers are yet to be fully convinced and committed to recognizing and utilizing the Māori language as a prime force for the motivation of Māori students. More research work is needed to argue the case that the more that Māori students learn with te reo Māori in mainstream schools then the better their achievement (Anderson 1994).

Lack of commitment has been observed in school management practices that tend to exclude the Māori parent community from the decision-making processes that govern the management of the teaching of the Māori language. School management teams have been sent annual reports of their own individual school’s decline in Māori language grades being achieved. Yet most have failed to implement effective improvement practices. There is no apparent sense of urgency to prevent the extinction of the Māori language within the school community (Māori Language Commission 1998). All school management teams are required to carry out annual performance appraisals on all teaching staff (Fancy 1997). This research revealed that from over twenty schools in the district not one was able to produce any performance appraisal type document that specifically mentioned the problems of Māori educational attainment or performance.

It will be shown in Chapter Three that all but two of Northland’s secondary schools have retention rates for Māori that are continuing to decline. Some schools, including those with high proportions of Māori students and high funding rates for Māori Language Resourcing, continue to have no Māori students enrolled in their seventh forms (see Chapter Four). Even reports from the
Education Review Office\(^2\) on individual schools have continuously omitted any specific or detailed reference to low retention rates for Māori students. It appears that “Māori” do not even exist as a “problem” in schools. Such behaviour of school management is typical of mainstream schools that tend to have one policy that fits all, without any special recognition of any special problems. One recommendation, the need for performance appraisal for Māori by Māori, as part of a five point plan for school improvement will be discussed in the final chapter.

Various initiatives for improvement are being attempted. Independent community sponsored programmes to assist pupils in schools, such as Tū Tangata (Puketapu 1998), are predicted in this thesis to have only partial success because of several limitations. The issue of Māori language retention has not been the specific aim of the programme. The community participants are excluded from being involved in any aspect of the delivery of the curriculum. There is no recognition of the cognitive and social benefits of bilingualism (Cummins 1989). But such programmes are making an important contribution to the welfare of pupils by making sure that they are in uniform, in school and on task for learning (Puketapu 1998).

The main limitation with such programmes is the continual focus on the students. This tunnel vision makes for a false assumption that the management and delivery of the school curriculum by the teachers is correct. For problem students all that is needed is an intervention by the Māori parent community to change the behaviour of the students. Change by the school is not recognized as necessary. The exists the assumption that simply by changing or modifying the inputs to schools (student behaviour and readiness) will improve school outputs (the ability of pupils to exit with higher qualifications). The machinery of the school (school management) also needs to be evaluated on such assumptions made by the programmes.

A model for parent participation was sought in current education beliefs and practices but it is evident that current practices are a source of problems for parent participation. Recent Ministry

\(^2\) This statutory office inspects and reports on New Zealand schools. It is responsible to a Government Minister separate from the Minister of Education and the Ministry of Education.
of Education sponsored programmes reviewed, such as the School-Community-Iwi Liaison Project (Education Gazette 1996) and Social Working in Schools (Education Gazette 20/11/99), are not likely to be successful in terms of improving school outcomes to the extent required. This is because these programmes tend to support the status quo of school management routines rather than challenging and changing them. The programmes can be seen as patronizing and blaming of Māori parents (see Chapter Seven). They have lacked an intervention theory that is both attractive and effective for Māori. The continuing school achievement gap within the schools operating these type of programmes within Northland shows that they have had limited success so far.

The rationale for the significance of parent involvement in this research is that it attempts a new intervention, a fresh approach to the problem of under-achievement. The first component has been the development of an effective change agent, something that will make a real difference to the improved teaching, student learning and outcomes for Māori. The second component of the research has tried to define within a New Zealand education context what indigenous language rights (Hastings 1992) mean for parents. Research first began by examining two particular areas of school management policy and practice: Treaty of Waitangi in school charters policies (see Chapter Two) and the operation of Māori Language Resourcing (see Chapter Three). These were considered to be areas in which it was most likely to find an established and active role by the parent community for the support of Māori language programmes. It was expected that these would then provide ideal models for participation by the Māori parent community to increase educational achievement. But what was actually found in common to the areas of teaching, policy and operation was that very little, if any, regular parent participation ever occurred. All the schools surveyed were often reluctant to encourage their parents to engage in the management of school curriculum issues.

The common rationale given was the lack of time caused by the heavy workload of teachers in schools. The frequent reason observed by this researcher was that parent involvement was desired in order to improve the behaviour and learning readiness of students. It was not
considered or recognized as a major influence for student learning. Thus, parent involvement was not valued and practiced as a high priority. Even if it was the teachers in the schools lacked training and expertise to promote such involvement in learning. The teachers articulated many untested assumptions about their Māori parent community, which actually prevented involvement. The Māori language teachers were in the main using what I have termed a “teaching mythology” - a fixed belief that their Māori parent community was not particularly interested in helping their own children with schoolwork. Such beliefs that govern the teaching behaviour of teachers have been termed “folk pedagogy” by Olson and Torrance (1996) where “beliefs and assumptions about teaching whether in a school or in any other context, are a direct reflection of the beliefs and assumptions the teacher holds about the learner” (ibid p11).

The mistaken assumption of the lack of parent interest had become the mindset of the teachers. Teacher perceptions have come to be the reality of practice. Thus, the role of Māori parent community could be described as being mainly that of spectators to various school events. The process of consultation could best be described as the school management working out and writing school policy then simply telling everyone else, usually by newsletter, what was going to happen (Capper 1994).

The research began by examining assumptions of Māori language teaching and moved to the construction of an intervention for improving teaching and learning. The intervention included the designing and production for teacher use of higher quality home notices for parents and prepare media releases in order to encourage more Māori parent community participation in school learning events (such as preparatory exams for the School Certificate examination). When such events were well promoted with the maximum publicity then these tended to be well supported and attended by parents, and the performance of the students noticeably improved. Effective contact by teachers with parents makes for more effective teaching, student learning and outcomes.

3 School Certificate is the first external examination taken by most high school students in New Zealand.
The research demonstrated that a successful school for Māori students depends on both the strength and shape of the tripartite relationship between the school and the home and the students. Māori teachers need both the support, the training and time to do this work. Defining the relationship is the difficult problem to put into practice because of the existing patterns of teachers and school management teams. It is argued that the nature of the Treaty of Waitangi means that Māori parent participation should not be restricted to school governance (parent teacher associations and school boards) but have direct input into school management (teaching issues) both for Māori students and the Māori language. In the words of the Waitangi Tribunal4: “The promises in the Treaty of Waitangi of equality in education as in all other human rights are undeniable. Judged by the system’s own standards Māori children are not being successfully taught, and for this reason alone, quite apart from a duty to protect the Māori language, the education system is being operated in breach of the Treaty” (Hastings 1992:22).

The cause of Māori low achievement in schools is seen as school structures preventing the empowerment of the Māori parent community. But is this prevention a deliberate action? For as it was discovered in this research teachers in schools lacked any formal training of how to actually implement successful Treaty of Waitangi practices (see Chapter Three). It was not so much that teachers in schools deliberately prevented Treaty of Waitangi practice but rather knowing what to do and being committed to change.

These structural impediments ranged from the national institutions such as the Ministry of Education, to the senior management of individual schools, thence to individual Māori language teachers. Leadership from the Ministry of Education officials was not being effective. Many official policy statements on Māori education issues are unclear (see below). Other educational institutions, such as the New Zealand Qualifications Authority5, have had to be forced to give out basic information (see Chapter Two). An example of a school management “closing the gate”

---

4 The Waitangi Tribunal is the special court to hear Treaty of Waitangi claims.

5 The NZQA is the government organization that sets national qualifications for all schools.
(Stewart 1993) to parent participation resulted in an appeal to the Ombudsmen’s Office\(^6\) to force the release of a particular school’s budget for the operation of its Māori Language Resourcing (see Chapter Four). There is a continual criticism by teachers of school principals that they are never seen in the classroom to view their teachers at work. This criticism is one that is common to New Zealand and overseas schools (Stewart 1993). Because of this, teachers often feel that they are undervalued and not appreciated. This is often the reason given why Māori teachers give up the teaching profession (Mitchell & Mitchell 1993; Bloor 1996). Yet principals themselves are just as likely to be as busy as anyone else is in the school and that there is just not enough time in the school day to make such observational visits.

It is argued that the skills of the Māori language teachers are critical to effective outcomes. Too often the responsibility for the empowerment of the local Māori community to become involved in the activities of the school falls on these individual teachers. It is a responsibility that they lack the time, authority and expertise for, let alone any extra payment (Bloor 1996). It is the responsibility of school management, knowing full well that so many Māori pupils continue to fail in schools, to be proactive in its evaluations of performance management of “the problem.”

A further problem arises through the implications of the question of who owns te reo Māori? It is a problem that is unique to New Zealand as an indigenous language. As the ownership of te reo Māori has been declared by an Act of Parliament (Hastings 1992) to be the property of the Māori people then they have full property rights. They are in the legal position of not being just co-managers, but full managers of the language. The question of who owns te reo Māori presents no problem in itself, but the implications of the answer have never been demonstrated within mainstream schools. As far as this researcher was able to find, no school charter, official publication or academic literature was located to account for how such complete or even partial property rights, both intellectual and cultural, might be exercised in schools. This

\(^6\) This office is responsible for reviewing access to public information and expenditure.
thesis will propose a methodology for such management rights in co-operation with schools, not for the sake of assuming positions of power, but for the intention of improving Māori student outcomes.

Mistaken Assumptions.

From my own twenty years of teaching experience I predicted that the teaching outputs of Māori language were quite strong and so could possibly be used as an improvement model for other school subjects, for teachers to follow as a boost for parent participation. In fact this was found to be a false assumption as serious problems were located for the teaching of the Māori language. The annual published examination results for all Northland schools (see Chapter Five) indicated decreasing average grades. Further analysis of collected data indicated decreasing numbers of students of Māori language at the School Certificate level over the last ten years. Any assumption that the Māori language has enjoyed a revival in the Northland province within the last ten years is not indicated by such figures.

I assumed that the Māori language possessed a "holding power" for Māori students in secondary schools. But it has not been sufficiently attractive, either culturally or intellectually, to prevent the continuing high school dropouts. As will be shown in Chapter Three the numbers attending Māori language classes in the fifth form have typically reduced by a half from the middle to the end of the year.

At the beginning of the research it first had to be determined if the standard of Māori language being taught in schools had actually declined (and consequently what the cause might be). This was determined from data collected and the analysis of grades achieved over a ten-year period. Other disappointing facts came to light during this work. School Certificate subject choice of te reo Māori rates as only nineteenth in popularity for Māori students (see Chapter Five). When it is chosen by pupils it often ranks as their highest achieving subject - which does not say much for the achieved levels of the other subjects. But it does indicate,
however small, an interest in the subject as the most likely area to model any improvement. Recent research (Anderson 1994) indicates that the more te reo Māori that Māori children learn with, the better they perform at school. But how can children best be attracted to learn te reo Māori in this modern age? Why does the language appear to be so unpopular with Māori students?

Perhaps the answer to some of these questions can be found in the way the Ministry of Education has in the past failed to officially promote and encourage community management and responsibility for Māori language programmes. Partnership and the community are accepted by Māori as two of the most important ingredients for successful schooling (Brell 1997). These were initially promised in the education reforms and are often promoted in the academic literature (Capper 1994; Jowett, Baginski, MacDonald & MacNeil 1991; McNaughton, Parr, Timperley & Robinson 1992; Ramsay, Hawk, Harold, Marriott & Poskitt 1993), and they are considered essential to Māori cultural values (Irwin & Broughton 1993; Johnston 1992; Peters and Marshall 1988; Reedy 1992; G.Smith 1991b; Richie 1992). But all of the above contributions to the theory of partnership and the community contain very little, if any, directions on how any Māori parent community involvement may come about. Perhaps because any giving of directions, such as a definition of partnership, may involve the community taking some role in the management of the curriculum it may be too controversial a problem.

Parent participation - the official viewpoint.

While the learning importance and benefits for the teaching of the Māori language have long been recognized, it is only within the last decade that Māori language programmes and parents have been officially linked as a priority for school parent involvement practices. A Ten Point Plan for strategies to improve Māori education outcomes was proposed by Wally Hirsh (1990). The Ministry of Education adopted Hirsh’s proposals, and released an official text: The Ten Point Plan for Māori Education (Ministry of Education 1994). The Ministry of Education has
now renamed the plan as Ngā Haeata Matauranga (Māori Education Strategy) and is committed to making annual progress reports both to parliament and the public.

The problem with this document is that it has been an internal policy paper for the Ministry of Education in order to guide and direct its own staff. Other educational institutions, such as schools, have not been encouraged to adopt this code of practice. But the document, produced as an annual report, has been useful in providing up to date data and analysis of Māori education trends in one folio. Numerous issues raised within the report have often been of a general value, and do not set a priority focus. In order to give appropriate leadership the former chief executive of Education, Dr. Maris O’Rourke, previously summarized the ten-point plan into a three-point plan of emphasis. She stated:

"the three significant and valuable goals for the Māori language education option are:

support for the recovery of te reo as a living language,

encouragement of greater participation by Māori parents, and

encouragement of higher achievement of Māori pupils"

(Education Gazette 2/3/94).

However, one year later O’Rourke appears to have left out any specific reference to parents. She reduced the three-point plan to a two-point plan in a statement for the purpose of the 1995 Māori Language Year:

“Reviving te reo Māori and increasing the educational achievement of Māori students”

(Education Gazette 15/2/1995).

At the beginning of the following year the Education Gazette (19/2/1996) again featured Māori education as an issue (the contributor was anonymous) but the role of parents, apart from the desire for more te reo instruction at school, still remained undefined. So in fact the parent community remained excluded from any participation, official or unofficial.

In 1996 the annual report on Māori education (Ministry of Education 1996b) continued to mention parents in the relatively broad terms of “home-school relationships” referring to “a key
factor affecting the schooling of young Māori is the increasing problem of truancy." The problem of low outcomes for Māori pupils is defined in terms of the symptoms (ie truancy) not the problem itself.

In that same year in an issue of a popular teachers' weekly magazine (Eduvac 18/3/96), the acting Chief Executive of Education, Lyall Perris clearly stated his opinion for the most critical issue for Māori parents:

"For years, they have recognized the benefits of a good education, but for structural and cultural reasons they have largely been excluded from the important decision making processes which have run education.

Māori can no longer sit back and watch their children fail. They are questioning the quality of education at all levels and questioning those who make the decisions. They are taking greater responsibility and control for Māori medium education and realise that the quality of their leadership is paramount.

Having full responsibility with full accountability is the ultimate goal. The Ministry supports this strategy because we know that being in control and being responsible provides a greater incentive for making sure education works."

This statement claims that the lack of the right and responsibility of Māori parents to decide on issues affecting their own children is the paramount reason why Māori pupils have done and continue to do badly in schools. It represents a radical change from the earlier Ministry statements that were rather timid in expressing the rights of Māori parents. Such rights have recently been re-affirmed by the Senior Manager of Group Māori in the Ministry of Education, Rawiri Brell (1997). The current claim is that exclusion of Māori parents from active participation has given rise to the low motivation of their children within the mainstream schooling system. Certainly, a parallel argument for parents in general has been well supported in research literature. Those parents (especially non-Māori ones) who take an active interest in school affairs have their sense of motivation to succeed transferred to their own children (Capper
But what is policy for the Ministry of Education is not always put into practice at the lower levels of administration. For instance, in the Ministry’s own guide-lines for the setting up of bilingual units, the only mention of parents is limited:

"... the whanau play a support role only and not try to control the unit’s activities" (Wilson 1995).

The direct exclusion of any management role for Māori parents can be found in other areas. For example, the requirement that a school’s application form for Māori Language Immersion Funding being endorsed by the local Māori community has now been dropped (Ministry of Education 1995). During the 1997 verification process to check the correct levels of the Māori Language immersion Funding (Ministry of Education 1997) community Māori liaison officers were supposed to be used as assistants. Yet checks with local Runanga-a-Iwi, community groups, could locate not one point of any contact between any school and their associated Māori parent community.

What then is meant by Māori parents "having full responsibility with full accountability" (Eduvac 18/3/96)? Although the academic focus for this thesis is in the teaching and learning of te reo Māori at the pre-School Certificate level, the allowance of “having full responsibility with full accountability” is problematic for all school subjects, not just te reo Māori. This is because the new curriculum statements for all subjects being taught at all schools are required to have a tikanga Māori (Māori language and culture) content and methodology. If Māori language teachers are not being successful in their own language teaching programmes, how then are the teachers of other subjects supposed to manage? How can Māori language teachers be held up as good examples and mentors for other teachers in schools? If the teaching results for Māori language students are so poor, does this fact send signals to school administrators that perhaps te reo Māori should have a low priority for development or retention in the curriculum? In order to help answer these questions a commentary is needed on the status and roles of te reo Māori
within the wider community.

The survival of te reo Māori.

Because schools are such powerful community institutions for learning and socialisation they have the ability to either promote the Māori language for survival or by default to extinction. In the absence of regular surveys external to schools, the annual results of a school’s Māori language examinations give the only indicator of the strength and commitment within the community. This research has shown that the outlook for the survival of the Māori language in many Northland communities is a dim one.

In late 1995 the Māori Language Commission conducted a household survey to calculate the number of Māori people who were considered to be fluent speakers of this indigenous language. Their provisional report released in April 1996 was bad news for all Māori people. Richard Benton’s (1978) survey of twenty years ago estimated that some sixty thousand plus Māori speakers were alive in all of Āotearoa, by 1996 the number were less than ten thousand.

But for the province of Northland (known as Te Taitokerau), New Zealand, the results would have been far worse. Even so, the province could once boast of having the highest number of resident fluent native speakers, but now in proportion to its population it has the least. It is estimated that less than one thousand fluent speakers remain. The great majority of these speakers are elderly. As they pass away their number decreases further. Their rangatahi, their younger replacement speakers, maturing through Kohanga Reo and Kura Kaupapa (native language schools) are not yet sufficient in numbers to replace the language loss. It is quite likely that the total number of Northland’s fluent speakers will decline even further, maybe to as low as even three hundred (as the situation in Hawaii, see Stewart 1993). While it may be possible to resurrect the language with the help of other speakers from other districts, the personal history, local knowledge and dialect preferences that characterize the Ngā Puhi tribe will be irrevocably lost as an oral tradition.
The tragedy of the language loss can be easily quantified within mainstream state secondary schools in the North. In the 1990 year Taitokerau pupils achieved the highest average grade in all of New Zealand, but now School Certificate pupils achieve only at a middle national average (this is detailed in Chapter Three). Although there has been a huge growth in all forms of Māori language nationally, such growth has definitely not been reflected by increasing numbers of students of the language in Northland secondary schools. There is now, on average, one hundred less pupils presenting themselves for the examination than there were ten years ago within the Northland study area.

But the news is not all bad. Those Māori pupils who do choose to study te reo Māori at school do much better academically than their peers who do not. Official Government reports indicate that the more te reo that Māori students learn the better they perform at school. The 1995 Education Review Office report to Parliament stated that school attendance was much better in Māori language immersion type classes as compared with main stream classes, and that suspensions were far less likely to occur. The Employment Task Force Report (Anderson 1994) stated that pupils with a bilingual background of te reo demonstrate a superior ability in other subjects such as mathematics. Such findings of cognitive gains for bilingual students are consistent with overseas studies (Cummins & Swain 1994). In the course of this study anecdotal evidence from interviews with teachers also confirmed that those Māori language pupils who achieved at the highest levels for the School Certificate examination were also achieving at high levels in other subjects taken.

Educational researchers do not readily understand the exact reason as to why bilingual students generally have superior performance. But it is known that the transfer of any language skills and performance enhancing attitudes from one subject or language to another takes place only when one of the known languages is developed to fluency (Cummins 1989). In this research it was observed that a student who is achieving at the top level in te reo is likely to achieve a similar high level in English and mathematics. Does this then mean that the quicker a Māori child
can become literate in te reo then the quicker s/he will become literate in other subjects? This question is not answered in this thesis, but remains for further research into metalinguistic and metacognitive skill building of bilingual students.

There is still much to be discovered about the process of language learning. Especially interesting is the phenomenon of language transference from one subject to another. All subjects can be regarded as being a language-of-their-own, especially within the sciences and mathematics. But transferring the skills of analysis and decoding from one (language) subject to another, what Jim Cummins (ibid) calls “linguistic detectiveness,” can lead to making false assumptions. For example, the Chief Examiner for the University Bursary examinations has stated in his annual report (Pene 1997) he expects the proportion of students at each level of achievement in the examination to be the same in both the oral and written examinations. Because this does not happen the chief examiner favours adjusting (scaling) to bring the results in line with his expectations. Yet there is no linguistic reason for this to happen.

The intervention.

The fieldwork described in Chapter Six, encouraged a voluntary group of Māori language teachers from a small cluster of mainstream state schools in Northland, New Zealand, to become researchers themselves in order to analyze the problem of poor writing skills in te reo Māori national examinations. These teachers perceived low parent participation and interest in nearly all school learning originating in the homes, but felt powerless to combat the problem. They assumed their pupils coming to school with “bad attitude” originated from the parents.

The nature of the intervention was to offer the Māori language teachers assistance to improve the frequency and quality of parent contact in order to improve their teaching, student learning and outcomes. This work initially proved to be very difficult, as the Māori teachers themselves were largely ignorant of school governance, school management, and examination assessment. But at one school the teacher felt sufficiently confident and competent to invite the
parents and elders into the classroom on a regular basis to actually co-mark written composition exercises in preparation for the national School Certificate examination. When this happened a dramatic improvement in pupil grades was observed.

Much of the intervention assistance involved facilitating frequent meetings, usually once a month, in order to provide a forum in which exemplars of written work (and other issues - see below) were discussed.

From the analyses of these exemplars extra diagnostic and remedial resources were designed so as to focus on improving specific writing skills. These were followed by suggestions for making, utilizing and benefiting from their parent contacts.

Examples of this work were in the provision of personalized home notices from each teacher for specific events during the study. From research work done overseas, particularly in Chicago Public Schools, the value of personalizing home notices was demonstrated (Stewart 1993). At all stages of the intervention research these types of resources were being evaluated by interviews with teachers, parents and pupils. The evaluation often proved to be very difficult owing to the variation in delivery by teachers when using the material supplied. This will be described in Chapter Three.

An important task was to keep school principals fully informed of the research progress and events. Principals demonstrated a wide range of interest in the research intervention. The range was from extremely negative to extremely positive. One principal refused to allow parents in to share in the evaluation of the language activities (the marking of essays). This was because the evaluation of other pupils' work was considered by the principal to be confidential under the Privacy Act. It was suggested that the pupils in this school could then independently gather at a local marae to share their evaluation work. But then their teacher was not keen to co-operate fearing a professional conflict with the school principal. Another principal gave carte-blanche permission to do anything to assist in the school to promote better learning for its Māori pupils. Another principal could never be met over the three years spent frequently visiting the school.
Where success by individual students was noticed and recorded (such as the achievement of high essay marks) letters of commendation were written to the schools to keep both principals and Boards of Trustees fully appreciative of the work being done by their te reo teachers. Feedback on this from the commended teachers included a very personal note mentioning: “This is the first time in my teaching that anyone has ever written anything good about me ...”

All pre-arranged meetings with teachers and parents were intended to have a primary focus to improve language learning. During these meeting times, both formal and informal, many other school and community issues were raised and dealt with where possible.

For instance, one grandparent too shy to talk in front of others, was insistent that the wearing of beanie hats by pupils at school was a gang symbol and influence. In quiet conversation she asked this researcher to take her concern to the school principal. Although initially thinking that the matter was rather trivial (the form class teacher had already thought so and was not concerned enough to take any action) such matters raised could have well been a test of this researcher’s credibility with individuals in the parent community. Who was right - the freedom of a young adult at school to choose, or to respect the wishes of a grandparent? It was learnt that it was not who was right in such a dispute as this, but that there was a forum made available in which the matter could be discussed and later resolved. Listening to the opinions and problems of parents is what teachers and principals are not very good at because they are so busy running either their classes or the school. Making parent-teacher forums available to resolve problems before we could even start to learn language activities was not in the original research agenda. It soon became a time consuming but beneficial part of the research work. At the beginning of 1996 there was a strong desire to “get stuck straight into” the fieldwork. But building rapport of trust and respect with all participants took time that was well worth the effort.

This researcher has criticized Māori teachers (Stewart 1997a) for spending too much time

---

7 Both G Smith and P Sharples (1989) advocate such parent-teacher forums as an integral whanau based on long established Māori custom and tradition.
being defacto guidance counselors at the apparent expense of their class time. But if the Māori teacher does not attend to this type of work who can?

Research Methodology.

A case study approach to researching official documents was used to determine the outcomes of the intervention. School Certificate is this country’s first national examination taken by high school students. The Ministry of Education’s annual returns for the School Certificate test reo Māori grades have been available as public documents. These have been used as the main baselines against which the effects of the intervention have been compared. Records of meetings, a personal dairy, teacher workbooks and interviews with parents have provided rich (qualitative) data for processes.

Obtaining documents and data from official sources frequently proved to be a very difficult process. For example, requests were made to schools for copies of their Treaty of Waitangi policy documents (that had been included as part of their school charter). The process included calling at school offices to collect a copy (as would any parent), or requesting a mail-out if not immediately available. When nothing was sent, a further written request was made, then finally followed up with a phone call. This procedure produced policy documents from only nine out of twenty schools within the research district. Even data concerning pass rates for School Certificate had to be officially requested from the New Zealand Qualifications Authority by the intervention of the Office of the Ombudsmen, Sir Brian Elwood. Data from the Ministry of Education concerning school enrolments and funding statistics has also been difficult to obtain because often the publication of such data either changes its name, format, or method of dissemination. What was once called the Statistical Index (Ministry of Education 1996) is now termed student Performance Indicators, but commonly known as the “League Tables.” As if the name change was not difficult enough to deal with the Ministry of Education, that used to print and distribute an annual volume containing all such school information, now makes such information available to schools with
only their own statistical data. It seems that there are no current public documents freely available to compare school performances.

*The Review Of the Ministry of Education: Service Delivery to Māori* completed by the Monitoring and Evaluation Unit of Te Puni Kōkiri\(^8\) (1997) is critical of the information collection and analysis of the Data Management section of the Ministry of Education. The report calls for an expansion of trends analysis in Māori education over time (work that has occupied much of my time in collecting data), and comparisons between Māori and non-Māori educational outcomes. There is an admission of a major problem - that schools when surveyed to collect ethnic data give poor response rates, further reducing the reliability of any data already collected.

The report discusses the *National Administration Guidelines* issued to schools in 1993 but fails to make any mention of the omission of the Treaty of Waitangi from those guidelines. In Chapter Three the effect that this omission has had in schools will be demonstrated as being detrimental to the interests of Māori. When reviewing the review of a Te Puni Kōkiri research publication (*Review of the Ministry of Education, Te Puni Kōkiri 1997*) this researcher requested from the authors copies of the three major documents on which the review was based (the literature review of Chapple & Jefferies (1997) and a report of the Minister of Māori Affairs (1995)). This researcher was informed by correspondence that these were "not able to be located." Only "an out of date" copy of the *Māori Policy Checklist* could be provided.

An initial financial difficulty for this researcher was that the Ministry of Education demanded a prepayment of sixty-four dollars per hour for the collation and sale of selected education statistics. This difficulty was overcome when it was learnt from the Office of the Ombudsmen that the first hour and 20 pages of any requested material were normally expected to be free of charge. It was found certain statistics needed for this research project were already published on an annual basis and simply needed to be collated from a decade of separate volumes available from the Ministry of Education and the New Zealand Qualifications Authority. By this
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8 Te Puni Kōkiri is the Ministry of Māori Development.
course it was estimated that a saving at least 500 dollars was made.

The way in which this research was originally designed and intended is quite different from how it has ended. The research design first started as an extension from the researcher's own seventeen years teaching experience as a Māori language teacher in Northland. I made the assumption because I knew the participating schools and their associated teachers personally, all I had to do was analyze the performance of the schools, provide the necessary resources for improvement, then sit back and calculate the results. One initial assumption was that the research work would be relatively easy because my perception of problems and solutions would be simply agreed to by all the other participants. I assumed what I provided was what the others wanted. At no time during the initial year of the research did the researcher consider questions such as: what if the teacher and parents did not want assistance, even though they had signed the consent to participate in the research? What if a teacher was selective in the use of the resources and help provided?

This problem led to a fall off in the number of school communities being assisted. In the initial year seven schools were being assisted and all fully participated in the research. At the beginning of the second year only four schools indicated they wished to continue. The decision to do so was made almost exclusively by the Māori language teacher at each individual school.

During the third and final year assistance was still provided to these four schools, but as one teacher in particular was more enthusiastic to involve parents the work of this teacher became the subject of more intense study. As to the value of resources provided during all years of the research this finally depended on the way the individual teachers used them. Certainly the idiosyncratic use of resources by teachers, as described in Chapter Six, was an initial problem that was not anticipated.
Chapter two examines the impact of reform of the administration of education in New Zealand schools that began in 1987. It explains how and why the promise of the reforms being “sufficiently flexible and responsive to the particular needs of Māori education” (Lange 1988:iv) has never been realised for the great majority of Māori still failing in schools. Tomorrow’s Schools (Lange ibid) contained tools for educational reforms the use of which required highly skilled operators in order to achieve maximum output. The universal principals of egalitarianism on which the reforms were based have not produced universal results. Those with little experience, who didn’t know the names of the tools processes or even knew of their existence have tended to retreat from their usage. Participation by Māori on influential bodies, such as Boards of Trustees, remains at less than half of what it should be (Ministry of Education 1997). It will be shown that school boards and principals have strengthened their positions of managerialism where those who have been appointed to responsible positions in local education make decisions based on expediency and on the assumption that they know the situation best. Very little local consultation takes place and Treaty of Waitangi rights have very little meaning.

Chapter three gives a detailed report of the School Certificate Māori language examinations. The researcher’s own teaching experience led him to believe that the teaching outputs of Māori language were quite strong and so could possibly be used as a good example and improvement model for other school subjects and teachers to follow. In fact this was found to be a false assumption as serious problems were located for the teaching of Māori. All the schools studied gave decreasing average grades and decreasing numbers of students of Māori language at the School Certificate level over the last ten years.

Thus, two school areas were researched in an attempt to locate possible solutions: Treaty of Waitangi policies in school charters (Chapter Four) and the operation of Māori Language Resourcing (Chapter Five). These were considered by the researcher to be areas in which it was most likely to find an established and active role for the support of Māori language programmes
by the parent community. But what was actually found in common to the areas of teaching, policy and operation was that very little, if any, regular parent participation ever occurred. All the schools were often reluctant to encourage their parents to engage in the management of school curriculum issues. The researcher found that Māori parents (including the extended family and tribal elders) are still being largely excluded from both their promised democratic role as participant decision makers - what school reform and Treaty rights are all about.

Chapter Six describes the intervention work with the group of Māori language teachers and their parent communities. The teachers were offered assistance to improve the frequency and quality of parent contact in order to improve their teaching, student learning and outcomes.

The researcher concludes (Chapter Seven) that a successful school for Māori students depends on both the strength and shape of the tripartite relationship between the school, the home and the students. Māori teachers need the support, the training and time to do this work. The argument in this study is that the nature of the Treaty of Waitangi means that Māori parent participation should not be restricted to school governance (parent teacher associations and school boards) but have a direct input into school management (teaching issues) both for Māori students and the Māori language.
Chapter Two:  
Partnership and the Community.

When school reforms began to be implemented in the latter part of the 1980's an important aim of the then Prime Minister and Minister of Education, David Lange, was for "Partnership and the Community" (Lange 1988:1). He claimed that this process would make school administration more open to democracy so as to improve opportunity and results for all students. The special appeal to Māori was that the reform processes would be "sufficiently flexible and responsive to the particular needs of Māori education" (Lange 1988:iv).

But now, ten years after the beginning of the reforms, Māori students seem to be still worse off as indicated by the very low average retention rates of schools (already described in Chapter One). This chapter establishes a theoretical framework to explain why. The framework cites the reforms and the resulting failure for Māori within the socio-political-economic history of New Zealand. The drive for economic and administrative efficiencies that are seen in commercial enterprises continue to pressurise their rational philosophy into the education reform processes. The original good intentions of democracy for community partnership have become an autocracy - a domination of technocrats (Boards of Trustees and Senior Managements of Schools) within a culture of managerialism. This type of culture has tended to highly rationalise and compartmentalise all exchanges between school partners. Māori culture is often seen as irrational and so avoided by the new autocracy as much as possible. In this way "the particular needs of Māori education" (ibid) have been ignored.

The chapter is presented in three parts.

The first part introduces the reader to the history of schooling into New Zealand. The negative impact of colonisation on Māori education is described. The rise of right-wing economic reforms that has permeated nearly every type of business enterprise in New Zealand will be shown to have adversely affected Māori economics. The philosophy of the "think-big," "what's good for
business must also be good for schools," "what's good for one is good for all," (Stewart 1993; Fitzsimons & Peters 1993) is exposed as being the major contemporary problem that militates against the best interests of Māori.

The second part discusses concepts of community and explores theoretical accounts of the ways in which communities work to participate in schools. A description and comparison of the philosophy of two opposing types of educational communities is developed. The predominant type will be shown to oppose the cultural traditions and interests of Māori. This will explain why so many Māori do not participate in schools.

Part three will demonstrate where the full capture of Māori interests has taken place by the process of managerialism. As schools struggle to cope within the demands of the reforms, participation by Māori parents, the community that really needs to participate, will be shown to have been reduced to almost nothing of real value to make any difference for reform. A model of a tripartite relationship between parents (as the community), Boards of Trustees (as managers of schools) and the Ministry of Education (as the funder of schools) is presented for discussion. The relationships are represented as a triangle of three possible shapes demonstrating three relationship possibilities.

Part One - The Historical Context.

The Legacy of Colonialism.

This is not a chapter on history or economics. But it is important to recognise that economic theory, policy and practice have profoundly influenced Māori education over the last one hundred and seventy years. These continue to put great pressure, perhaps now more than at any other time in this country's history, on the economic reform of schools. But by explaining the impact of economic theory on Māori education it is hoped to illustrate the possibilities for improvement. Only by understanding our history can we see to influence the future.
Since the establishment of the European system of schooling in New Zealand in 1815, Māori have continuously recognised the necessity of a good education, especially one that is based on strong literacy skills (Stewart 1992). After the establishment of European government by the Treaty of Waitangi in 1840, Māori lost control of their own economics in education (Simon 1986).

The establishment of formal European schooling in New Zealand was at first enthusiastically received and utilised by Māori as an addition and enhancement to their culture and society. The speed and rate in which literacy skills were acquired that benefited Māori language, culture, traditions and economy have been described by Beaglehole (in Ronald 1972) as highly successful. The intellectual benefits were seen in the many publications that appeared, written exclusively in the Māori language. These included an early grammar booklet, parts of the bible, and a collection of thousands of manuscripts detailing letters, petitions and historical accounts collected by Governor Grey. The commercial benefits were seen in the large number of coastal traders (local shipping) that were built that soon opened up exports to Australia. A number of notable Māori chiefs (e.g. Ruatara, Hongi Hika) made round trips to England (Bawden 1987). There they teamed up with academics from Cambridge University to assist in the writing of the first dictionary of the Māori language (Stewart 1992).

Right up to the time of the signing of the Treaty of Waitangi in 1840 it could be said that Māori held the balance of political and economic power by reason of the sheer population size that provided both food and labour for dependent European settlers and missionaries. Written records surviving from these times indicate that this power was exercised almost entirely in the Māori language (Stewart ibid).

During this period the Missionary schools taught exclusively in the Māori language. The schools were funded and supplied from England. Soon after the signing of the Treaty of Waitangi the Church Missionary Society expected their furthermost outpost within the empire to become self sufficient in their own requirements. Twenty years after the first mission school began, and only seven years after the signing of the Treaty of Waitangi, the church missionaries gave away
some of their independence when they accepted the government’s offer of financial assistance to help run their schools. Governor Grey’s *Education Ordinance* of 1847 gave money to mission schools providing the curriculum was taught in both the Māori and English languages. This was the edict by which the English language officially began to replace, rather than add to, the Māori language.

By the mid 1860’s the mass immigration of European settlers outnumbered the *tangata whenua* (indigenous people). The former benevolence once displayed by the early missionaries now became a stranglehold of colonisation (Walker 1990a). Little did Māori expect, from the time that they welcomed Europeans, benefits that would be an addition to their economy, to become a deliberate replacement. The first European missionaries and settlers who were once entirely reliant on the Māori for their very survival now had the provider/survivor roles reversed. The 1867 Native School’s Act made for the compulsory use of the English language for instruction as a condition of funding for schools. According to Lester Ronald this “*spelt the end of bilingualism in the education of Māori children*” (1972:11).

Since the establishment and provision of State funding for New Zealand secular schools Māori students have continually faced a struggle to succeed when compared with their European peers. In earlier research (Stewart 1993) I argued that this decline in the use of te reo Māori in schools was the primary cause of the general academic failure for the majority of students.

There have been other causes. Massive changes in Māori society and economics have exacerbated the problem. At first the language was replaced, then the people were displaced. Huge state housing sub-divisions were built in the post World War II period on the outskirts of the major cities in order to attract large numbers of Māori families into the cheap urban manual labour force. Within one generation a largely rural based Māori speaking population quickly became a mainly urbanised English speaking population, largely divorced and ignorant of its tribal origins.

Māori society responded to the change of lifestyle in a number of ways. First, the development of pan-tribal urban *marae*, traditional gathering places, began to cater for large
numbers of Māori living in the cities. It was made possible by high income in a time of full employment. This provided the base for two further changes, for once firmly established urban Māori were at the forefront of Māori language revival. This was motivated by the strong desire of a displaced people to retain their language. It was made possible simply because urban Māori more than rural Māori have been able to earn the necessary money in order to make and purchases their choices. Many rural marae were funded by money earned in the cities and sent back as donations for various building projects - these have always been the poor relations, dependant on handbacks from the cities. Nowadays, over 80% of the Māori population live away from their original tribal area, only to make occasional visits during the year as time and funds permit. Richard Benton (1997) has warned of the growing gap between urban and rural Māori, one that has economic and linguistic consequences: one that is rich and one that is poor, one that is second language learning and one that is native speaking. Whatever the situation of any school, urban or rural, high or low decile, the results from this research do not indicate that one is more favoured than any other in terms of Māori language and pupil retention. This will be demonstrated in the next chapter.

Over the decades since World War II there have been many reports and commissions that have recognised the problem of poor performance in schools and have made attempts at solutions. In fact there have been more than thirty listed from 1945 (Stewart 1992). Proposed solutions have varied from promoting skilled manual labour, such as the Māori Affairs Trade Training Schemes, to special needs allowances for schools in order to bridge the performance gaps. But unemployment rates for Māori have continued to grow.

But by the beginning of the 1980’s it was very clear that the need for and employment in manual labour was in decline. No longer was manual labour highly paid work. The Employment Contracts Act that removed some of the rights of workers to free bargain working conditions and remuneration, removed such high earnings as triple pay on Sundays. The key problem now facing Māori economics and employment is how to make the change from low skill, low pay to a knowledge based work force, where high skill, high pay is located? This problem is directly linked
to success in education. If the majority of Māori are not succeeding at school then any ability to obtain higher paid work is obviously very limited.

While there is some debate about how bad the achievement gap is between Māori and non-Māori students in school achievement statistics (is the gap widening, static or narrowing) the problem still remains. There exists a gap, and a large one at that (Ministry 1996; Brell 1997). Economists such as Chapple & Jefferies (1997), while attempting to prove a smaller gap, fail to see the broader social consequences of school failure for the majority of Māori. Paralysis by analysis appears to be a problem. If the majority of Māori is still leaving school with no or low school qualifications then they remain largely unemployable in a highly technical and knowledge based economy.

So why have the majority of Māori students failed to achieve at school over many generations? Why in this country, which has often been praised internationally as having one of the most advanced education systems in the world, have Māori not succeeded to expected levels?

Pressures from the economic reforms.

This thesis argues that the continual failure of school reforms to benefit Māori are now centred and fixed in a new form of colonialism, the new right economic, "think-big" theory of education in New Zealand. The term "think-big" had its origin from a former Prime Minister Robert Muldoon in the era of the 1970's economy. There was a deliberate attempt to push the New Zealand economic base from pastoral to manufacturing by the promotion of selected huge industrial complexes. It was supposed that one big size would benefit all with an expanded and improved NZ economic base. In the short-term think-big provided short-term high rates of employment during the construction periods of some large industrial complexes. But within a generation these big employers faced modernisation and re-capitalisation mainly from overseas investors. Specialists were needed. The labour force has been reduced, profits have been marginal.
What started as an attempt to be a self-sufficient economy has turned out to be one more reliant on others.

The pattern of think-big development has been repeated for school reforms. It was a think-big educational reform that was presumed by its proponents to have universal principles of opportunity that would be beneficial to all, including Māori. If policy and legislation were to be put in place then all the supposed benefits would just happen for everyone. But the presumption was simplistic. While all people had the same aims and aspirations to be successful in school and all realised the benefits of a good education, the methods by which these could be achieved may and perhaps should differ according to the culture of the participants. In the reform policy and legislation there was scant recognition of the importance of another different culture within New Zealand which would determine the way in which people would or would not participate.

The reforms were to have the "level playing field" concept. The new rules and regulations of the "game" for education had the appeal because all were to play under the same set of liberalised rules. But what actually happened was that some of the players entered the field more prepared and experienced than others with a referee that has been very slow to act. By the means of possessing more cultural capital (such as prior knowledge and experience; Harker & Nash 1991) than others, certain players were then able to tilt the field in their favour and so gain nearly full possession of both the game and the field.

Those who originally designed the reforms divested themselves of responsibility, and those who were already benefiting from education captured the reform processes in order to gain further benefits (Bertrum 1988). The dominant class who voted in the reforms did so intentionally to further increase their own position and power culture while believing it was in their own best interest to maximise the given opportunity. Education outcomes have always been poor for the majority of Māori students (Stewart 1993) but modern economic reforms have definitely exacerbated the structural inequalities.
The world wide economic recession beginning with the oil-shock price increases of the early 1970’s, combined with the equally disturbing rise in our domestic unemployment rates and negative social statistics of the mid-eighties (Spoonley 1990) had a major impact on the whole of the New Zealand society.

Economic inflation became rampant. The intended think-big industrial projects for economic self-reliance and full employment of the 1970’s soon turned into huge overseas debts as labour intensive industries shed their surplus manpower by redundancies, and were overtaken by the more capital demanding ones. Farm and basic food subsidies came to an end - the cost of living jumped. From the mid 1980’s all government departments underwent restructuring which usually meant that units of state owned property were prepared as independent trading enterprises. These enterprises were then directed to make profits and were sold off to reduce the nation’s external and internal debt. Once the government saw the political benefits to itself (in the appeal to voters of low interest rates and inflation) from such debt reduction no state service was held to be sacred. The government soon withdrew from being a direct trading operator within the commercial world, yet remained a wealthy shareholder with the ability to intervene as it felt necessary. Once the state owned enterprises (SOE’s), as they became known, were on a fully organised basis, the government of the day turned to the non-commercial services of the state. As the education vote (along with Health and Social Welfare) receives a large slice of the annual government budget it was obviously a prime target of economic restructuring. The New Zealand Treasury (Fitzsimons & Peters 1994) saw no reason why it should not. They constructed a New Zealand version of an ideology that saw: “future in terms of a post-industrial utopian vision based on a faith in science, technology and education as the key sectors which will increase our long-term national competitive advantage in the global economy” (Fitzsimons & Peters 1994:46).
Pressure on schools.

By heavy public advertising the government of the late 1980's sold the idea that such restructuring would give economic efficiencies, which would then free up more finance to give us all a much better access to social services. If we could just raise our economic performance then we would be better off as a nation and get back on track towards the dream of equity and utopia (McCulloch 1990). It was a model that seems to have been borrowed from overseas and tried at least a decade before (Newman & Oliver 1980). There was no need to spend more money but just utilise what we had in a much better way. It all made sense:

“David Lange's wide ranging 1989 reform was sold with buzzwords such as parental choice, accountability, responsiveness to community needs, excellence and flexibility” (Wheeler 1995:7).

The recent coalition government (up to 1999) continued the de-regulating of many aspects of school administration. This indicates a strong desire and push for schools to adopt the neo-right economic principles of successful business and become fully commercial. All the government would then have to do is make the necessary capital investment with some periodic regulations (called fine-tuning) with all schools free to act in the open market to attract clientele. Monopolies would have to go, so de-zoning of schools would ensure the free competition for pupils as customers. As with many other commercial enterprises the market school may seek overseas investment by attracting foreign full fee paying students, and adopt user-pays by seeking to recover debts by charging school and subject fees. Schools must stand their own losses (such as by fire) by the provision of their own insurance for any replacements. Boards of trustees are free to co-opt as members the necessary management or commercial type experts who do not have to be parents of attending pupils. Full site-based management by boards of trustees, especially if bulk funding of teacher salaries is included, completes the commercial model because the school is then
independent of all its funding management. Bulk funding is now called direct Resourcing in an attempt that the controversial image of the former term will disappear.

As with the executives of commercial enterprises the boards of trustee members seem to be in a strong position to protect their membership, unless a serious administrative crisis causes the Minister of Education to use the right of replacement with a commissioner. The community has the opportunity once ever three years to show its satisfaction with continuing members of boards and/or elect replacements. External checks (e.g. Government Audit Office) have been more preoccupied with accounting procedures and administration (e.g. Ministry of Education spot checks on over enrolments); Education Review Office reports are very infrequent (only every five years plus) and very contestable within the public media. Bad school reports that have been released to the media remain as temporary embarrassments to which school principals have been highly defensive, or pass the blame back to the Ministry. School boards may decide their own policy on how and when they report to their community, who in turn are reduced to almost silent-partner shareholders between triennial elections.

Going to school sounds like going shopping for learning five days a week. Competition in the market place is to be the main regulator of efficiency and customer satisfaction. Around your town you might see posters advertising the attractions and benefits of respective schools. The smaller rural schools threatened with closure and amalgamations into town schools are advertising themselves in this way. There is certainly wide advertising in newspapers for pupils. During the field research it was observed that one school has issued uniformed blazers to its senior staff to enhance its corporate image. School uniforms, once reflecting the tradition of middle class public schools are now reflecting the latest corporate fashions. Those schools that cannot attract pupils, or do not have the necessary economy of scale (often meaning the small rural schools) will simply close their doors. The Minister of Education has stimulated the market by the release of a SnapShot Report (29/6/95) that ranked a number of secondary schools against each other by their
public examination passes. He claimed he was required to do so because in his opinion his ministry was now subject to report under the Public Finance Act (National Radio News, 1995).

Going to school may well begin to sound like going shopping for learning. But employing the market model for education to improve national educational outcomes has one major difficulty - it is in the nature of competition that there are winners and losers. The winners are no doubt well satisfied but the losers will not be happy.

The disparity in achievement appears to be as wide as it has ever been. It is now clear that we are not the homogeneous society that we thought we were. The rich still seem to get richer and the poor still poorer, for both under the "iron cage bureaucracy" (Bates 1984) of old and the choice of the new, the white middle class does better than the poor and the brown (Hubbard 1995:23; Wheeler 1995:7). This may mean that the large population growth predicted for Māori (Statistics 1994) will result in a large community of underachievers. The implications could be disastrous for our society.

Some critiques.

The dangers of creating further social inequalities by the introduction of new right economic principles influencing our education system in New Zealand were argued well before the beginning of the 1987 education reforms (Bates 1984). Others argued during the implementation process (Bertram 1988), and others through post-evaluations (Easton 1995). So why have successive Governments not listened to our education experts? As already outlined above, the reforms have been economically driven by the more powerful influence of the Treasury\(^1\), where a neo-classical type of human capital theory has presumed that the economy can be managed quite separately from society (Fitzsimons & Peters 1994; Peters 1993; Sutherland 1994).

\(^1\) The Treasury is a New Zealand Government Ministry that sets policy and regulates spending within all government ministries.
The fundamental weakness of the reform ideology is that getting an education is not like going shopping. It is just that the reforms have tended to treat all people as if they were, and as if all parent customers were the same on universalist principles. Richard Bates (1984) referred to these principles as being part of the old, one best system, where inequality on the level playing field was part of Darwinism in education, where some pupils made it, some did not. There is a growing discontent from those who are not. "The main tenet of classical liberal economics is that people should be treated as rational utility maximisers in all their behaviour" (Fitzsimons & Peters 1994:48). Again, universalist principles do not work for parents who often exhibit an "irrational" behaviour, one that the economist has not been able to deal with as it appears to have no logical sense. While people often go shopping with an experienced eye for price and quality a recent major OECD study concluded that parents and children rarely chose schools on the basis of well-informed comparisons of educational quality (Hubbard 1995:18).

Clearly there exist much wider social structures which influence parental decision making. The lack of acknowledgement of this gremlin within the market model of education continues to "lead to personal, social and economic catastrophes" which Picot (1987:5) the author of the government's reform policy said it would avoid. What was envisaged in policy is not always emerging in practice. What is clear is that the provision of education "is dependent on but not determined by" (Dale 1995:2) the national economy. There must exist then another variable or other variables that need to be taken into account.

One of many criticisms of the education reforms is that the: "free-market economies will use labour at its cheapest, discarding the poor and the less able, in order to concentrate wealth in the interests of capital and those who control it" (Richie 1992:160).

It is a politically motivated ideology that certainly poses a great danger to Māori for as the group achieving the least in education their position and opportunities are then likely to remain static. The great irony of Tomorrow's Schools (1988) was that it originated from a pro-Māori
Labour Government’s (Lange 1988) intent to reform educational administration within New Zealand primary and secondary schools. The rationale was also appealing to the conservatives, for this reform was a promise that it would:

“result in more immediate delivery of resources to schools, more parental and community involvement, and greater teacher responsibility. It will lead to improved learning opportunities for the children of this country” (ibid p iv).

Selling the reforms.

The words of the reform are very persuasive. Even the various teacher unions and schools had previously been very busy in promoting such reform packages as the Curriculum Review (Department of Education 1987). Now the new Minister of Education was going to make it all possible to happen:

“It seemed to me to be a good mixture of responsiveness, flexibility and accountability” he said (Lange 1988:iii). His intended reform of the educational administration was based on nine principle features, the second of which was:

“The running of the institution will be a partnership between the professionals and the particular community in which it is located” (p 1, see also Snook 1989:13).

Early in 1989 the first “particular community” contact of the reform process was made by children bringing home from their schools colourful pamphlets to their parents urging them all to “really get involved with the education of their child. Speak up. Have your say. Make sure your child gets the best education possible” (Ministry take-home pamphlet 1989).

From this researcher’s own experience as a teacher up to this time there seemed to have existed a clear demarcation of roles, responsibilities and definitions between teachers (as the “professionals”) and parents (as the “particular community”). We all seemed to follow a long established tradition in schooling where teachers had their three R’s to teach and the prime role of
parents was to make sure their kids got to school on time all adequately clothed and fed (Beattie 1985; Timperley, McNaughton, Parr & Robinson 1992; Capper 1994). Any strengthening of these roles seemed to me to be a good thing. Within the economic depression of the time perceptions of the standards of care by both teachers and parents seemed to have been slipping.

Up to then the local and voluntary Parent-Teacher Association, or PTA, was the forum for teachers and parents to come together to solve common issues, usually a lack of money for extra equipment. It was the place where school policies (or governance) could be explained to parents but where school classroom practices (or management) were usually not. Other than this, communication was rather a one way traffic system - from school to the home via newsletters (Capper ibid). There is strong empirical evidence to suggest that these types of home-school collaborations are still very commonly expected and regarded as adequate (Timperley, McNaughton, Parr, & Robinson 1992; Capper 1994).

But this traditional interpretation of partnership between home and school has given rise to a “comfort zone” mentality with a clear demarcation of roles and responsibilities. In this study, the pyramid of school power with school management at the top and individual Māori language teachers at the base, were all resistant to change of identity and responsibility. But the narrow interpretation of “professionals” as being the teachers and “particular community” as being the parents of pupils was not necessarily what the Minister had in mind. It was a statement in general, but nothing in particular, using a type of language that was pleasing and appealing to us all. The terms were vague enough to provide the possibility of a much wider definition for which everybody could later be suited. While the language for educational reforms may have been acceptable at the time, the participatory mechanisms were not fully comprehended. There was some warning by early commentators (Snook 1989; Smith, Peddie, Thew, Jones & Lankshear in Access 1988). But politicians and public both seemed to be in the mood for change (Barrington 1990), confident in a number of assumptions (Thew 1989) that problems could be solved as we all worked to improve the “learning opportunities for the children of this country” (Lange ibid).
There is no sign at all that Māori students have reaped any benefits from the restructured economy or the administrative reforms in school (Chapple & Jefferies 1997). In fact the gap in the attainment of Māori students compared with non-Māori is so great that the predicted population rise for Māori (Statistics 1994) may only exacerbate the cycle of failure and disadvantage in schools.

The problem of Māori participation does not have a solution based in improving economics. A Ministry document has stated that:

"There is no evidence that where schools are failing students, extra funding alone can change things ... the paper argues that the key element in changing learning outcomes is the analysis and planning that precedes action" (Ministry 1993:8-9).

At the moment the analysis and planning seems to be excluding the Māori community, as will be shown in part three. But for the moment it is important to know what the Māori community is and how it operates for Māori parents.

Part Two - Defining the Community.

As noted above it is difficult to locate within the literature (either state-sponsored reports, academic and media commentators) what or who the community actually is. The contributions reviewed appear to be assumptions rather than precise definitions. None of the official documents such as Tomorrow's Schools (1988) which promote the "partnership and the community" are particularly helpful (Timperley, McNaughton, Parr & Robinson 1992).

Roger Dale (1994) has defined community as being simply the residue of what ever has been left over from a description of the state (as the Ministry of Education) and the free-market forces: "the third sector." The community here could be taken for what ever you wanted it to be. Laurie Thew (1995) states that we have for too long "taken for granted" the current use of the term
community as being simply of where schools are located. He argues that the concept of community was not clearly defined within the Tomorrow’s Schools document. Yet in Chapter Five of that document, The Practical Issues of Schooling, there exists an explicit statement: “that students can attend a state school reasonably convenient to their home” that would be protected by “the provision of a home zone area” with any unfilled places able to be filled “by out-of-zone applicants” (Lange 1988:36). Here is a presumption of the definition of community. Anyone who is able by these requirements to attend any particular school becomes part of its community, based in the main on geographical reasons. The other part, we are to presume, is made up of all others within the geographical area, whether or not they are active in the school’s affairs because they do have the potential to be so.

The geographical community may be modified by enrolment schemes which are required to help predict any future growth of the school, and may cap or expand according to the Ministry’s prior approval, any future extra resources for teacher supply and building expansion. This is a definition for administrative and control purposes. Laurie Thew’s argument is that this is more a matter of control rather than administration as school boards have learnt to pick and choose who they would like to attend and be part of their particular active community. However, the long held cultural value in New Zealand of the right of attending a local school, in geographical proximity to a home, or any other choice may soon be at an end (New Zealand Post Primary Teachers’ Association 1988). The commercial model of free choice in deciding what school is best to attend also now seems to mean that schools have the right to serve any customers they wish. Thus, we can well expect the rise of many niche market schools, for “up” as well as “down market” custom, similar perhaps to the magnet schools within the USA system. My study of these magnet schools in Miami, Florida (Stewart 1993), indicates an entirely non-geographical school, one that maximises preferred combinations of artistic and language use. These schools are free from zoning.
restrictions to choose who ever they want as pupils from any town district and may be described as having a special character\(^2\) similar to state integrated Catholic schools in New Zealand.

**Extremes of views.**

The neo-liberal market reforms in our education system have provided a simple operational definition of community. We may not agree with it, it may be not what we want, but it is the way the system has been designed to operate. Community is, for administrative purposes, simply the geographical catchment from where the pupils come to attend the school, or those pupils that the school is prepared to accept. The catchment may be a single geographical area or include many disjoint segments. Where the catchment is located, parents may be active in contributing to the school, or re-active in exiting to attend another, while the residue of the catchment can have a passive attachment by reaping economic benefits by the supply of goods and services, sponsorships, property values, using school facilities for recreation, etc. From my reading of many charter documents, the sections that describe the community, consultation with the community and the sections that details enrolment schemes all describe who is in or out of the school - this then becomes the “particular community” (Lange 1988:1).

This type of market led definition of the community is distinguished by what people are able to do in their community, that is if they are able to choose their school and if the school chooses them. There may be some notion of belief in or self conscious affiliation with the school, but the self-found situation is more important, for people will tend to make do where they are. Levels of co-operation between members of this school community can and do vary, but always in the belief that they are working for their children. This community is distinct from a community of interest, such as a religious school where the membership is voluntary, or a community of kinship such as a papa kainga (family estate) where membership is a birthright. It may even be a community of

\(^2\) The special character is allowed by the Catholic Schools Integration Act for Catholic schools to retain the teaching of religion within a secular schooling system.
compulsion, such as a jail where membership is at Her Majesty's leisure. We can add to this list a community of language, such as kohanga reo or kura kaupapa where the membership is highly cultural. It is these latter types of communities that continue to have strong normative forces as compared with the more descriptive type (Abercrombie 1988; Peters & Marshall 1988b; Newman & Oliver 1980).

Table 2.1 below constructs a summary of nine elements that define key characteristics of community. It sets out a contrast of two polar types: between a more descriptive (as the economic) model and a more normative (as the co-operative) model. These characteristics first identify the source and membership of the particular community, both of which determine the working outcomes of knowledge, pursuits, benefits, decision-making processes and public acceptability.

The nature of the descriptive model is that it has very dynamic and powerful processes. Because it encourages and accepts outside intervention (market forces) and membership (outside experts) it is constantly subject to change. The driving force is the continual pursuit of materialism and capital accumulation. The "culture" is expressed by financial rewards that are very visible and tangible (e.g property accumulation) and can be readily traded (e.g for cash). Such pursuit makes for winners and losers within a competitive community that regards this process as being a healthy one for the survival of the fittest. As much as it is likely to be changed within by the movement of its own internal membership (fragmented interests), it can easily and readily be changed from without (e.g by the power of the State). External auditing can make the management processes highly visible.

In contrast, the normative model of community is highly resistant to change. It achieves this by looking for and encouraging positions of leadership and responsibility (e.g. experts) from within the established membership. Therefore, human development is vital for self-sufficiency, before any material gains can be achieved. Perhaps the continuation of the present identity (language and culture) is the most desired outcome. The most severe criticism comes from internal censure.
Table 2:1 Two Extreme Models of Community.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Characteristics of the Communities:</th>
<th>Descriptive</th>
<th>Normative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>source</strong></td>
<td>defined by the market</td>
<td>internally defined by the group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Membership</strong></td>
<td>democratic</td>
<td>autocratic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>legalised by the state</td>
<td>own authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>fragmented interests</td>
<td>continually hereditary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>fixed number</td>
<td>open number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>temporary</td>
<td>life time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Knowledge</strong></td>
<td>co-ops outside experts</td>
<td>contains its own experts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>external curriculum, pedagogy</td>
<td>internal curriculum, pedagogy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>pursues</strong></td>
<td>materialism</td>
<td>welfareism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>continuation of capital accumulation</td>
<td>continuation of present identity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>in competitive market</td>
<td>non-competitive self</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>benefits</strong></td>
<td>for individuals</td>
<td>for the whole group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>decision making</strong></td>
<td>by majority vote</td>
<td>by consensus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>exterior regulations</td>
<td>internal rule making</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>contestable</td>
<td>harmony</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>acceptability</strong></td>
<td>external audit</td>
<td>internal censure</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Material bases: economic**
- human capital theory
- economic social theory

**political**
- neo-liberal
- neo Marxist
It can be seen that although these two polar types are extremes of each other, they do have common characteristics. For instance, both have their own distinct and special language for the working of their own particular culture. Both would, if taken to their ultimate desire, exclude the Ministry of Education from any running of the schools. Both types would want to set their own agenda and curriculum, making finance the only state input. As such they are not politically acceptable to the state as it would lose all control. It is presumed that schools are operating somewhere between the two extremes, perhaps some more to the right and others more to the left. How then do schools work against the demands of both sides? But within any school community there is an “affiliation that brings to a greater or lesser extent mutual costs and obligations where the actions of some members has an effect on all other members” (Thew 1995).

As the education reforms continue in the next decade the push or pull of polarisation is likely to greatly increase. A notion of a community that has its membership based on geography and the ability of its membership to access the services offered can operate like any business or shop. It works on an economic rationalism that economics of scale are beneficial to everyone. Tomorrow’s Schools (Lange 1998) was concerned with the reform of the administration of education within New Zealand. The “business” of operating schools has tended to favour the descriptive model of community. The opposing normative model of community, which best fits with the position of Māori cultural and social values, makes it difficult for Māori to participate within this reform process. It explains the problems that Māori may have in attempting to compromise or change their traditional values, hence it explains the reluctance of Māori to participate within the whole reform process.
Ten years after the 1999 beginning of major school reform in New Zealand, it seems, at least as portrayed by the public media (Hubbard 1995), that we have lost the dream of reform and slipped into a nightmare of crisis within our schools. So many schools seem to be struggling for cash to provide resources, many find it difficult to involve parents and their communities, teachers are claiming they are all over worked and underpaid, and above all that learning opportunities for the children of this country have not improved. The crisis is not so new for it was officially recognised at least eight years ago as:

"a perception of increased central bureaucratic control, increased burdensome administrative tasks, inadequate Resourcing and support for the institutions, and inadequate attention to educational outcomes" (Lough Report 1990:6).

Teachers themselves were not impressed and continued to be scathing in their criticism as this news editorial says:

"Perhaps one of the greatest failures of all the reforms is that it difficult to identify even one element that will help teachers do better the task that education is all about ... Parents were offered an illusion of having a greater say in their children's education. instead boards of trustees are overworked and facing potential industrial conflict, the trauma of cost-cutting within diminishing budgets, endless hours of night meetings and increasing pressure for local fundraising, while the purse strings remain at the centre" (NZPPTA News March 1991).

Teachers also claim that their senior managements in schools have developed: "an ideology of mangelialism, which held that only managers know what to do or should know what to do has hijacked partnership" (PPTA News, Nov 1991). Such a decision making process is consistent with other financial decisions that principals make under the work pressure of recent reforms of educational management. This is a complaint that frequently arises in most studies of home-school relationships (Timperley, McNaughton, Parr & Robinson 1992; Stewart 1992; Johnson 1992;
Capper 1994; Mitchell & Mitchell 1993; Filipo 1993). Roger Dale (1992) refers to this as "professional capture" where the convenience of the educational system and teaching profession is easier than serving the community.

Escape from this capture has not been possible for a number of reasons. First, many parents are perhaps reluctant to move from the comfort zone of familiarity in terms of their own schooling experience. It may be far easier to accept a choice model of schooling rather than that of conflict or change. Rather than changing schools, presuming that one can afford the change, it may be easier to put up with what one has. Often it is far easier to be persuaded that any "problems" originate from the students and not from the school management. The lack of definition in the role for Māori parents in the management of the delivery of the curriculum has already been emphasised. Lastly, the lack of any successful legal challenges through the law courts, such as has been seen in two United States studies (Stewart 1993 & 1997), has put school boards into strong positions of power.

Principals continue to justify their mode of work by arguing that the complex and sophisticated business-management skills required for the work in such multimillion dollar enterprises are not understood or appreciated by parents, and that these skills are often lacking among Board of Trustee members (Chamberlain 1995). As New Zealand candidates for Boards of Trustees are more likely to be elected because of their particular expertise of management (Johnson 1992) they very easily tend towards managerialism themselves. The apparent lack of appreciation of parents, because of the nature of managerialism, has minimised the representative nature of the relationship between Boards and their parents.

The three main partners in the education system seem to be in a cycle of blame:
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Is the popular perception portrayed in the media of the failure of the educational administration reforms and expected outcomes valid? Several national daily newspapers (e.g. NZ Herald) and weekly publications (e.g. NZ Listener) as well as provincial and community papers, along with television and radio have recently run commentaries and enquires as to how well schools in general or particular are performing. The majority of these items continue to doubt the promises of benefits from the reforms (Stewart 1995). Is the media just pursuing the bad news? Whether valid or not the notion of *perception* has been very neglected within the New Zealand education reform literature. We do not stand-alone here, for overseas research case studies also demonstrate the inherent difficulties of community participation in schools (David 1993; Beattie 1985). What the government wants to allow for by legislation and implementation and what the community expects to be able to perform are two quite different things. While in-between on the grid are the market forces feeding the popular media of radio, television and radio their own perceptions of reform.

The *End of Term Report Card* on the reforms featured in the widely read weekly, *New Zealand Listener* (Hubbard 1995), clearly demonstrated that under both the old system (of State bureaucratic management) and under the new system (of consumer choice) white middle class families do better than the poor and the brown in terms of school examination. Above all the original and current criticisms of the reform repeat over and over that there is little relationship between the provision of improving learning opportunities and improved outcomes for students (Snook 1989:14; McCulloch 1990; Dale 1992:6).

Why is there now a strong perception that the more immediate delivery of resources, parent and community involvement, and teacher responsibility has all gone wrong (if “wrong” is the fairest word to use)? Did parents ever really become involved? Is the *partnership between the professionals and the particular community*” (Lange 1988:1) all that it should or could be (note that the reference to parents is missing)?
Distorting the model.

There may have been a public expectation that the partnership model was to be tripartite, with some notion of equality represented here by the equilateral triangle. But the shape of the working triangle has now become very unequal:

On this representation the triangle moves from what may have been originally advertised or intended as a type of equilateral relationship to that of a scalene triangle that distances the community. The Ministry of Education will always tend to deal directly with that vertex which is more recognisable and coherent to itself and within the legal framework it itself designed. Principal agent theory (Boston 1991) deals with only one customer at a time and favours that with which it can most easily work. Education Development Initiatives (EDIs) that were designed as a series of local consultations to rationalise the provisions of schooling within certain districts, meaning some schools might close, amalgamate or be decapitated (lose year seven and eight students), proved to be a nightmare for the Ministry organisers. It has become increasingly impossible for the Ministry to work directly with the community, especially on divisive educational issues, therefore, it has devolved itself of such issues directly to Boards of Trustees. As far as the Ministry of Education is concerned the Boards of Trustees are the only easily recognisable partners they can act with.

School cultures that move the role of parents to the sidelines can be seen even within classroom practices. The study by Daphine Johnson (1991), Parents, Students and Teacher: a Three-Way Relationship, within a working-class group of English schools demonstrates that teachers, just like school managers prefer to work with students in order to avoid complex
relationships with parents. According to this study teachers preferred that "parents should remain in the background as a secondary resource, if things did not go according to plan between teacher and student" (ibid p177). Thus, parents were only required during negative occasions to visit the school.

In a Canadian study by Coleman, Collinge & Tabin (1992) a conceptual framework is outlined in order to identify and explain the major attitudinal elements amongst parents, teachers and students that influence triadic collaboration to facilitate student learning. The study demonstrates just how powerful teacher are in shaping attitudes of students and parents to schools. The authors conclude that the teachers “cannot assume positive parent attitudes to involvement; they must "permit" collaboration and indeed stimulate it” (ibid p6). If teachers are blaming parents for their lack of interest in their children’s education then the teachers have only themselves to blame for “seldom do teachers and parents interact in ways most likely to enhance student learning” (ibid p7). The power of the teachers to control parent participation either by limitation, avoidance and exclusion has been a noted feature of many overseas studies, especially by Joyce Epstein (1992), and in New Zealand by Ramsay; Hawk; Harold; Marriott & Poskitt (1993). The authors each outline graduated steps to increasing levels of parental involvement but note that parents never seem to succeed in moving past an approximate halfway point. Typically, the ascending levels (Department of Education 1989) involve parents as first being informed, second taking part in various social activities, and third being involved through various opportunities for dialogues and exchanges of views. But higher steps, such as those that involve the making of decisions and the highest step, that of having any responsibility to act, are both way out of reach for parents.

Parents have been officially listed as missing persons. In chapter one I have already detailed how Dr Maris O’Rouke’s front-page article in the Education Gazette (2/3/94) listed three significant and valuable goals for the revitalisation of the Māori language, one of which was the specific encouragement of greater participation by Māori parents in education (ibid p 2). However,
one year later her lead article in the Gazette repeated only two goals, omitting any specific reference to the role of parents (15/2/95). This is in direct contrast to the Māori Language Commissioner’s often-repeated statements that parents of children are the critical issue in language education and survival (Karetu 1997). The tripartite model of ideal partnership drawn above has dropped the Māori community right out. Yet there have been repeated calls from Ministry of Education officials to make the Māori parent community an integral part of the decision-making processes in Māori education matters. It appears that there has been a move from involving the wider Māori community to one that is far more restricted. From what may have been the original normative community involvement (as described within Table 2:1 Two extreme Models of Community) there has been a move towards descriptive (or restricted) participation.

The capture has distorted the intended meaning of partnership and community as Māori would view them, and so neutralised any idealised implementation. The research work completed and reported in the next three chapters will illustrate three specific ways in which the Māori parent community is excluded from partnership practices. Perhaps more important is how the Māori parent community could be reconstructed within schools.

The specific questions asked in the next three chapters are how much and what type of Māori parent involvement is actually taking place, and how effective is this in the aim of improving outcomes for Māori students?
Chapter Three:

*Treaty of Waitangi Policies in School Charters.*

This chapter describes the first of three investigations undertaken in order to observe and analyse the amount of Māori parent community participation within Northland schools during a three-year period. The previous chapter has dealt with notions and the practice of community in the politics of New Zealand education. This chapter examines and discusses the place of the Māori parent community within a particular historical and legal framework that is unique to this particular country, based on the Treaty of Waitangi. In all three investigations (see the following two chapters) the researcher wanted to find out exactly how much and what type of Māori parent community involvement was actually taking place, then to evaluate the effectiveness of this involvement. The Māori parent community is defined as any member of the local Māori community who contributes to the health and welfare of the students; including mātua tūturu (natural parents), mātua whāngai (care givers), kaumātua (tribal elders), kōmiti marae and runanga-a-iwi (tribal district councils).

At the beginning of the reforms of the administration of New Zealand schools (Lange 1987) all school boards were required to write and incorporate into their school charters a document expressing their community’s commitment to the Treaty of Waitangi. This Treaty was a negotiated deed of settlement, signed in 1840, between the British Crown and the Māori tribal chiefs that allowed for the establishment of British colonial government within New Zealand. Most historical references to this treaty have been to secure land and other resources, such as traditional fisheries. Only in more recent decades has a wider recognition of “other resources” been legally extended to determine the ownership of intellectual property (Hastings 1988) such as the Māori language. Such recognition was placed within the *Tomorrow’s Schools* (Lange 1988) document in order to encourage Māori into the management of education to improve Māori outcomes.

However, in 1993 the *National Administration Guidelines* (Ministry 1993) issued to all schools...
omitted any compulsory requirement to do so.

The first research question was to ask how well schools were implementing the Treaty of Waitangi on a voluntary basis? At the beginning of 1995 school charter policy documents were requested from 20 local schools in order to evaluate their contents. Initially all these requests were made "over the counter" and where not immediately available were sent by post. This revealed that the majority of local schools no longer had Treaty of Waitangi sections within their school charter documents. This was quite surprising because all of these schools were actually situated close to Waitangi (the actual place where the treaty was first signed in 1840) in the Bay of Islands. However, an extensive reading and search through the academic literature has revealed that although general principles have been stated for the incorporation of the Treaty of Waitangi into education, there has been very minimal expansion of these principles into action. At least four major government sponsored reports, will be shown either to have completely ignored any reference to the Treaty or give only brief mention.

There are a number of reasons why many school charters are omitting Treaty of Waitangi policies and why academic writers ignore the practical issues for schools. First, schools and academics are not being sufficiently pressured to do so by Māori leaders who seem to be continuously distracted into Treaty issues of high economic gain, such as fisheries and forest claims. Such claims, often accompanied by protest demonstrations, have been publicised as radical and negative within the various media. Perhaps such publicity has made many school boards with good intentions, very cautious, especially when sited within European dominated communities. The lack of sufficient numbers of Māori members of Boards of Trustees (Johnston 1992) is also a concern for mainstream state schools, even for those that have high percentages of Māori students. For many, including some academics and officials, the issue has been placed in the too hard or too risky basket. Then for others, as was found in this research, they are just too busy, burdened with every day administration and duties.

Surprisingly, documents issued from the Ministry of Education or Education Review Office
make few references to the Treaty of Waitangi. When doing so the Treaty principles are emphasised as being one of *partnership* with the local Māori parent community. The school charters that were reviewed also emphasise partnership, as do the Education Review Office reports done locally. It is argued here that partnership should not be and never was, the basic principle for the Treaty of Waitangi. For all other Treaty claims being settled the main issue is that of *ownership*. Being a Treaty partner or a Treaty owner (such as the Māori language) involves differing attitudes and modes of behaviour. This issue is crucial to the argument and will be demonstrated as the main reason why many Treaty policies fail to be effective.

Robert Parahaki (1990) regards “success” for Māori pupils as being able to reach the end of the seventh form with their te reo intact. The fact is, that more than eighty percent of all Māori students fail to reach the basic goal of even reaching the seventh form and only one percent reach it with te reo Māori (Reedy 1992; Davies and Nicholl 1993; Statistics 1994: Chapple 1997). The problem has been a long time in the making, yet this national shame has only recently been the cause for government sponsored hui up and down the country, guided by Wally Penetito (Te Punī Kōkiri 1997). According to OECD reports (Department of Education 1982) it is an international shame when comparing our student attainment with our trading partners. Yet there does not seem to be a sense of national urgency to combat the problem.

This chapter is presented in three parts. It begins with an account of our nations divided and often anti or apathetic attitudes to Māori language and education - a rather forgotten part of Treaty concerns. The second part reviews analyses of theory and practice that illuminate practical applications of the Treaty of Waitangi in our mainstream schools. In this section a series of questions are asked as to what Māori people want from the education system. Finally, a number of schools’ Treaty of Waitangi charter documents are examined as to their policy statements and outcomes.
The National Attitude.

The 1990, one hundred and fiftieth anniversary celebrations of the signing of the Treaty of Waitangi has long been and gone. Politicians and the press were then busy publishing books and pamphlets to enthuse the New Zealand population with national pride in our bi-cultural achievements. But now, ten years later, the parties and parades have all quietened, and it is business as usual within the so-called One New Zealand. Where does all the literature, the endless TV commercials of fuzzy feelings leave us all? Throughout the year since there have been continuing land protest occupations. Protests at Waitangi had become, until 1999 too difficult for the government representatives to attend.

An editorial in the *Northern Advocate* illustrates the need to appeal for calm and reason:

"it is all too easy for people to jump to the wrong conclusions, stirring up the embers of racial discord ... there needs to be a greater knowledge of the Treaty of Waitangi, a document which to this day attracts little more than lip service from many people" (15.8.92:4).

It was most unfortunate that in 1995, the year dedicated to *He Taonga te Reo*, the Māori Language Year, that another controversial issue, the fiscal envelope, had occupied both Māori and European alike. It took away a focus from the central issue facing us all as a nation of people aspiring to racial harmony - that of the health, welfare and especially education of the Māori people. As much as the land confiscations and dubious deals of last century left many Māori people almost landless in our own country, so too the foreign imposed system of schooling has left Māori almost speechless in their own language. The Waitangi Tribunal is over-worked with some five hundred claims (Cleave 1989), all concerning land and resources, be it forest or fisheries, but nothing is currently claimed for education. Those who stand on the protest lines and shout "Honour the Treaty!" know their whole lives have been alienated, not just their tribal lands. One of the most treasured taonga of all to the Māori, that of te reo, gets no mention within the Crown

---

1 A political movement that attempts to ignore cultural differences.
2 The fiscal envelope refers to the attempts of the New Zealand Government during 1995 to encourage Treaty of Waitangi settlements with Māori, but with fixed final amounts.

It might be claimed that one of the fundamental characteristics and strengths of our New Zealand society is that we all have many cultural values in common, such as the love of sport and outdoor recreation. The great range of such leisure pursuits is very diverse. As a country we excel internationally. However, one of the major weaknesses of a powerful and dominant society is an intolerance for using and speaking other languages. The English language has become so institutionalised into all facets of our society, that the very use of any other language is often viewed as a separatist threat. The use of any other language, especially Māori, is ironically misconceived as an "invasion," a take-over, of our important cultural institutions of transmission, such as schools and the media, rather than simply adding on, enjoying or recognising another culture (Waite 1992). The occupation of Moutua Gardens (Paikatore) in Wanganui\(^3\) was a microcosm of how New Zealanders can easily become polarised into taking sides, and so demonstrates how far we as a nation have to go before we can claim to be anywhere near bi-cultural in attitude or practice. Certainly the claims of customary fishing rights would be viewed by the majority as a problem, not a privilege.

Yet liberal arguments are made that anyone in New Zealand is able "to do their own thing" - provided of course, it is "user pays," or privately funded. But anything that is publicly owned or funded by the taxpayer (such as schools, parks and reserves) or has a high public interest and participation (such as television) appears to be sacrosanct to the exclusive will of the dominant language group. In this way it tends to exclude all others (Smith & Smith 1989; Vasil 1988). Nina Benton says it well:

"At a flick of the switch, the elegance of English speech and English ways is ushered into almost every living room from Ninety Mile Beach to Bluff, from the Arran Islands to the other side of the Atlantic. But the beautiful people rarely have a Māori face and even more rarely say a Māori word" (1987a:3).

\(^3\) This was the passive occupation of a public park within the city that was claimed by local Māori.
A simple reflection of the issue of the dominance of one language can be seen in the small amount of te reo Māori being broadcast on national television. If, for instance, the amount of television time given to Māori language was brought up to an equivalent time as a fair percentage of the total Māori population (I calculate that this would give at least one hour or more each day) there would probably be a public outcry. At the moment there is just enough Māori programming to fulfil the statutory requirements of the New Zealand Broadcasting Corporation, but not enough to upset the general public (the dominant English language group) or change the station ratings.

The reason for the strength and dominance is suggested by Gladwin and Saidin (quoted in Fleras 1984):

"The trouble is that the system within which they live is so thoroughly organised around the principle of white superiority that they cannot conceive of being in any other position ... it is essentially psychological: the system creates the illusion that there are no alternatives outside its own logic" (p 59).

Orally it was referred to in the Swann Report (quoted in Hirsh 1990:92) as a "mental rigidity," and by Fleras (1984:67) as the "cultural blind spot".

In modern history, the English language has never been subjected to any threat of extinction by assimilation, but has always assimilated others (Vasil 1990). Early social science notions of phrenology (the shape of the skull determining intelligence, in Hodson & Prophet 1986) and eugenics (the improvement of populations by using genetics, in Spoonley 1990) were once used as justifications for such control. The sociolinguist Jim Cummins uses the term "Anglo-conformity" (1981:5) for it was assumed that all ethnic groups of the British Empire would eventually give up their own language and become assimilated into the "superior" British culture. The dominance of one language to the deliberate exclusion of any other for any reason is, quite simply, racism (Spoonerly 1990; Hirsh 1990; Blackburn 1981; Ward & Shueng 1992).

In New Zealand such racism became institutionalised by the power of the State using the 1867 Native School's Act. This Act of Parliament, according to Ronald "spelt the end of
bilingualism in the education of Māori children" (1972:11), and since then Māori pupils in particular have suffered continuing low academic performance and outcomes in contrast to European pupils in State mainstream schools. For nearly one hundred years there existed a deliberate policy of the State in suppressing the teaching and even the use of te reo Māori in schools. Yet there seems to be no doubt that the historical decline in the use of te reo Māori for the education of Māori pupils has paralleled a decline in their overall performance at all levels of schooling. There still exists a popular view in the news media, especially by anti-Māori letters in newspapers, that te reo Māori has little practical use in the "export-import" modern world. Even in schools this anti-Māori sentiment has been found to be common (Mitchell & Mitchell 1993).

Mainstream schooling in New Zealand by the use of the English language controls with the English culture. The dominant language has always been the dominant power - one language means one power source. Power alone rules if there are no language rights for minorities (Spolsky, in Ministry of Education 1991a). Over the last two decades Māori activists and protesters have been busy attempting to reclaim Māori land and justice rights (Legat 1986). Only since the passing of the Māori Language Act in 1986 have language rights been such an intense focus for tino rangatiratanga, or Māori self determination, as promised in the Treaty of Waitangi.

There have been three issues involved. First and foremost were attempts to take the necessary steps to rescue the language from extinction. Second and especially in the present has come an intense power struggle between competing educational interests and ideologies (as will be shown later in this thesis). Third, Kura Kaupapa Māori schools have now advanced from the struggle to institutionalise te reo in schooling to focus on academic and cognitive benefits from the learning of te reo Māori (Cummins 1989; Hirsh 1990; Anderson 1994).

The motivation and determination of the Māori people to preserve their language is not well understood or appreciated by many. The language is more than a traditional communication tool, for it is regarded as essential for the very survival of distinct culture. If there is no distinct language, then there can be no culture, no Māori people.
When a speaker first rises on the marae[^1] he will often cry out the words: "Tihe mauri ora!"

Often this is translated as: "Behold I sneeze!" But the English language misses out on the mauri, the real soul of these words which describes a conscious awakening, a sense of being Māori, for:

"Māori language is the means by which I celebrate my birth, teach and chastise my children, work and feed my family, mourn my dead and communicate with my god. Without it I am nothing. I don't belong, I can't relate, I am lost" (Waifers Shortland 1990:99).

Here is an enormous intimate and personal commitment of a lifetime. For this Māori person his physical and spiritual life cannot exist without his language of expression and communication. The language is his being. It is an external expression of his power within.

The Ministry of Education in contrast to one holds this explanation of the necessity for the preservation of the Māori language:

"The Māori language is unique to New Zealand. It is like the kākāpō and the Chatham Island robin; a national treasure on the brink of extinction, too valuable to us, our history and our unique New Zealand society to be allowed to go" (Education Gazette 15/3/91:2).

While these types of analogies are very inspiring, in order to preserve our taonga, our national treasures, the responsibility to act is rather impersonal and remote. There is much publicity and money given to the experts to help prevent the extinction of these rare and endangered birds, but because of the geographical isolation and expertise needed, only a chosen few are actually involved in the preservation work. Te reo Māori cannot hope to be preserved in a similar way. It is not just a matter of pumping in millions of dollars to assist the experts. Te reo Māori is part of the people about us, not on some remote island. Every person, Māori and European, needs to be encouraged to assist, especially in learning the language at school (Hirsh 1990). Sir James Henare has supported this ideal on many, many occasions by saying:

"Ko te reo Māori, he taonga tuku iho, mo ngā āwi katoa o te motu"

(the Māori language is a treasure to be handed down, for all the people of the land).

[^1]: The marae is the place where a speaker stands to make a formal speech.
Official policies of the Ministry of Education acknowledge, "the revival and maintenance of
the Māori language is an important factor in improving the success and achievement of Māori
children" (Education Gazette 15/3/91). There is never a mention of any necessity or even the
importance of European pupils learning te reo, yet there has been a consistent cry from modern
Māori language educators for nearly thirty years for greater European participation (Dewes 1958;
Hirsh 1990). Therefore, any emphasis on teaching te reo Māori only to Māori pupils may increase
a possible European notion that the preservation of te reo is not a personal involvement or
responsibility.

The right to a similar coexistence as a separate language and culture is the mana motuhake\(^5\)
of the Māori people (Mead 1979; Benton 1983b, 1984; Fleras 1984; Hastings 1988). It is not
separatist, but a right that was explicitly guaranteed by the Treaty of Waitangi (Hirsh 1990; Vasil
1990). It was once also an important part of the 1981 National Party's\(^6\) manifesto:

"The re-establishment of Māoritanga will bring about self-determination, cultural identity,
and independence. All of New Zealand must work together to let Māoritanga assert itself amongst
the Māori people, and consequently to assert itself on New Zealand, which gives us all a unique
cultural identity in the world" (Fleras 1984:61).

The Ministry of Education has begun to acknowledge that teaching of the Māori language is
a political issue within mainstream schooling:

"With the loss of their language and under-achievement of Māori children there is a
widespread disenchantment among Māori people at the education system.

The growing confidence in tino rangatiratanga and self determination is focusing towards
an alternative delivery system that is controlled by Māori people themselves.

The debate is fuelled by the recognition that while regeneration of the language may be
fostered by separation, the achievement of academic excellence may be better met in the
mainstream. However it is important that the concept of some separate structure associated with

\(^5\) Mana motuhake refers to the political freedom to make self-determining choices.
\(^6\) The National Party at that time was in parliamentary opposition to the New Zealand Government.
Maori education be explored. For instance, immersion programmes in the early years of school could lead to the self esteem and fluency that enable children to achieve within an academic mainstream, maintaining and extending their language as part of a wider curriculum.

The issue therefore requires honest and frank analysis by all the key players, out of the emotional glare of publicity" (Education Gazette 15/3/91:3).

The 1986 Waitangi Tribunal’s judgement (Hastings 1992) that te reo was indeed a taonga (of cultural value), means that it is included as a Treaty right. The passing of the Māori Language Act in 1987 (ibid) has laid the legal framework for action to restore te mana o te matauranga Māori, the importance of Māori language education. The Ten Point Plan for Māori education has as its number one priority the use of te reo to help lift the educational achievement of Māori pupils in schools. Because of a national attitude ingrained into the education system this will be a very difficult task to break down the barriers of institutional racism (Stewart 1992), the systems that are known to continue failure and continue to fail to take action. Yet Māori students, of whom ninety six percent study in mainstream state schools, as I have already stated continue to have a near eighty percent failure rate. It is time to ask why.

Arguing the role of the Treaty:

For the most part many commentaries on the Treaty of Waitangi have concentrated upon Māori claims to tribal resources, such as lands, forests and fisheries, as guarantied by article two (McHugh 1991). However, the Waitangi Tribunal has made it plain, especially in the Te Reo Māori Report, that Treaty issues arise in areas other than those of physical and economic resources. Non-resourced based issues, such as the right to autonomy and self-determination for the use of te reo Māori in schools, continue to receive little attention within the literature (Marshall 1991).

A review of over one hundred references to the Treaty of Waitangi reveals many small
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7 Article Two of the Treaty of Waitangi, a settlement signed in 1840, deals with property rights and ownership.
pamphlets and magazine articles with a theme for social justice and racial tolerance in New Zealand. Two contributions are illustrative of these themes and of their originality and informative contribution to how the Treaty can be of positive use for the future. Falconer (1990) warns us that we either attempt to honour the Treaty or tear it up and so go back to civil war. His is a common sense argument of social justice that gives legitimacy to Māori grievances:

“For New Zealanders to progress down the road to a healthy future, it is imperative that we accommodate all the cultures that comprise this nation. There is so much work to be done, that infighting and separatism of race, gender, or culture is playing right into the hands of those who hold power by the principle of divide and rule ... The only way for us to have any hope of living together in Aotearoa is if we use the past as a way to learn from our mistakes. Looking to the future, we must address the issues that have been raised in the present, with the aim of arriving at mutually acceptable solutions” (1990:4-5).

A second insight has come from Judge Eddie Durie’s (1992) article that insists on the place of Māori as a people as being central to the Treaty. He argues that the Treaty is about Māori and European relationships, thus bi-cultural before any consideration of being multicultural. He also raises supporting issues of social justice and attempts to calm fears by clearly stating European people have rights of settlement. We should seek the very best that Western economics and education can provide. That Māori ancestors knew what they were signing and that Māori have continuously called for the ratification of the treaty, so protests have not been recently invented.

In the academic literature there are four works which have been exclusively concerned with educational issues. The first two lay a theoretical argument for the place of Treaty principles in education. James Marshall’s (1991) paper, The Treaty of Waitangi, Educational Reforms and the Education of Māori, was the exclusive effort (post Waitangi Tribunal Report8) to examine as the title suggests, the importance of the treaty in Education. Marshall’s conclusions are not very optimistic. He aptly uses a quote from the Tribunal report:

8 This particular Tribunal recommended to the Crown that the Māori language should be made official throughout all New Zealand Government departments. See Durie, Taihakurei, Latimer & Temm 1986, and also Oliver 1991.
"How can it be the Department's philosophy and practice in educating children accords so closely with the aspirations and desires of the Māori people as described to us, and yet the results of its application be the object of such trenchant and bitter criticism?" (Marshall 1991:3).

The strongest criticism of all today, is the continuing cycle of failure and retention of Māori students compared with their European counterparts (Statistics 1994). Marshall’s further finding is that although the state is required to make an active protection of te reo Māori, it is in fact making a minimum provision by denying it has the resources. Among his conclusions is that there could well be a legitimate case against the Crown for more resources to promote and fund Kura Kaupapa Māori. This could well appeal to a Māori community that sends its children to a mainstream school that has little or no provision for te reo Māori.

Bonita Sutherland’s (1994) Enterprise Partnerships and the Treaty of Waitangi: Implications for Māori Education, is a useful supplement to Marshall’s (1991) work. Her critique is of what she terms the neo-liberal economic and individualistic ideology which has captured and taken control of the educational philosophy of managers in mainstream schools. I have supported her critique by presenting my own evidence in another paper (Stewart 1995b. See also Smith 1991). Sullivan suggests that Te Puni Kōkiri and the Ten Point Plan (refer back to page 17) have been mainstreamed and thus also captured by the assumption that all Māori under-achievement problems have derived from economic instability, and so economic remedies will cure all problems. The State has attempted to define partnership, through its economic preoccupation of Treaty resource claims, as an enterprise partnership. She concludes:

"The State cannot simply disown its obligations to Māori by replacing the Treaty partnership with another partnership model. The treaty partnership is not, and never was, intended to be about privatisation, but protection. If partnerships are to enhance educational outcomes for Māori students then it is crucial that the Treaty be re-instated in educational policy to ensure the protection, status and cultural integrity of Māori as tangata whenua" (Sutherland 1991:3).

9 Te Puni Kōkiri is the Ministry of Māori Development.
Stephen Filipo's (1993) Whakamana Te Tiriti (giving importance/dignity to the Treaty) reports his analysis of the degree to which the principles of the Treaty were being put into practice. Although his selected schools had good intentions for the treaty that were promoted by religious convictions that included a strong commitment to social justice issues, he concluded that in practice the schools were not able to implement policy action to the stated aims of their charter documents. The reasons cited were a lack of time during the teaching day (as other work took priority) and a claimed lack of understanding as to what was required from the teaching staff. Filipo argued that the Treaty was crystal clear in its meaning by quoting a legal opinion from Paul Temm: "The plain terms of the document, especially in its second article where Māori New Zealanders were promised the fullest authority over their own affairs, Te Tino Rangatira, are too simple, too clear and too explicit to be capable of misunderstanding" (Filipo 1993:91).

Further research reported by Patricia Johnston's (1992) MA thesis, extended the analysis to Māori members of Boards of Trustees: Māori Members on School Boards of Trustees: Findings from the Research, took its title from what was promised within Administering for Excellence (1988:66):

"We see the need for a system that recognises and supports the culture, values and language of the Māori people. In order to promote this objective, we opted for the changes which would encourage community involvement ... We are convinced that this change, together with the others we have recommended, will result in an education system within which Māori have considerably more scope than they have at present to exercise a fair measure of influence over their children's education." (1988:66).

Her research attempted to see how far the above claims rang true for Māori members of Boards of Trustees in particular reference to their influence and control of the Māori language funding in schools. Her conclusions were that such Māori members, although in supposed positions of power, were in fact powerless because of three constraints. First was the low priority
given to te reo Māori as compared with European language and culture, second was that Māori members were simply out voted, and third that Māori members were regarded as individual members not as representatives of their Māori community.

Patricia Johnston’s work supports the claim that the “system” does not work fairly in the interests of Māori, especially in the very places where we would expect it to - that of deciding on the use of the Māori language factor money. She concludes with recommendations for improvement. These are all discussed in the final chapter.

In addition to the academic literature, six official publications, all released within the 1996-97 year, were examined for their contributions to understanding as to the practical applications for schools of the Treaty of Waitangi:

The list is (in order of release):

1. Briefing for the Incoming Government by the Ministry of Education (October 1996),
3. Māori Participation & Performance in Education by Chapple & Jefferies, commissioned by Te Puni Kōkiri and the Ministry of Education (May 1997),
4. Review of the Ministry of Education by Te Puni Kōkiri (June 1997),
5. Māori Education Strategy by Rawiri Brell, Senior Manager Māori in the Ministry of Education (Education Gazette, August 1997),

In the introductory chapter there is an account of the difficulties experienced in obtaining three of these publications (numbers 1, 2 and 4). Number one was obtained five months after its initial release (March 1997) and required payment. The excuse for the delay was that the report had to be read first by the newly elected coalition Ministers then approved for release (from correspondence).

Although each of the reports was written for a different audience there is a large area of
commonality and agreement between them. This then suggests that the audiences receive the same message, and that the message is correct. All acknowledge the value of te reo Māori in schools as a force for improved outcomes. While there is prominence given to developing Kura Kaupapa Māori schools, little attention and development is given for the vast majority (being some 85%) who are largely expected to remain within mainstream schools in the near future. There exists a continuing saga, a type of never ending story, for the need for policy development, even though the Māori Education Strategy first developed by Wally Hirsh (1990) has been in existence for as long as the education reforms. It seems that there is continual reiteration of the same basic ideas:

"An integrated strategy is required ... as well as policies that better meet the needs of Māori in the mainstream education system" (Ministry 1996a).

But at least the reports are beginning to focus on identifying possible causes to the achievement gap between Māori and non-Māori students. Especially Simon Chapple (1997) makes strong links between achievement and socio-economic status. There is some dispute about this (eg. Ohia 1994) as being the sole or even major determinant factor, although it well may be influential.

An indication of the complexity of the relationship can be seen in an analysis of the relationships between decile rating and indicators of success. The decile rating system first introduced by the Ministry of Education in 1995 as a socio-economic indicator used to provide Targeted Funding for Educational Achievement (TFEA) in order to boost educational achievement (Ministry 1996b). A decile is a ten percent grouping or tenth, with schools drawn from the lowest socio-economic groups being the closest to decile one and schools drawing from the highest socio-economic groups being closest to decile ten. The socio-economic groupings are determined from national census data that has calculated average household incomes from within the residential suburbs where the schools are located. The problem with this decile rating method is that it assumes that all children attend their local school, therefore, the match between the local economy and such ranking of the school is correct.

Table 3:1 displays school retention rates to the seventh form in Northland. There is
considerable variation in any one year between socio-economic status of the pupils and their examination results. For example, Pompallier College, in the city of Whangarei, is highly rated as "decile" (see below) seven school and has achieved a high retention rate for Māori pupils. Northland College in the mid-North town of Kaikohe has achieved up to a forty-percent retention rate that is more than double the national average (Ministry 1996) yet is lowly rated as a decile two school.

The table below was constructed from the Statistical Index (1996) and MOE supplied data (23 July 1998) using the Official Information Act. All figures were rounded to the nearest whole number. The Ministry of Education did not make available any data for schools with less than 15 Māori school leavers, so as not to distort the comparison for smaller schools or schools with a small Māori roll. These schools are indicated by a (-) mark. The one percent increase of attainment from 1995 to 1996 is mainly due to the much greater performance seen in two particular schools (Northland and Pompallier Colleges). Only four schools show an actual increase of the performance indicator. If these schools are omitted then the attainment is only seven percent for the 1996 year. The minimum seventh form qualification is Higher School Certificate, usually awarded when 80% attendance and assignments are completed. Three schools indicated that no Māori students reached the end of the seventh form. Although the Taitokerau (Northland) average retention rate to the seventh form has appeared to remain consistent over the three years (1995 to 1997), individual schools show wide differences from year to year. The large increase in retention can be deceptive. For instance, the increases for both Kerikeri, Whangarei Girls' High and Kamo from 1996 to 1997 "are apparent participation rates and may be considerably influenced by positive movement into the school at senior forms replacing student losses" (Ministry of Education 1996c:31). This can be confirmed by the large role increase over the same years. Yet Kaitaia College managed a large increase with an actual drop in roll numbers.
Table 3:1  Māori Student Performance Indicators.

All Northland secondary schools showing their decile rating, and percentage of Māori school leavers who attain the minimum seventh form qualification:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Secondary School</th>
<th>'96-'97 decile</th>
<th>'95 leavers</th>
<th>'96 leavers</th>
<th>'97 leavers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kerikeri</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pompallier</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tauraroa</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kamo</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruawai</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whangarei G</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dargaville</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mangakahia</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Otamatea</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whangarei B</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bream Bay</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaitaia</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Okaihau</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0Islands</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northland</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taipa</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tikipunga</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broadwood</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opononi</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Te Kao</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pangaru</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whangaroa</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Averages**

| Northland        | 3              | 11          | 12          | 13          |
| National         | 15             | 18          | 18          |             |

Note: the minimum seventh form qualification is the award of seventh form certificate given for 80% attendance and work completion. See previous page for explanation of missing data.
The gap between the national average is difficult to explain. Further data was not available at the time in order to make comparisons (using variable census data) with other regions in New Zealand. The type and nature of the Northland schools and their teachers who are mostly geographically isolated in small rural areas may explain the gap.

Chapple & Jefferies (1997) dispute that the achievement gap between Māori and non-Māori is growing, and they ask that theorists who believe that it is, must explain why this is so:

"Many of those who write on the widening gap are of the belief that the underlying causes of the gap are school barriers. If school barriers are the primary cause of the gap and for argument's sake we accept the myth of the growing gap, then we must explain why school barriers are getting worse over time, despite major innovations in both the mainstream and in Māori provided education aimed at remedying the situation. One could imagine the gap as being stable, since policy changes and community innovations may be ineffective, but it is hard to imagine a worsening of the underlying factors" (Chapple 1997:47).

They have expressed the crux of the problem - policy changes have been ineffective for Māori. In the next chapter it will be shown how policy changes to Māori Language Resourcing have worked against the best interests of the Māori parent community, because school management has captured the administration of this resource. As a result the original intention of the funding to promote te reo Māori is not working as few secondary pupils choose to take the language to an advanced level. If the original intention of the funding was to keep Māori students at school using the attraction of te reo Māori (see the next chapter) then Table 3:1 above shows that the policy in practice has been a failure.

Evidence can also be shown from the effect of the Treaty of Waitangi compulsory clause being dropped from the National Administration Guidelines in 1993. Te Puni Kōkiri (June 1997) does not mention the dropping of the clause in any of the official reports, such as the Review of the Ministry of Education. Up to the 1993 year Māori school achievement had been slowly growing. But from that year when Treaty clauses were omitted from the Guidelines there has been
a steady decline in performance. This may be a coincidence, but is suggestive evidence of less emphasis by the Ministry of Education for the Treaty to be recognised in the implementation of school policies for Māori. In the report, *Making Education Work for Māori* (1997), the Ministry wants to:

"Strengthen partnerships between government, education providers and communities to help raise the participation and achievement of Māori students" (1997:25).

The Ministry continues to talk about "partnership" without ever defining it. Partnership has not worked simply because the majority partner controls the majority of the resources. What is needed is a sense of ownership and control of education by Māori parents. This is strongly supported by Chapple & Jefferies:

"The organisational structure of the school may be such that Māori parents do not feel any ownership of the school and have any ability to access and relate to it and support its goals. Initial indications are that recent initiatives by Māori where they have been given the opportunity to design and control their own programmes (e.g. Kōhanga reo, kura kaupapa Māori, Māori private training establishments and wānanga) may have raised both participation and performance" (Chapple & Jefferies 1997:7).

If this proves to be true in the long term then it proves that school barriers for Māori are the prime cause of the current under-achievement. The problem will still exist for the majority of Māori who remain in mainstream education. How can mainstream education be changed to allow the inclusion of a sense of ownership for the Māori parent community. Putting the Treaty of Waitangi back into school charters would be a first step.

Questions to ask.

I have argued elsewhere (Stewart 1992) for the necessity to promote a model of democracy in education which will set an indigenous people truly free "to do their own thing," in their own cultural and spiritual terms. How to do this within a culture, which was the feature described
earlier as antagonistic or apathetic, starts by questioning the unfair system of education. During the asking of questions Wally Hirsh (1990) suggests that three common beliefs be first unlearnt:

1 - "that our traditional state education system satisfactorily fulfils the obligations of the Crown to all its citizens;"

2 - that there was no deliberate attempt for "the dilution and ultimate disappearance of the Māori ethnic group and of its distinctive culture" in the second half of the nineteenth century, even to more recent times; and

3 - "the belief that Māori parent communities have been generally contented with the services delivered by the education system" (Hirsh 1990:59).

As these three false assumptions are unlearnt, Paul Spoonley (1990) suggests that three new processes are developed as replacements. First needed is a new political consciousness among those who are failing. Second there needs to be an emphasis on the positive aspects of being Māori; along with a de-colonisation of the mind.

When taha Māori programmes were first encouraged in the early 1970's it was interpreted as the Māori "dimension" within schools, such as using Māori art forms and forming culture groups. But Treaty issues now seem to:

"go way beyond these and may mean bringing in new ways of running the school and a new assessment of the curriculum and teaching outcomes" (Project Waitangi 1989:2).

Do Māori parents have a direct role here, or should the job of teaching Māori pupils be left more or less to the teachers, the traditional "experts"? There follows a list of basic questions: what might be the appropriate methods and levels of participation? Does the unique nature of the Treaty make the management of the teaching of te reo different from all other subjects? Are Treaty rights (what exactly are these?) compatible or in conflict with school/ministry/state policies? Does the amount of participation that a parent has at school have a direct relationship to their child's performance? What are the Treaty obligations of schools? What are the Treaty rights of Māori parents? How can these best be exercised for the benefit of their children? Are Māori parents
satisfied with both their own and their children's level of participation at their school?

How do all of these above questions relate to already identified key elements for success at school: parental and home support, capable teaching, personal support from principals, and good role models (Education Gazette 15/3/91)?

How and by whom the terms "sovereignty" and "ownership" are to be interpreted is seen to be a crucial factor in determining both the theory and practice of Māori people in the education of their children. The Treaty clearly states "i ngā hapu, i ngā hapu" (Article Two). Should each sub-tribe have its own control, or should there be a national "iwi Māori" system (Sutherland 1994)? Has the concept of ownership been superseded?

The business of the curriculum remains, at least at the present, firmly with the teachers and the Ministry (Stewart 1992). The major conflict for research and debate seen here is that the Māori people, especially in terms of teaching the Māori language, are the owners of this language, but not the controllers. The Treaty gave a distinct and unique ownership of the language that has long been absorbed and controlled by the State and delegated to agencies such as the National Qualifications Authority.

Up to now, Māori policies for schools have been set on a national basis. It is clear that the Treaty emphasises the role of the iwi / hapu. Are these two decision-making sites compatible?

A further conflict to be explored is exactly how far Māori parents can be involved in the curriculum. They may have rights over their own language being taught, but do these rights extend through the school to all other subjects being taken by their children? With an increasing "Māori" component being argued for beyond “taha Māori” in most school subjects these rights need to be checked. If te reo Māori has been defined by the Tribunal as being a “taonga” and within the full protection of the Treaty, then how much are all Māori pupils protected? Does the Treaty apply just to "things" Māori, or to all persons Māori? Although it is generally accepted that any parent may have a role in the governance of schools through Boards of Trustees, do they have any rights of management - the traditional prerogative of the principal and senior management?
"The one principal of the Treaty that comes through most clearly is partnership, yet the practical meaning of this partnership has yet to be fully explored. Some may view this as a 50:50 partnership, others a 80:20 partnership, still others as increased consultation but no change in who makes decisions or reaps the benefits" (Helen Hughes 1988:18).

Does the Crown's given right to govern (Article One of the Treaty) protect or conflict with the Crown's promise to guarantee and actively protect Māori absolute authority (tino rangatiratanga) over Māori systems, possessions and resources (Article Two)?

What is being said and what is being done does not always seem to be consistent. For example, the Education Gazette, the front page article of 15/3/1991 states that:

"fundamental to changing a system of education where Māori students experience little success are increased participation and success by Māori through the advancement of Māori education initiatives, including education in te reo Māori, consistent with the Treaty of Waitangi."

Another front page leader of a subsequent issue of the Education Gazette (14/2/1992) stressed the importance of teacher education and the "promotion of home-school relationships and remove obstacles to Māori families becoming full partners in the educative process," and that "The Ministry of Education's priority for Māori education for 1991/1992 is the advancement of Māori language education within the framework of the ten point plan" (p 2). Has the state now taken over the tino rangatira role, perhaps preventing local hapu from exercising their own? What does "full partners in the educative process" actually mean?

In an effort to find out what is happening in some schools a number of school Treaty of Waitangi policy documents were examined.

Treaty of Waitangi Policies.

An attempt was made in 1995 to collect a number of policy documents from educational institutions in order to analyse their statements of intent and then apply the above questions. All policy statements were collected within the Taitokerau region. As a member of the Northland
Māori Language Teacher's Trust, I am familiar with all the institutions and know their Māori language teachers personally. Using these network connections I have been able to include anecdotal evidence that shows that actions by some of these institutions have been contrary to their stated policies.

Just getting these policy documents was a big problem. From the requests made to twenty different schools by letter and calling in at school offices I only received ten copies of individual school policies. Three schools told me directly that their policies "were not yet available" because in one case "it was not yet typed up." Seven schools did not reply to my request by mail. Of those received, two were tertiary institutions, three were secondary schools, and five were primary schools. I did consider making a repeated and more forceful request by using the 1982 Freedom of Information Act. It is unknown as to whether they would have contributed anything more to the conclusion reached below.

An initial analysis of the ten policy documents revealed that the amount of text for each individual policy ranged from one single line to two whole pages. The one line statement:

"To acknowledge the principles of the Treaty of Waitangi,"
came from a very well known tertiary institution that attempts to attract Māori students through specific advertising in the open media. The other extreme, a two-page document, although attempting to "detail" its commitment to Treaty principles, remains almost as vague in its language use as the one liner. The lack of specific detail was found to be common in all policies read. For instance, the term "Māori" was always used to describe local iwi and hapu, thus denigrating local tangata whenua (the local people). In other words Māori were described in general and de-personalised terms rather than being of a specific local identity. Some policy documents contravened the original purpose of the Māori language funding by allowing its use where other funding should have been provided, e.g., the purchasing of all textbooks from this fund. Some schools want "to enable to understand, respect, and show sensitivity for tikanga Māori" and yet the same schools have banned the display of bone carvings when worn by students, and have even
forbidden their Māori language teacher to write school reports in te reo Māori. Another school (the two pager) wants: "to ensure the language of the tangata whenua is retained" but only allows one hour per week study of te reo for the first two years. All the policies stated that they were to be renewed on an annual basis by consultation with their community, but on inquiry, not one school could tell me as to when their policy was last renewed. One of the major findings (see also Stewart 1995b) was that a family had to use the Official Information Act to force the principal to supply an audited account of the school's Māori language resourcing fund.

The secondary teachers’ newspaper, PPTA News, illustrates case studies that demonstrate the above occurrences are not restricted to the Taitokerau region but happen commonly throughout New Zealand. A simple conclusion is possible - these policy documents are minimal responses and do not provide a major framework for decision-making.

Some time ago Graham and Linda Smith (1989) had predicted this. Given that Treaty of Waitangi policies were negotiable documents and left to the school market to determine, their significance would be cast aside by school managements that is often ignoring Māori demands. The evidence presented in this chapter has proven their prediction to be correct. It is therefore essential that in order to achieve maximum participation in education the Māori parent community must become more active in all given opportunities. The next chapter describes a number of case studies that further illustrate how difficult a solution for this problem is going to be.
Chapter Four:

Māori Language Funding in Mainstream Schools.

Māori Language Resourcing, commonly known as Māori Language Funding, is a separate payment given to schools in order to finance the extra costs involved in promoting the learning of the Māori language. At the beginning of this research it was presumed that there would be a large amount of parent community participation and decision making in the spending of this resourcing. However, very little evidence has been found of parent involvement. In the earlier chapter it has been argued that the problem is explained by the ideals of partnership and consultation that have been replaced by managerialism in schools.

This chapter is presented in five parts. The first section details the history of this particular supplementary resourcing for schools. The policy for resourcing of Māori language in schools could best be described as developing piecemeal over a long period of time with confusion over the changing of guidelines and lack of accountability to the Māori parent community.

The second section deals with the difficulty of interpreting the rules and legitimising actual spending. Two surveys carried out have revealed confusion by Māori language teachers on how the resourcing is generated and some disturbing allegations of the misuse of the funding. A third survey revealed the verification process that is necessary for all schools in order to fully promote the effective use of the resource funding. The relatively low levels of funding being claimed indicate that schools are not progressing to higher levels of immersion.

The third section develops the argument that the best interests for Māori have been captured through a process of managerialism and the public interest. Since the Ministry of Education for the use of this Resourcing has never really defined partnership in any issued guidelines, so partnership has rarely been practiced.
The first call for extra funding to support Māori language programmes in schools was made in the Currie Report of 1962. The call may have been considered rather radical at that time yet it only asked for Māori language to be more widely available as an optional subject and be taught with other subjects at the intermediate (middle) school level. The result was that te reo did not become a distinct language study but part of “doing the Māori” in an assimilationist Social Studies curriculum (Stewart 1992).

Eight years later in 1970 the National Advisory Committee on Māori Education (NACME) concerned with Māori language loss and low academic performance called for special staffing allowances and strategies for the improvement of Māori pupils in schools. The result was that those schools with a forty-percent plus Māori roll earned an increased staffing allowance (Department of Education 1981). Although this extra staffing allowance could have been used to appoint Māori language teachers to schools, it was mainly used for special needs - the appointment of remedial teachers to assist Māori pupils to catch up with their European peers in the English language. It has been argued that this money was misspent because the problem was wrongly sited within a deficit needs theory (Walker 1984). The interpretation of the problem was located in the politics of education, not informed educational analysis. Misspending can also be argued on pure economic grounds. All through the seventies and eighties, even though some hundreds of millions of dollars had been specifically spent in order to raise the achievement level of Māori pupils, there was no significant rise in the overall success of Māori pupils in schools (Stewart 1992). Pumping more money into the education system for the purposes of teaching Māori pupils to be like model European pupils has been both an economic and social failure (Walker 1984).

The next meeting of NACME held in 1980, with the original Māori leaders of 1970 still in attendance, called for change. The term taha Māori originated from this conference as a call to teach more Māori studies in schools. But because the teaching was done through the medium of
the English language it continued to be as "doing the Māori" or termed "taha Pakeha" (doing the European) in disguise (Walker 1984:26).

Richard Benton's (1985) research continued to show the very rapid decline of the Māori language and predicted its eventual extinction unless serious efforts were made for its revitalisation. Two responses to this crisis call were the formation of Te Kohanga Reo (language nursery schools) and Kura Kaupapa Māori (language school) movements. These institutions initially struggled to survive as they were not funded by the government and catered for only a small number of pupils. The Curriculum Review of 1987, in a radical departure, continued the call to support the funding and teaching of te reo Māori, but for all pupils in all schools.

The passing of the Māori Language Act put greater pressure on all government departments to be more pro-active in their use of the language. It was this Act of Parliament that empowered groups of teacher unions, NZEI (New Zealand Educational Institute) and PPTA (Post Primary Teachers' Association), through various hui (e.g. Waahi Marae at Huntly in 1985). It led the Minister of Education (Lange 1988) to express his personal commitment to the support of te reo in the Picot Report of Tomorrow's Schools. Finally, action was to be taken within schools on a national level.

Māori Language Factor Funding was officially announced to secondary schools by way of a Ministry of Education Circular (June/July 1989) with the simplest of directives that the money was to be used for the: "enhancement and retention of Māori language".

There was no other policy document or guidelines issued by the Ministry of Education to help in making spending decisions. As a result five problems soon arose. First, the capped funding immediately devalued on a per pupil basis. Second, diverse and dubious spending decisions appeared (Stewart 1995c). Third, immersion levels\(^1\) remained static. Fourth, methods for Māori

---
\(^1\) The are now four levels of immersion that describe minimum hours of instruction that are linked to four different payment levels. See ahead for more explanation.
endorsement of applications disappeared and fifth, a lack of frequent inspections by the Ministry of education have exacerbated 1-3 of the above. These problems are elaborated below.

The Ministry of Education, however, perceived the main problem as how to achieve the maximum language and educational benefits from the limited government funding (Ministry 1994b). In May 1994 the Ministry of Education released its discussion document called Targeting of Resources for Māori Language Education. The paper was created from a:

"1991 internal review to examine the allocation and targeting of the existing levels of Māori language education Resourcing. Their objective was to achieve the maximum language and educational benefits from that Government funding" (Ministry 1994b:1).

In keeping with the Picot promise of equality for all pupils the funding was initially distributed to all Māori pupils on an equal basis from a capped fund of $8.7 million. In the first year of funding the number of Māori pupils divided into this fund equalled $75, then reduced to $71.33 per student distributed to schools in the second year (Manatu Māori 1991). School administrations were not slow in recognising this extra windfall of funding. Within the next couple of years the Māori student population was “rapidly discovered” to be very advantageous.

How the actual number of Māori pupils was identified was anybody's guess. What or who is Māori? Some teachers openly asked their class if any pupil wanted to be recorded as a Māori. From informal interviews with teachers in Northland it was recorded that some Māori teachers filled out the forms for their principals, while some schools used a re-enrolment strategy to identify and promote "being Māori." No doubt this latter action was motivated by the simple notion of financial mathematics - the more Māori pupils - the more money. The great increase in applications caused the capped fund to give a value of only $25 dollars within three years. As a result a major review of the funding took place in 1995. The review recommended that funding be given only to those schools that had dedicated Māori language teaching programmes (Māori pupils only) that
were described as being within minimal weekly time limits. The review also recommended a doubling of the capped fund.

It was not surprising then to see the results of the responses to the Ministry's proposed changes to the allocation of funding. Because most Māori pupils attend mainstream schools and do not have any dedicated language immersion type classes, most schools would therefore miss out on funding. Given this contingency, most Boards of Trustees, principals and teachers voted against the proposals; while most Māori language teachers and iwi groups voted for the proposals (PPTA July 1994). Boards and their principals were chiefly concerned with their loss of money, while Māori were concerned with their loss of mana reo (dedication to the language).

The final result was somewhat of a compromise. The Ministry of Education circular (95/12) in July 1996 announced that some ninety-percent of the funding would be allocated specifically to dedicated immersion programmes in te reo Māori. The Ministry would: "develop strict criteria for the verification of immersion levels, as part of the approval process" (p 3).

But what the Ministry promised didn’t quite happen. Within the original regulations there was a requirement that all students claiming the allowance were expected to ascend to the higher level, ie move upwards in language proficiency, within two years. This requirement has now been dropped without explanation. As a result the majority of Māori students appear to be staying within the minimum teaching time requirement (see below). Another dropped requirement was that a kaumatua (tribal elder) sign the official form as an endorsement of the application (see below also). The date of the dropping, 1993, does not appear to have been random, for it is the same year when the National Administration Guidelines for schools omitted the inclusion of Treaty of Waitangi clauses in school charters.

By use of the Official Information Act a list of the funding allocations for all twenty-two Northland secondary and area schools was obtained for the two-year period (1997 and 1998) of the new funding formula that specified four levels of immersion. From this information Table 4:1
was constructed. An analysis of the total amounts received reveals that of the total of twenty-two secondary and Area Schools only ten actually increased their funding while eleven schools reduced from 1997 to 1998. One school has remained the same. From a comparison of the Ministry of Education funding information over the two years it can be ascertained that the schools that gained extra funding have done so by increasing their level of immersion, not their number of students. Those who have reduced funding have done so by both lowering their immersion levels and having a lower number of students. The facts suggest that a number of traditional Māori secondary schools have a lowering commitment to the teaching of te reo Māori, but there also seems to be a dropping of the number of Māori language pupils in the more senior classes. It is likely that this lack of commitment will have a direct effect on each school’s ability to retain the language in the community at a level at which it is likely to survive. Such schools will also experience more difficulty in holding their Māori pupils at school to the higher levels.

Interpreting the Rules.

The wording on the Ministry of Education circular distributed to secondary schools differed slightly to that given to primary schools. The purpose of funding secondary schools was for the:

"the enhancement and retention of Māori language and culture."

The primary schools’ directive did not include “and culture.” The addition of "culture" for secondary schools was sufficient to allow a wider interpretation on how to spend the money. The chief adviser to schools admitted in a 1994 circular:

“There has, however, been a great deal of criticism of the lack of accountability of the resource and considerable anecdotal evidence to suggest that some schools have either not used the money at all or used it for purposes marginally related to the enhancement and retention of Māori language” (Neil McDonald, Ministry of Education newsletter).
Table 4:1, Allocations of Māori Language Resourcing in Te Taitokerau (Northland) region of New Zealand.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Secondary School</th>
<th>total 1997 Funding</th>
<th>total 1998 Funding</th>
<th>Net change in funding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Broadwood</td>
<td>41,750</td>
<td>52,252</td>
<td>+ 10,502</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opononi</td>
<td>56,500</td>
<td>68,346</td>
<td>+ 11,846</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pangaru</td>
<td>69,000</td>
<td>86,500</td>
<td>+ 17,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kamo</td>
<td>12,450</td>
<td>14,490</td>
<td>+ 2,040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mangakahia</td>
<td>1,950</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>+ 2,050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whangarei G</td>
<td>4,950</td>
<td>5,150</td>
<td>+ 200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Te Kao</td>
<td>20,250</td>
<td>26,368</td>
<td>+ 6,118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bolslands</td>
<td>17,500</td>
<td>24,352</td>
<td>+ 6,852</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bream Bay</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>1,600</td>
<td>+ 700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whangaroa</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>14,110</td>
<td>+ 9,110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taipa</td>
<td>12,350</td>
<td>10,616</td>
<td>- 1,734</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whangarei B</td>
<td>4,500</td>
<td>4,400</td>
<td>- 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaitaia</td>
<td>13,500</td>
<td>7,222</td>
<td>-12,709</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tikipunga</td>
<td>29,450</td>
<td>10,490</td>
<td>-18,960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Otamatea</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>1,750</td>
<td>-250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruawai</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>-250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kerikeri</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>-3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northland</td>
<td>20,950</td>
<td>16,480</td>
<td>-4,470</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tauraroa</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>-500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Okaihau</td>
<td>8,250</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>-6,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dargaville</td>
<td>5,750</td>
<td>5,250</td>
<td>N/c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pompallier</td>
<td>1,050</td>
<td>1.050</td>
<td>N/c</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Ministry of Education supplied data in correspondence.
But schools were not the only source of confusion. The Ministry of Education through the adoption of its Ten Point Plan (1994) has seen the funding as promoting bi-culturalism, whereas Māori members on boards of trustees saw the funding as necessary for addressing Māori underachievement in schools (Johnston 1992). Both the promotion of bi-culturalism and the achievement of Māori pupils in schools are not divorced from the promotion of te reo Māori. Such aims were also promoted in the 1970 NACME conference (National Advisory Council on Māori Education). However, this promotion ended as a failure, simply because it reinforced the use of the English language at the expense and exclusion of te reo Māori (Stewart 1993).

The only prohibition for all schools was that the funding was not to be used to pay the salaries of teachers. The lack of policy guide-lines continued to cause confusion as to what could be purchased as serious concerns were frequently raised in editions of Te Kaahū, the Māori language teachers' magazine printed by the national union of secondary school teachers, the PPTA.

The Ministry of Education has proved reluctant to interfere with the process of self-managing schools. Two studies have shown how wide the variety of “resources” that have been purchased are. Charlotte Thompson's (1990) survey of eighteen schools recounts the use of the money for teacher release, koha to visitors, planting of native trees, establishing a hangi and barbecue area, and the purchase of many types of audio-visual equipment to increase resources. All of these appear to have benefited the whole school, rather than specifically benefiting the retention of te reo Māori. Thompson has also documented many cases where the fund was used to pay teacher salaries with the Ministry's prior approval. Unlike the original stipulation, the Ministry no longer requires any such prior approval as they regard schools as being totally self-managing and accountable only to their community (conversation to a Ministry official).

A survey conducted under the auspices of Te Runanga o te Reo Te Taitokerau (The Northland Māori Language Teachers Trust) during 1990 (Stewart 1993, 1995) demonstrated a similar wide variety of expenditure items. As an example, one Area School (a combined primary
and secondary) purchased a class set of mattresses to enable groups of students to sleep overnight at school in order to hold special events, such as Māori culture group practices and study/homework evenings. Another used its entire annual fund to send a teacher away to be up skilled in an immersion class for one term at an Auckland Polytechnic course so as to improve fluency. Several schools used their allowance to purchase one-off expensive items such as audio visual equipment, the cost of which would otherwise have been prohibitive for small units within such schools.

Overall, most teachers commented that they felt a great sense of relief that they no longer had to spend so much time raising money for the cost of travel to take part in regional events, such as culture group festivals and speech competitions. The geographical isolation of Northland secondary schools has always meant that travel in order to participate has been very expensive as compared with the majority of urban schools who also have the advantage of larger student numbers to generate even more funding. Although the Māori Language Funding has been part of the Ministry of Education’s concept of equity funding (uneven spending for even outcomes) rural schools have been at a disadvantage because of their higher operating costs for Māori students, especially for transportation. Although rural schools as found in a recent survey (see below) have strong te reo teaching programmes their falling rolls mean they actually receive less funding totals than most city schools (Ministry 1993:6). But less funding has not stopped these smaller rural schools achieving examination results that are well above the national average for the School Certificate examination (Chapter Three), or having Māori student retention rates that are double the national average (e.g. Northland College).

A third survey was conducted in March 1997. The survey was designed by this researcher and was distributed by the secretary of the Northland Māori Language Teacher’s Trust (see Appendix A). The purpose of the survey was threefold: first, was to find out exactly how many students were studying te reo Māori, second, what levels of immersion were being taught and
third, to evaluate the Ministry of Education’s verification visits to schools. Twenty-five forms were distributed to all Northland secondary schools, plus two intermediate schools (because these intended to present candidates for the School Certificate te reo Māori examination). Fifteen replies were returned and analysed, and compared with returns from schools obtained from the Ministry of Education. These indicated that very few students in very few schools were in immersion classes at the higher levels in the whole of the Taitokerau district:

- only five schools had classes at the highest level (level one, being 80% of the teaching time),
- three schools had classes at the middle level (level two, 50% of the teaching time),
- seven schools had classes at the lower level (level three, 30% plus of the teaching time),
- all schools had classes at the minim level (level four, less than three hours per week).

Of the five schools at the highest level of immersion, four of these were local Area Schools where the majority of the pupils were in the primary section of the school (so generating most of the schools’ funding entitlement). There were only a handful of secondary aged pupils in their higher levels. Of twenty-two secondary schools and two intermediates in the whole of Northland only one class within the region (Tikipunga High School) had what could be considered as a viable sized group of high immersion students. It was the only Northland secondary school (as distinct from the area schools) with level one immersion classes. Table 4:2 indicates the number and immersion levels being operated during the 1997 year.

The official list of funding allocations for the 1997-year was requested from the Ministry of Education in order to check against the numbers claimed within the survey. A wide gap was found between the official Ministry numbers and amounts claimed by schools at the end of the previous year compared with what was reported by Māori language teachers in the survey. At one extreme at least five secondary schools were being over-funded and at the other at least two were being under-funded, all schools by nearly one hundred percent. This discrepancy was reported to the Māori language teachers at an in-service meeting to which the researcher was invited. In part the
discrepancy could be explained in the apparent difference between predicted rolls (as applied for in
the previous year) and actual rolls (checked in March) which are then adjusted mid-year. But this
does not explain the wide gap.

Table 4.2 Types of schools with Immersion levels being taught in 1997
(including twenty-two secondary and area schools).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School type</th>
<th>Level one</th>
<th>Level two</th>
<th>Level three</th>
<th>Level four</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Area</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>(Maximum total of 7 schools)</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>(maximum total of 15 schools)</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


At the meeting of Māori language teachers in August 1997 several issues became apparent.
Most teachers had not seen the Ministry Circular (1996/17) that explained the four different levels
of immersion. Thus, there was widespread confusion as to what each level of immersion required.
As a result at least two schools were being under-funded. The normal funding allocated from the
school’s teaching budget to Māori as a subject was replaced either in whole or in part by this
Resourcing, not given as an extra allowance.

Half of one school’s allowance was “kept in reserve” by the school’s senior management as
a type of future insurance fund against any difficulties, and one school had not spent any of its
funding in four years. Many schools are offering their third form te reo classes only a half year
course of study, thus are not eligible for Māori Language Immersion Funding.

These are serious allegations that warrant further investigation and research. Such problems
are not being officially detected as the Ministry’s verification process (by visits to schools – see
which only selects a few schools to check each year. Then, only is the ability of the Māori teacher assessed, not any of the school’s accounting or policy decisions. The survey revealed that only two of the twenty-five teachers knew exactly what their te reo budget was for the year and were confident that their numbers were correct.

Following this meeting a letter (see Appendix B) was sent to the Resourcing Manager of the Ministry of Education giving the survey results and explaining the confusion, suggesting some remedial action (such as an official notice within the Education Gazette) and requesting more information on the verification process. As no reply was received the Official Information Act was used to claim the verification information. Furthermore, none of this essential information had ever been supplied, even to the office of the Māori language advisers for schools. They in turn received the information from this researcher. At the request of the Northland Māori Language Teachers’ Trust a submission was made to the Parliamentary Māori Affairs Select Committee on Education (see Appendix C) detailing the above difficulties with the funding process.

The verification process (see Appendix D) was intended to examine two issues. First, was the proportion of time that the curriculum is delivered in Māori and second, the ability of the teacher to sustain the immersion programme at the level stated. No criteria were given on how this examination was done. The brief report states that only four (out of a possible twenty-two) secondary schools in Northland were verified. Although the stated emphasis for inspections was to be for schools claiming the highest levels of immersion (levels 1 and 2), this "carefully selected random group" of four schools individually fell into the full spread of the four allowable levels. One school was reported to have its level of funding raised one level, effectively doubling the year’s funding.

But no point of contact could be found with the Māori Liaison Officers appointed to assist the verifiers either at the schools or any iwi authorities. According to the verification information supplied the only point of community contact would be when an appeal against the proficiency of
the Māori language teacher was made. It also states that such an appeal would have to be endorsed by the local marae and kaumatua. This is the only point of contact to be made with the Māori parent community.

Managerialism in Schools.

Once the amount of Māori Language Resourcing is allocated to schools the use of the money is entirely the responsibility of the Boards of Trustees. As with bulk funding the Ministry of Education seems to have the intention of putting all available money for schools into one resource basket to make the task of supplying extra funding and devolution more simple, thereby cutting costs to itself. The State may save money in the short term, but in the longer term it will have to spend more to reverse the problems caused by the lack of accountability to the Māori community. Māori parents are not likely to take part and benefit from Māori language programmes unless they have a sense of ownership for the programmes (Brell 1997).

Second to the wide variations and interpretations of what constitutes Māori language resource spending is the problem of who is, or should be, making the actual decisions on spending. When it came to actually deciding what types of Māori language programmes to run Patricia Johnston's (1992) research clearly showed that even Māori, as members of Boards of Trustees and so the official policy makers within the school, had very little participation within the decision making process. A result of the lack of official guidelines both for the purchasing and the decision making process has made the funding contestable within individual schools (see below). It appears that school management (i.e. school principals and senior teachers) not school governance (the Board of Trustees) are the real decision-makers. It has becoming increasingly clear that what was intended to benefit Māori interests is now becoming increasingly captured by other more powerful groups, a process that I have termed managerialism.
But there may be some hope, as Thompson's (1990) study indicated, that where principals act as facilitators, assisting parents and the Māori community in general to achieve the kinds of programmes they want for their own schools, then high levels of support and satisfaction for the programmes were given. The important role of the principal as the facilitator of the decision making process is also well demonstrated by Peter Ramsay (Ramsay, Hawk, Harold, Marriott & Poskitt 1993), and there exists other good comparative overseas models such as the *White Paper on Education in Britain* (Ministry of Education 1993). This latter paper gives clear evidence to support Ranginui Walker's (1984) argument that simply giving more money to failing students does not change things and that the "problem" lies elsewhere.

In the absence of any spending directives or guidelines from the Ministry of Education an issue of the newsletter from the New Zealand Post Primary Teachers' Association, *Te Kaahu* (Ken Mair 1989), assisted its membership by proposing a number of ways in which the funding could be decided upon. In particular, these guidelines stated:

"*that Māori children must be the beneficiaries and that Māori parents must play a major part in the making of the final decision of how to spend the money.*"

*Te Kaahu* further stated that while Boards of Trustees have the ultimate responsibility for accounting for how the money is used they first must set up the appropriate Māori community hui for decision making. It was made quite clear to all PPTA members that the decisions should be made by parents, while the trusteeship is the role of the school board.

The Ministry of Education itself has stated that:

"*the key element in changing learning outcomes is the analysis and planning that precedes action*" (1993:9).

The Taitokerau survey indicated that the control of spending has continued to vary from school to school. At least one Māori language teacher responded in the survey saying that she supervised the full budget in co-operation with the Māori parent community. At the other extreme
another Māori teacher was too shy to challenge the principal’s response that “the supervision of
the funding was a Board (of Trustee’s) responsibility” and not his. When this was reported back to
parents a formal request was made to the school’s principal for the release of the annual school
accounts. After two months with no response from the school, the parents asked the Office of the
Ombudsmen for assistance. The school principal then arranged for the parents to be shown the
school accounts. An interview with these parents later revealed to this researcher that the
accounting jargon used during the meeting left the parents even more confused. No copy of the
accounts was made available to the parents to take away for later consideration.

It was clear from the survey that most Māori language teachers felt that the principal was the
main decision-maker on how the money was spent. This is also a conclusion of Patricia Johnston's
(1992) research. Such a decision making process is consistent with other financial decisions that
principals make under the work pressure of recent reforms of educational management (Stewart
1992; Capper 1994; Mitchell 1993; Filipo 1993). Roger Dale (1992) refers to this as "professional
capture" where the convenience of the professional management systems is easier than serving the
community. It is a problem that seems to be well fixed within the public service where the
centralist values of government departments are in conflict with the values of the intended

Some principals feel threatened by parent radicals who are "basically antagonistic towards
teachers and, if given the opportunity, will try and take over from them " (Ramsay et al 1993).

There may be now a new breed of parent, one that may have failed during his or her own
years of schooling and may continue to hold such institutions in contempt for failing their own
children. There are also far more educated parents demanding what Picot promised to them.
Some of the strategies that astute parents have employed to challenge and change the attitudes of
their principals have been detailed in Ramsay et al (1993). The most important elements for the
success of any Māori language programme have shown to be close and careful consultation with
the Māori community (Thompson 1991; McPherson 1994). Many principals see consultation as time consuming and not worth their effort. Such workload pressures tend to resist change and have continued to support the status quo:

"While it is clear that many of the administrative changes, the internal managerial changes and various government mandates in many different particulars were all initiated by an act of will somewhere, there was a marked predisposition amongst many staff to fail to recognise, or else to deny, that fundamental social, technical and economic changes were taking place around them at an accelerating pace and were demanding a response from schools. This predisposition was also evident amongst some of the principals and board members we interviewed ... The central issue here is a question of management. Although for some teachers change per se was seen as threatening and undesirable, for many this adverse reaction seemed to primarily represent a stress response" (Capper 1994:32).

In their study of Māori Teachers who Leave the Classroom, Helen and Maui Mitchell (1993) concluded that even: "bilingual teachers were completely overridden by school administrations on the matters ... of the use of Māori language funding," and that "a considerable number of teachers interviewed thought they had virtually no ability to influence policy or to participate in decision making while they were teaching" (ibid p 73).

There is evidence of increasing concern by the Ministry of Education to provide some necessary guidance in how to create collaboration between schools and parent communities. Using its experience from the Curriculum Review (1987) and Getting Started on Consultation (1989) the Ministry of Education produced an attractive booklet called Guidelines for Success in Consultation (1990) and distributed it free to all schools in the country. Its stated purpose was to:

"help principals, trustees, and teachers to develop educationally sound policies on consultation and community partnership, and to put these policies into effect" (p 4).

A very useful and informative five step method for such success is outlined at the beginning
of the book: the making of information available, encouraging all people in the school community to take part, the exchanging of views, helping make decisions, and having the responsibility to act. The first three steps are well explored in the booklet, but steps four and five, where the real test of partnership operates there is very little said. Sadly, the emphasis is on teacher action, not parent action.

Conclusion.

It has become evident that what the Māori Language Resourcing was originally provided for is not happening. Evidence has been given in this chapter of how few Māori language pupils in secondary schools are studying the language at higher immersion levels. The changing of the regulations in 1993 have in effect excluded the Māori parent community from any consultation or participation. Even the Māori language teachers in schools seem not to have any knowledge and control of the resourcing. The Ministry of Education has failed to ensure there has been adequate accountability by official inspections and reporting to local communities. The effects of excluding the Māori parent community will be further illustrated in the next chapter.
Chapter five:

*School Certificate Te Reo Māori.*

This chapter evaluates school programmes that attempt to incorporate parent participation. It provides an analysis over a three-year period (1995 to 1997) of the preparation and performance of Māori language students for the national School Certificate examination. The work began with researching the established policy, then proceeded to evaluate both the recent national and local trends. During this process I searched for indications of any benefits to te reo Māori students in schools indicated by improved school performance and retention. The second part of the research was to establish if the degree and type of Māori parent involvement contributed to the success or failure of the School Certificate programme. The Māori parent community was defined in Chapter Two. It included any members of the local Māori community that contributed to the health and welfare of the students, including *mātua tiituru* (natural parents), *mātua whāngai* or *kaitiaki* (care givers), *kaumātua* (tribal elders), *komiti marae* and *runanga* (tribal district councils).

The investigation into the School Certificate examination was chosen for three specific reasons. First, because of its importance as the first major external examination faced by New Zealand high school students. It can be seen as a gate keeping mechanism (Stewart 1992) that prevents the continuation of many Māori students to higher school achievement. Second, because this subject has often been reported as the “lead subject” (Ministry 1996a) for Māori students in schools it might provide a suitable model for success in other subjects. Third, I had assumed, that perhaps for more than any other subject or school activity the Māori parent community might have had a sense of cultural preference and guardianship for the language and thus would want to be involved in this subject. Of particular interest was the type and degree of the involvement, and an evaluation of how these particular roles might help in the delivery of the curriculum to improve teaching, student learning and academic outcomes for all Māori students in all subjects.
The chapter begins with an outline of the School Certificate te reo Māori examination as a whole. The first year of the research establishes a baseline through the collection, documentation and analysis of past examination material and results. Material was collected in detail over a three-year period. I was also interested to establish more general trends from the available data both on a national and local level for a period of at least ten years. The initial results were not supportive of the second and third rationales stated on the previous page. Near the end of the first year of the research it became very apparent that the average School Certificate pass rates for te reo Māori were extremely low. Furthermore, very few students were opting for this subject in high schools. There was very little evidence of Māori parent community involvement of any type observed.

On a personal level, having myself taught School Certificate te reo Māori since 1979 and with continuous experience as an official School Certificate assessor since 1988\(^1\) in Northland, I had gained the anecdotal impression that the average marks being achieved were in decline throughout the whole northern region. This suspicion, contrary to the "lead subject" claim of the Ministry of Education, needed to be verified. If found to be correct it also needed an explanation in terms of public claims by schools in the news media (see next chapter) that Māori students were achieving high marks in examinations.

A description of the Taitokerau (Northland) method of assessment for the oral Māori examination for School Certificate is given. The results suggest the average oral mark has declined sharply over the last few years. The fact that the average mark for the written examination has also been close to the lowest possible mark has made many students reluctant to pursue their language study in to the senior levels at school. This is because when a low oral mark is coupled with a low written mark, a very low indicator for sixth form certificate allocations is then predetermined. Any improvement in student performance during the following sixth form year cannot be rewarded by a higher grade as these are determined from the previous year's performance. It is also a system of

\(^1\) Part of a team of trained teachers to evaluate pupil performance in the oral examination.
grade allocation that is competitive, and does not reward co-operation. In this aspect it clashes with accepted Māori traditional values.

National School Certificate Te Reo Māori.

There are two separate but complementary examinations for School Certificate Te Reo Māori. Each examination is marked out of one hundred percent and each is reported in five grade levels of competency. The result for each of the examinations appears separately on each individual candidate's result slip. The code letter “T” stands for *tuhituhi* (written) and the letter “K” for *kōrero* (oral). For the average pupil doing five school certificate subjects that includes te reo Māori, there may be some status advantage of having an "extra" result. For those pupils opting to do six subjects, they will have gained more *mana* (status) of seven grades on their result slips when received in the reporting month of January.

Both papers have been removed from the hierarchy of subjects (Hughes 1983; Stewart 1992) and are no longer norm referenced. However, graphing the annual results over the last few years gives an appearance very similar to the traditional bell curve of normal distribution (see Figure 5.1). The trend of the results shows a definite movement from left to right, indicating decline in the standard of grades over the last five years for the written examination.

The drop in the highest grade (level one) is from 12% in 1993\(^2\) to less than 4% in 1997, while the number of lowest possible grades (level five) has actually more than tripled from 5 to 18%. But perhaps the most disturbing find is that the number of absent pupils (marked as *DNS* = did not sit), earlier thought of as insignificant, now exceeds 12%. This amount is now more than the total of the two top possible grade allocations combined. The average absenteeism from other examination subjects at this level is approximately 3% (from the annual returns of all other subjects). Clearly there is a serious problem here that needs further investigation.

\(^2\) In the years previous to 1993 this subject was reported in seven grades of achievement so is not represented here.
Both of the te reo Māori examinations were the first subjects to be wholly criterion referenced (Ministry 1989:6) and both were originally fully externally assessed. The national method for oral examination now differs significantly from that in Te Taitokerau (Northland region) where other Māori language teachers in neighbouring schools externally assess it, all of which are located within three geographical clusters or groupings. However, the written examination is marked externally in Wellington by the traditional anonymous, independent and external method common to most other School Certificate subjects. These Māori language teachers (see below) regard this process as culturally objectionable.

Both examinations are presently designed at an academic level expected for “year three” pupils. This means that having started in the third form (the first year of secondary school in New Zealand) and with three years study of the language, the pupils will then have been expected within three years to have reached the required standard in order to cope with the examinations by the fifth form. Yet the level of knowledge and fluency expected in this oral examination is well
above the standard of any other languages offered for the School Certificate examination. I have described the oral examination, as having a degree of difficulty that is perhaps four times that of the French oral assessment as judged on both the amount of writing and speaking required (Stewart 1992).

But it is assumed that as more pupils progress from primary to secondary schools who already have a good knowledge of te reo Māori, the oral fluency levels of pupils is perceived by teachers (from field notes) to be continually rising. If this assumption was correct then we might expect to see a gradual rise of grades achieved over time. But as with the written examination the oral examination performance of pupils appears to have decreased also (see Table 5.2).

Figure 5.2
National distribution of SC oral grades.

Table 5.2 clearly shows the sharp decline in the highest grade (blue column) being achieved between 1993 and 1997 of some 10%, and that the middle grades (yellow column) have increased by about the same amount. Over this period the results have also come to appear more like the traditional bell curve of normal distribution, just the same for the written examination results in Table 5.1.
One can argue the merits of using the School Certificate results as a contemporary indicator of the state of the Māori language in schools, but it remains the only national test for which comparisons, however valid, can be made. The annual reports on schools published by the Ministry of Education often include tables that demonstrate that more and more pupils in schools are having instruction in the Māori language. However, any public perception of a revival and renaissance of te reo Māori is not supported by Table 5.1 or Table 5.2. My attendance at many teacher meetings during the research period gave me the distinct and frequent impression of Māori language teachers assuming that the state of te reo Māori in schools was a healthy one (field note entries). Often teachers when interviewed excused the poor performance of their class as having "just a bad year." But in actual fact it was a mistaken assumption that the general state and strength of te reo was good. In actual fact it was declining at least on the measure of School Certificate. This was the first of a number of mistaken assumptions made by the Māori language teachers who were assisted during the intervention period (see next chapter).

This thesis is the first ever study of Māori language in secondary schools. It is the first time that the yearly average results for the School Certificate examination have been collated and reported on. Those officials who have been in the position to access data have not commented on or even been aware of these recent trends. For example, the annual reports of the Chief Examiner for Māori have not fully alerted us to the serious nature and consequences of this decline in academic standards for te reo Māori. Nor have any other official Ministry of Education documents, such as the Statistical Annex (Ministry 1995) or any of the Annual Reports on Māori Education in which all examination results for Māori are reported.

When the Chief Examiner's Report on School Certificate te reo Māori (1996) was obtained from the office of the New Zealand Qualifications Authority a meeting was arranged with the chief examiner to discuss the publication. However, the chief examiner who was the author of the report and a local Māori language Advisor, had not even been issued with a copy of his own report from
the Qualifications Authority (or even knew a copy was available). It was through this researcher that he was able to receive a copy.

While the achievement levels of fifth form pupils seem to be dropping on an annual basis, more and more younger pupils in the lower forms are now coming forward and entering the examination. Field notes (from which Table 5.3 was constructed) indicate that these younger pupils make up nearly twenty-five percent of total candidates. The younger pupils appear, as the collected data suggests for Intermediate School pupils (see next chapter), to achieve at a rate far superior to their older peers. In conversations with some secondary school principals concern has been expressed that primary school pupils should not be doing this examination as it is the prerogative of secondary schools. Furthermore, pupils who enter secondary school with such advanced qualifications "are awkward to cater for" (field notes). My reply has usually been that if you wait until such pupils are in the fifth form then such pupils through sheer boredom would probably have long dropped out of school (see the evidence in Table 5.2).

My enquiries indicated that no secondary schools in Northland had developed any planning or policies to cater for advanced attainment pupils (as distinct from immersion classes) either entering their schools with the School Certificate pass or achieving it in the lower forms. While top stream classes for advanced academic pupils are very common in most of our high schools these are always in the English language. It appears that advanced pupils were just mainstreamed into normal classes of their chronological age and peer groupings. Interviews with some of these students revealed that attempts by their teachers to provide them with "extra work" generally ended up as being the same work as everyone else in the class. There exists an important need for better planning in schools to cater for high achieving pupils and to design ways to build on their early academic success. The unique opportunity to use such pupils as positive role models to stimulate other pupils in schools is being lost.
In an attempt to provide for better planning I wrote a policy document called *Vision and Direction* 1998 for the Northland Māori Language Teachers’ Trust (see Appendix E). This document was adopted by this Trust at their annual meeting in December 1997 at Tauwhara Marae, Waimate North. The document contents are further promoted and discussed in the conclusion to this thesis.

Research Difficulties.

The gaining of statistical information to construct all the graphs in this chapter was a very difficult and time-consuming task. The process illustrates how the system finds it difficult to learn about itself in general – and in particular in the case of te reo Māori. A written request for annual pass rate data was first made to the New Zealand Qualifications Authority in early 1996. This was followed by three more written requests using the Official Information Act (1982). As no reply was received after one year of writing requests a successful appeal was made to the Office of the Ombudsmen. This action resulted in all requested information being released, plus a formal apology for the delay (which claimed earlier letters had not been received) from the Chief Executive of the Qualifications Authority.

A request for data information was made to the Data Management and Analysis Section of the Ministry of Education. Their reply was that such information would “require special programming” (by correspondence) at a cost of $60.00 per hour plus GST. On inquiry back to the Office of the Ombudsmen I learnt that the established protocol for the giving of information from government departments and ministries was that the first hour of information gathering was to be free of charge, as were the first twenty pages of printed material. For extra irony I was later able to locate much of the requested information within the Statistical Annex (1996), already published and distributed free to all schools.
Comparing the published data on School Certificate pass rates was further made difficult by the way the New Zealand Qualifications Authority count the examination candidates as compared with the Ministry of Education. As an example, the former reports the total number of School Certificate te reo Māori candidates for the 1996 year as being 3,376, but the latter as only 2,192. I was concerned that more than one-third difference would invalidate the construction of the above graphs in Figures 5.1 and 5.2. In correspondence received, the Ministry of Education explained the difference in numbers arising from only including year three pupils, thus excluding a considerable number of younger and older candidates. However, they admitted that this could not explain the full difference, as some 200 candidates could not be accounted for. So to ensure the accuracy of the graphs in this chapter only year three students were included. From my counting the number of entrants for the examination within the whole of the Northland area (see Table 5.3) the number of non-year three students would be at a level of less than five percent of the total and so not likely to dramatically change the appearance of the graphs shape for Northland. But with a much greater difference on the national scale, some one third of all students being non-year three, both the Qualifications Authority and the Ministry of Education need to co-operate to produce more accurate and complete data.3

I suspect that the non-year three candidates achieve at a much higher level than the traditional year three fifth formers. The work done at Kaikohe Intermediate School indicates this (see next Chapter). If, overall, students do better outside of the fifth form then this may indicate that the fifth form is the wrong place for the examination. Only by the production of more information and research can this matter be more fully considered.

3 One is reminded here of the BBC television comedy Yes Minister when David Lange said: "The public think of it as a comedy but we know it is a documentary."
Sixth Form Certificate Indicators.

The reporting grades for all the School Certificate subjects are from 1 (highest) to 5 (lowest). Because te reo Māori is no longer within the hierarchy of subjects and now criterion referenced, the grades are best referred to as levels. It is vital under the present system that students be encouraged to do equally well in both examinations and reach their highest possible level. It is these levels that will determine their entry into their sixth form (or some schools use a chronological entry) and provide the best possible pool of grades for their sixth form certificate results.

Secondary schools are allocated sixth form grades that are related directly to the performance of their pupils in the previous year’s examinations. Because the School Certificate te reo Māori is reported in two separate grades the National Qualifications Authority has designed a table in order to combine the grades to make one allocation for the sixth form for each individual student. Only during the last year (1997) has both the oral and written papers been treated equally in the allocations. It can be easily calculated from Table 5.1 that if any student has one low result out of the two from the previous year’s School Certificate result, then both are pulled down. The Qualifications Authority thus takes the lowest level of the oral with the written for its criteria for distributing sixth form awards to schools.

At the moment there is a serious disadvantage from the low written levels caused by this method of allocation to schools. Even if a school had the top oral students in School Certificate, it does not necessarily mean that corresponding top grades will be available to those students for sixth form certificate allocation. The oral Māori marks are in effect still moderated by the written (Wong 1990). The fact that each examination entry, assessment and report is made quite separately and that the ability to kōrero Māori (make conversation) is more highly valued by Māori, a “gate keeping mechanism” (Stewart 1992) still exists.

A 1977 circular sent out to all principals of schools (Table 5.1) contained the following grid.
It shows how the combination of the two school certificate assessments gives sixth form certificate grades. It can be seen that if a student achieved a level one for the oral, and a level three for the written, then the generated grade for sixth form certificate will be a three. Such a student, a highly ranked speaker, when doing the oral orientated course for sixth form (Te Reo o Te Rangatira) generates a contestable (see below) grade that is considered only just above average.

Table 5.1: Conversion of School Certificate Grades to Sixth Form Certificate.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Cert. Grade</th>
<th>Korero</th>
<th>oral</th>
<th>Sixth Form Certificate grade</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuheitih</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>written</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Source: New Zealand Qualifications Authority - Examination Learner Information, 21 March 1997, CQ97/215)

This is yet another example of a barrier that seriously disadvantages Māori pupils and traditional Māori values, that continually tells them that they will be awarded less than they are capable of. As the "gate keeping mechanism" is within the system it can be seen as institutional racism (Blackburn 1981; Peters & Marshall 1989; Stewart 1992; Walker 1990).

The act of gate keeping is further demonstrated by the way in which individual schools allocate the sixth form grades to their pupils. Some schools choose to pool all their allocated grades for all subjects. At the end of the year this pool provides a contestable division among all the subjects and pupils. Other schools may keep the allocation of grades for each subject completely separate so the contestable division is only among those particular pupils of that particular subject. Both systems have advantages and disadvantages. The main advantage of pooling is that the particular given range for one subject such as te reo Māori is not limited. It is possible for any pupil to achieve above (and also below) the range, thus taking an allocation that
would have been originally generated by another subject. This method rewards the harder working pupil. But what was found in this research was that schools, because te reo Māori allocations were so low, were keeping the pool of marks separate.

Low marks seem to be predestined for Māori language students. During one research interview (1995) a pupil said he would not have taken te reo Māori as a sixth form subject if he knew that his school kept the Māori language grade allocations within a separate pool. This then give no possibility of achieving a higher grade no matter how improved he was academically. He said: "There's no use working my guts out because I can't get above what I got from last year" (field notes).

There exist two possible responses. Either change the table to emphasise the preferred cultural importance of the oral paper by favouring it at least by one upward grade, or give special emphasis in an attempt to raise the performance of students in the written paper. This was the main work of the research intervention (see next chapter).

Furthermore, the written examination could possibly be done in the same way as the oral assessment. The success of the Taitokerau method (see below) of School Certificate oral Māori assessment has proved that this group of Māori language teachers are quite capable of working and assessing to nationally set standards (see below).

It was David Hughes who in 1983 first publicly reported the injustice of having school certificate Māori moderated against the school certificate English results which then gave an average pass rate for Māori language pupils of only thirty percent. His advice for us is still current in terms of controlling the gate keeping mechanism at the sixth form level:

"Few of those affected by the system really know what is going on. It is my fervent hope that more people will find out what is happening and begin to question the system. They may then agitate for change in the interests of the one-third of the school population for whom the school system is totally inappropriate ... only when enough people understand the operation of the
system and its implications will there be any prospect for change “) (Hughes 1983:35).

School Certificate Written Māori.

The format of this written examination is for each candidate to demonstrate their ability to write on a series of topics in a variety of formats (annual prescription documents 1995-97). Five topics must be attempted out of eight given, over a three hour time period. The answers are not simply a series of essays, but may include any or all of these genre:

- a report for a newspaper on a particular event;
- an invitation (pānui) suitable for a newspaper or poster;
- writing out the words of a song, with an appropriate explanation;
- the scripting of a dialogue, giving the situation;
- recalling an old time story or legend;
- descriptive writing that may include giving directions on a certain journey or task;
- writing out of mīhi (formal speeches) or karakia (prayers).

As with the oral paper the focus is always on te reo Māori, with no translations or English used. All instructions and questions are provided in te reo Māori. Any of these topics could well be incorporated into the oral paper. But the important non-verbal skills used in the oral paper do not apply here, nor is there any opportunity for an assessor to "back-track" a candidate to check. All skills required are similar to the literature requirements of the English prescription: grammar, presentation, spelling, punctuation, etc (Ministry 1989:21).

There are two very important aspects of the written assessment that differ from the oral paper. The first is in the assessment criteria. For the oral paper one of the most important aspects of delivery by the candidates is in how they display their mana Māori (personal dignity). Kaumātua (senior male tribal elders) have insisted (field notes) that if pupils are going to kōrero Māori, then whatever they are taught and choose to do must be done correctly. For instance, if a karakia
(prayers) was intended then it must be delivered in the correct format. This often means to stand and recite, and then proceed from beginning to end with as few stops as possible. The use of non-verbal indicators, mnemonic aids, musical instruments, solo or in-group, can all add to the Māori perspective of communication, but also must be used correctly. Any boy holding a taiaha (traditional staff) upside down on the ground would soon arouse some disapproval.

An earlier examination prescription (Ministry of Education 1989), makes no mention of the candidate's ability to display mana Māori in either the aims or standards. The highest award level (one) is for: "Students at this level will be technically correct throughout their writing. They will adhere to, and logically expand the topics. They will show creativity in their use of language, and originality in their development of themes. They will be able to write at length on a range of topics. These students will use correct structures, appropriate and extended vocabulary. Their writing will be consistent" (p 14).

The above descriptor of the highest level could almost have been extracted from any of the School Certificate language examinations. There is no doubt that the technical skills of writing are very important in order to preserve the exact meaning intended. Such skills need to be encouraged because contemporary writing for resources are scarce. But should such writing be devoid of mana Māori? As I was a member of the original working party in 1987 to write the initial descriptors, it was specifically intended at the time that the highest level would equally consider each candidate's technical ability, along with their ability to display their mana Māori. Which essay is the better? One, a description of a television programme, with no Māori cultural values incorporated, but perfect in grammar and vocabulary, or, a description of a hangi in which you could almost smell the kai, hear all the jokes cracked, taste the beer that was drunk, but have many spelling mistakes and terrible hand writing?

If these two examples above (that actually came from the 1986 School Certificate essays that I reviewed for demonstration to the writing panel) were put to a hui of parents and elders to
assess, there would no doubt be a long debate. The same types of examples came up with the oral criteria and long debates ensued, often carrying over from one hui to another. But by such a process did all agree to what they wanted. It is unfortunate that they have not been given the opportunity to debate and assess actual scripts. It was the first working party's original intention that all the teachers mark the new written paper in the community in the same way (i.e. an open marae forum) as the oral paper. A strong letter of protest was written to the Ministry of Education concerning the lack of control that the teachers had over the assessment system. A letter of reply revealed that financial constraints and a concern for moderation with other regions was the main reason to prevent such a move (Stewart 1992).

The Northland Oral Assessment Method.

*Te Reo o te Taitokerau* is the Māori name given to the School Certificate Oral examination method used for the examination in the North of New Zealand. The same national prescription and criteria for assessment are used as that for all other Māori language students in the country. But there are two main differences in the administration of the examination. In Northland all students are tested twice per year (not just once) and that in the final end of year examination all students are tested (not just a sample few - see below).

The oral examination covers five broad areas of interest, centred upon the life experiences of the candidate. These are similar to the written examination. The five prescribed *kaupapa* (topics) include the ability to greet and introduce one's self to the candidate's assessor; to talk about at least one family relationship; to talk on one district or community item; to provide a free choice prepared topic; and to select one picture from those provided for an impromptu conversation.

The priority of the assessment is to judge the ability of each candidate to communicate in te reo Māori. All candidates have the great advantage to be free to choose and talk about whatever they wish to within the specified *kaupapa* (topics) above. Nervous candidates may typically begin
by reading out the paper as a technique to help calm their nerves. It is possible for some candidates to come having pre-learnt by rote all five sections perfectly. But they would not necessarily achieve a perfect (level 1) mark. The ability and skill to "back-track" and accurately answer probing questions to the assessors on what was spoken would be decisive for the achieving the highest level.

This examination method differs from the rest of the country in that all candidates in Northland are assessed. *Te Runanga o te Reo o te Taitokerau*, the Northland Māori Language Teachers' Trust, has rejected the New Zealand Qualifications Authority’s directive (Circular CQ97/57S) where only a “sample of candidates” will be selected for testing that will represent a cross section of each individual school’s range of candidates.

The Northland Māori language teachers' group have rejected this requirement for a number of critical reasons. They wish to have the assessment fully transparent to all participants and so to give all teachers and their students a fair and equal opportunity. All the participants want to take maximum opportunity to value, critique and learn from the experience. It can be argued that the internally assessed marks are still not sufficiently reliable (see below), and all the teachers wish to
be present for any moderation process in order to prevent the NZQA from scaling all the results from any particular school.

It seems also that the NZQA has given these teachers some added administrative difficulties. Although, according to the above NZQA circular, all Māori language teachers are expected to accompany their students to all of the assessment venues, the teachers will only be paid for one half day's work. Yet at the same time the teachers are expected to remain at the venues for the full day in case they are required for any moderation process. The excuse that NZQA give for this half payment is that the students are only required for half of the day.

The Northland teachers have refused the NZQA directive to supply a ranked list of candidates so that any moderation can be made from such as list. Under the national system all candidates are required to be placed within five levels of competence (see below) and be ranked within each of those levels to be later sampled. According to the directive, if two pupils are given equal ranking and one of these through the external assessment is promoted to a higher grade, then both students will be promoted. But it is also possible that if one is demoted, then both will be demoted. This seems to be a new form of scaling, assessed by a "dip-stick" method of sampling that has been rejected in preference to all students having "stand alone" results. Within Northland if there is a disagreement between the teacher and the external assessor then the appointed supervisor (moderator) at the testing venue will arrange a moderation by having the particular student assessed a third time. Thus a solution is found, not on paper, but directly from the ability of each and every individual student.

There are no secrets in this examination. All pupils know well before they go into their assessments as to what they are going to be asked and so have the opportunity to prepare themselves. The assessment is most likely to be held within whare hui (tribal meeting houses) where all can see and hear each other. If any candidate wishes, s/he may request the assessor to provide the privacy of another room, or to move to a more appropriate area, such as the paepae
or marae proper (exterior front of the building), for the purposes of karanga or wero (performed art), then s/he may do so.

Each candidate is free to move around to listen to other candidates and so choose the assessor of their own choice. Often candidates join together to support each other in song. Others prompt each other. While most candidates are assessed consecutively, one after each other, some are assessed in pairs. This is referred to as a “one-on-one” and a “one-on-two” assessment. Whatever situation or technique is to the best advantage of each candidate it will be used. The time allocation for each candidate is one half-hour.

Of course communication is not by kōrero Māori alone. Not only are the candidates communicating words in Māori, but the mana and mauri (spiritual significance) they convey. Each candidate communicates to different assessors in different ways, using a variety of non-verbal skills. These have included very formal and classical speeches that have been complemented either by serious karakia (prayers), or contrasted with jovial waiata (songs) that contain comic pūkana
(face pulling) or wiriwiri (the quiver of the hands). Some students have included the demonstration of objects such as taonga (family heirlooms) brought with them.

Many parents and kaumātua (family elders) have accompanied their own students not just to watch, but to help their rangatahi (younger generation) get the best advantage by being there. Some parents have taken part in the actual assessment under the guidance of the official assessors.

The week before the assessment hui, each candidate will have been assessed by their own teacher of Māori at their own school. On the assessment day, each candidate is assessed by at least one other trained teacher from another school acting as assessor. These two assessments are collated together and considered at the end of each day. At this time, while memories are still fresh, there is a process of moderation for any candidates whose three levels are at variance. The regional moderator who has been observing the whole process during the day has the task of moderating such disputes. On any one day when up to one hundred students may have been assessed, then usually only about five will have to be moderated (field note). This means that because the school assessment was more than one grade different from the assessor the candidate will have to be re-assessed. Usually by consensus the assessor and the class teacher agree on a level. If there is no clear agreement then the candidate will be assessed a third time by the moderator.

One of the most notable outcomes of this type of assessment was that it initially promoted academic excellence. When this type of assessment first began in 1987, the overall standard of performance rose markedly. Previously under the old examination format the performance of the Northland students was very similar to that of students in all other areas (Stewart 1992). Figure 5.3 demonstrates the marked difference between the Northland region compared with the national cohort just two years after the beginning of this whanau and community based assessment.
Three reasons have been advanced why the pupils performed better. It was a more accurate and fairer method of assessment; greater training was provided to class teachers; and huge family support from local communities occurred. The interpretation of the grade criteria has been further refined since the method began. At the beginning of 1993 the number of reporting grades was reduced from seven to five in order to make the process more simple and more clear. Teacher reliability as assessors was one of the specific areas of interest for the researchers (Peters & Marshall 1989) who had been contracted by the Ministry of Education in order to independently evaluate the programme.

At the very first training hui in 1987 the teachers heard tape recordings of volunteer pupils to assess and mark on a one to seven (later five) scale. Soon video recordings became available and these had the advantage of being used with students themselves as exemplars that demonstrated differing abilities. As a class teacher at that time undergoing the training process it was interesting to observe the great diversity of levels first awarded. The more experienced the teacher was, in terms of teaching career, the more likely was that person to mark at the extremes of the range. Newer, less experienced teachers would usually be positioned in the centre (plus
cowards like myself). There was much debate as to what exactly made for a good speech, \textit{te hā o te reo}. Opinions differed widely, depending on what was valued by the various teachers. The experienced teachers obviously needed the process of debate and moderation from which the less experienced could observe and learn. Gradually after listening to many tapes and ensuing discussions more consistent results were achieved. One needed to ask the question that if this group of experienced teachers whom I had often come to previously for professional guidance, did not all work accurately to the national criteria, then what good were they as teachers?

After the initial two-year trial period the new assessment method was declared so successful that it became the national prescription in 1990. The initial group of Māori language teachers in Northland formalised themselves into a trust (Stewart 1992). The strengths and expertise of the trust continued to be built up by the quality of the professional relationships of the various participants. These included a central core of teachers who had been working together for at least ten years making all decisions by consensus to satisfy the whole membership. There was regular professional development and training meetings each year along with frequent informal contact at many other inter-school events. The annual general meetings of the Trust have given a continual rotation of membership responsibilities.

The group philosophy clearly demonstrates a determination for \textit{tino rangatiratanga} (self-direction and policy making) and maintains strong support for the national meeting of Māori language teachers. In turn the group enjoys the enthusiastic support and participation of parents and kaumātua (tribal elders), the participation of academic researchers from Auckland University and the national moderator for Oral Māori. These teachers have taken these skills back to their classroom to become much more confident and competent teachers. Teachers and their pupils have obviously been the direct beneficiaries of the whole process.

The clustering of candidates has allowed other pupils and parents to see the performance of many other students, and thus return for the next assessment to "do one better," not in competition
but in a higher level of attainment. The importance of having two assessments during the year must be emphasised, as giving the best possible opportunity to maximise pupil results. The draft version of the national Teacher's Guide (Ministry 1989) for the examinations states:

"Both the assessment of te reo Māori and schooling will be strengthened if the Māori community is involved. It is recommended that teachers, assessors and moderators of te reo Māori invite community participation in their work" (p 6)

However, despite official promises in the Education Gazette that "the new approach taken to the assessment of School Certificate Oral Māori in Northland will be continued in future years" (15/3/1991:5), finance for the twice a year cluster for assessment was cut to only one in 1992. It was ironic to see in the same issue of the Education Gazette a two and a half page report on Māori Education focusing on the importance of te reo and teacher education. Yet a few pages over, cuts were being made to these important items that had been associated with a direct influence on success. A strong letter of protest was sent to the chief executive officer, Dr. Maris O'Rourke, but no reply was received. As a result the Northland Māori Language Teachers Trust was formed to arranged their own mid-year clusters.

The Trust (commonly known as T.R.O.T.T.) has its headquarters at Te Kauri Marae, Waikūkū Road, Waimate North. Besides keeping busy organising the examinations, TROTT organises in-service programmes, Mamu Kōrero (speech) and cultural competitions.

The Māori communities were empowered because of their commitment together as a whanau (close family-like relationships), which gave them strength to develop the ability to take control of the whole process of the School Certificate examination. By actually being involved in a real way all teachers have developed a professional skill that retains all its mana Māori and academic excellence. The teachers were proved to be reliable as assessors (Peters, Para & Marshall 1989b).
Given that some ten years had passed since the beginning of this assessment and associated research, one possible explanation of the trends was a problem with reliability. A reliability test was run on the accuracy of the teachers in the grading of their own students. The internal mark given to students by their own class teachers was compared with that of the visiting assessor. This comparison was done both at mid and end of year for all the Northland schools having School Certificate students. The results as listed in the three administrative areas, often referred to as “clusters” of schools, are given in Table 5.2. The progress within individual schools is listed in the next chapter; see Tables 6.1 and 6.2.

This table below indicates a close level of agreement between the class teachers and the assessors, both at the mid year point and for the final end of year mark for the award of School Certificate. However, the original rationale for having two sets of assessments during the year does not seem to have been of much benefit to the students. The original intention was to give all students a trial examination experience at about the middle of the academic year so they could later return to improve their performance and achieve higher grades. This intention was achieved within the early years of this assessment from 1987 to 1993, as illustrated above in Figure 5.3. But in the years of this research, 1995 to 1997, the average mark for students actually reduced slightly from the mid to end of year assessment. It appears that the students gained no apparent benefits from having an earlier assessment in the middle of the year.

In addition to there being no discernible benefits to students, standards have decreased each year within the whole of the Taitokerau region. Figure 5.4 below illustrates the trend of the reduction of the top grades.

From what was once a highly successful method of assessment that promoted higher achievement in student performance there is now an obvious decline in achievement. In 1989 just over half of the Northland students were achieving the highest possible grade level. There has been a fall in standards to where by 1997 less than one quarter achieve at the top level. Yet after nearly
ten years of this assessment method one would not have expected such an outcome. Why has this method of assessment that once had international acclaim in the academic literature (Peters and Marshall 1989) become less effective?

Table 5.2 Average totals of all Taitokerau Clusters, 1997 Assessments:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test type:</th>
<th>Teacher grade</th>
<th>assessor grade</th>
<th>Teacher grade</th>
<th>final exam grade</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Test dates:</td>
<td>19 May</td>
<td>26 May</td>
<td>27 October</td>
<td>2 November</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cluster groups:</td>
<td>Schools:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern</td>
<td>Broadwood, Te Kao, Pangaru, Kaitaia, Taipa, Te Aupouri TB.</td>
<td>2.68</td>
<td>2.41</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tauwhara (Mid-North)</td>
<td>Kerikeri, Whangaroa, Northland, Kaikohe IS Bay College, Okaihau.</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern</td>
<td>Dargaville, Rodney, Oamatea, Bream Bay.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whangarei</td>
<td>Kamo, Mangakahia, Pompallier, Tikipunga, W Boys H, W Girls H, Raumanga, Tauraroa.</td>
<td>3.01</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taitokerau average grade:</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>2.66</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Added to this decline in reliably assessed standards there has also been a serious decline in the actual number of students opting to take te reo Māori as a School Certificate subject option. Records show that in 1988 there were 260 fifth form candidates. Table 5.3 demonstrates that for the 1997 final assessment there were approximately 120 fifth form students less than there were in 1988. Of the 193 total number of candidates in 1997, only 140 were from the fifth form, because the remainder were from lower forms or adult students.
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Table 5.3:
Number of Te Taitokerau School Certificate Te Reo Māori Entrants: comparing class numbers with assessed numbers, mid-year with finals, 1997.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cluster</th>
<th>School</th>
<th>Mid-year</th>
<th>Final</th>
<th>Mid to final assessment gain or loss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>class</td>
<td>assess</td>
<td>dif</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern</td>
<td>Te Kao</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kaitaia</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Taipa</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pangaru</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Broadwood</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>sub-total</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tauwhara (Mid-North)</td>
<td>Opononi</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kerikeri</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Whangaroa</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>+2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Okaihau</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>+2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kaikohe Interm</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Northland</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bay of Islands</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>sub-total</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>+5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whangarei</td>
<td>Pompallier</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>W. Boy’s High</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>W. Girl’s High</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kamo</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tikipunga</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mangakahia</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tauraroa</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Raumanga Mid</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>sub-total</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>-18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern</td>
<td>Rodney</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bream Bay</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dargaville</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Otamatea</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>sub-total</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>totals</td>
<td></td>
<td>266</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>-26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult</td>
<td>Te Āupouri TB</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>Aniwahihia</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Amo-rangi</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>+4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This researcher had known that the number of candidates had been dropping over the years. This was deduced from annual counts of pupils as reported from all the cluster venues. But construction of the above table also enabled a clear view of the decline in pupil numbers, not just from previous years, but also between the middle to the end of the year. Before now this problem had not been fully appreciated or even been reported in any literature. Some classes in some schools may appear only to have lost one or two pupils. But if the class numbers were small to begin with then such losses can be a big proportion of the whole. Having fewer pupils means that the total individual number of the top grades being achieved is less, even though this assessment is criterion referenced. In the reading of Table 5.3 it is important not to focus on particular schools but rather to see that every school in the North has a problem with low numbers and drop-out students. Just getting Māori language pupils to stay at school until the fifth form is difficult enough, especially the boys (Ministry of Education 1996), but getting them to remain there for the full year is another very difficult problem that needs urgent research.

Approaching the Problem.

The explanation for the continuing decline of student numbers and results for School Certificate te reo Māori advanced here locates a large part of the problem in the declining collaboration by the Māori language teachers with the Māori parent community to actively promote this subject at school. During the three years of this research very few attempts by teachers to involve their Māori parent community were noted. It would be true to state here that, other than resource ideas provided through the research described below no other parent involvement attempts or initiatives were observed in any groups or individual schools.

The original development of this Taitokerau assessment from 1987 attracted a large amount of national and international interest (Peters & Marshall 1989). There were frequent official notices appearing in the Education Gazette; newspaper and television publicity, and many visitors
and observers arriving at the various venues. The Māori parent communities were fully mobilised in order to first arrange suitable marae venues for the large number of students and visitors. During this work the Māori parents became fully involved in all aspects of the trial, including all aspects of student evaluation (Stewart 1992).

The "Hawthorne Effect" could be argued here - because there was a high expectation of success then such success did happen. Another explanation could be that because the initial support that promoted the assessment during the trial period has now ceased so has community awareness. The initial support came from agencies external to the schools and communities. Teachers were not trained as public relations consultants (actually that was my original portfolio) but concentrated their time and efforts into the professional development required for the assessment. Teachers, as it happened ten years ago, just expected their Māori parent community to turn up and support their students, without having to do the promotional work themselves.

As the "glory" years have gone the annual arrangements have become routine, with no important visitors, the Māori parent community has been almost unaware of the event. The lack of parent involvement has been observed. During the three years of this research many testing venues were visited each year. Very few parents, teachers of other subjects, senior management teachers and their principals have been observed coming to the assessment venues to support their own students. On no occasion was any student observed as a participating speaker standing either to welcome or reply on behalf of any school. In past years it was quite common for elders to train up their own children for this important ceremonial task. There seems to be a general assumption by all those present, especially from the complementary remarks made by the various speakers, that the cluster events "are excellent." But this opinion on the day must only refer to the organisational and social aspects only, and cannot refer to the academic results or improved retention of students of te reo Māori.
Teachers have made assumptions about the parents of their students. They complain that their parents are no longer interested in the pedagogy, so now have reverted to their previous roles (such as the preparation of food and participation in the pōwhiri (formal welcome ceremony). The much smaller pupil numbers has now made it convenient for the teachers themselves to act as drivers of school mini vans to the testing venues. Parents when interviewed complain that they are not needed or even asked to help by the teachers. One parent stated quite emphatically to me that the school to inform her of the assessment event issued no pānui (school newsletter). This was in spite of my supplying the same teacher with a draft example for possible use. It was only by reading the local newspaper that the complaining parent was informed (see next chapter).

The draft version of the national Teachers’ Guide (Ministry of Education 1989) for the examination of oral Māori states:

"Both the assessment of te reo Māori and schooling will be strengthened if the Māori community is involved. It is recommended that teachers, assessors and moderators of te reo Māori invite community participation in their work" (p6).

This advice sounds very sensible but the task of helping teachers to help their parents to become involved becomes a very difficult one. The following chapter details the intervention work in which the roles for parents were explored for the specific purpose of improving teaching, student performance and outcomes for Māori language students in the context of declining achievement patterns and declining numbers as reported in this chapter.
Chapter six:

The Intervention.

This chapter describes a longitudinal study of assistance given to a group of Māori language teachers and their associated Māori parent communities over two consecutive years, 1996 and 1997. The outcomes are presented in terms of the examination results during that period. The research was intended to facilitate a series of meetings where the “rules of the engagement” with pupils, teachers and the Māori parent community could be observed. From an analysis of the interaction between these participants a performance appraisal for Māori language teachers could be established so as to improve teaching, student learning and outcomes.

This chapter is presented in six parts. The first section gives the background and development of the intervention design. This is followed by an outline of the development research phase completed in 1995. The third section is the 1996 intervention proper which supported teachers in schools, and fourth is a record of the outreach to the Māori parent community. The fifth is the specific teacher support component that developed from this year was continued into the 1997 year and an analysis is provided of the School Certificate te reo Māori results for that year. The sixth and concluding part of the chapter illustrates three further themes to the intervention context: school suspensions, some school communications, and a critique of actions by the New Zealand National Qualifications Authority (NZQA).

The research demonstrates that it is not a simple matter to encourage teachers to let their parents become involved in their students’ learning and evaluation practices. Teachers first have to be convinced that it is a work priority and then be trained how to work in co-management techniques with parents. A model has to be demonstrated that is successful and likely to work in more than one school. The breaking down of structural mechanisms that occur within schools (as detailed in the previous chapters) applies as much to Māori language teachers as it does to school
management. Within the period of this research intervention new rules were discovered for engaging parents within the classroom for the benefit of improving student learning. These rules redefine the notion of expert within the teaching of te reo Māori and may have implications for the teaching of Māori students in other subjects at school.

Part One:

Research Design.

Initially, only a minimal intervention role was planned. But during the 1995 development phase of the intervention the three problems, described in the previous chapters, quickly became apparent. First, the average School Certificate pass rates for te reo Māori were found to be extremely low. Second, fewer Māori students were opting for this subject in high schools. Third, very little evidence was found for the involvement of the Māori parent community. The extent of these problems prompted a change in the research design. The focus for the first year of intervention had to be on the work of teachers and then the second year to work with engaging parents in the delivery of the curriculum.

It became apparent at the beginning of 1996 that the Māori language teachers were very reluctant to engage with parents for two specific reasons. First, because the teachers themselves did not really understand the marking and grading system used by the national School Certificate examiners (so how could these teachers work with their students, let alone their parents?). Second, teachers were seen to be struggling to cope with preparation and workloads associated with their schoolwork, plus changing curriculum and prescription requirements for their students. They were not able, therefore, to make parent engagement a priority. It was obvious that the teachers lacked both assessment and examination techniques that were necessary for this advanced level of School Certificate, as well as the necessary time to develop appropriate resources.
The research design for the first year of intervention, 1996, was then altered to assist a group of Māori language teachers with their planning, teaching and administration in preparation for the school certificate te reo Māori examination. First, teachers were supplied with diagnostic tests for grammar and vocabulary knowledge. This material was determined from a needs analysis of the process writing of groups of students (see below). Second, a series of five look-a-like formal School Certificate practice tests were composed for student use. Third, after each test, approximately two per term, the teachers and myself gathered together to share in the marking of the student scripts, discuss the results and plan ahead for the next test.

The purpose of these practices was to give all candidates, parents, and teachers focused learning experiences, leaving sufficient time for further learning before the formal examinations at the end of the year. But it also gave this researcher an insight into the learning abilities of the students and the teacher behaviour, plus precise data on which to compare results. The research for the first year involved a group of five schools with approximately sixty-five students. The selection of these participants was based on their being part of the Tauwhara cluster of schools for the administration of the School Certificate oral Māori examination as described in the previous chapter. I had myself been active within this cluster over the last decade so had developed local knowledge, friendship and compatibility with local teachers of Māori and their associated Māori parent communities. The fact that my own Māori ancestry was far away from this district gave me the advantage of being disinterested in local tribal politics and so more focused on achieving the research goals. I suspected on a number of occasions that teachers who had extended family relationships in their school district may have been reluctant to make contact with certain families, perhaps based on past experiences at school or other places, of receiving a negative reaction. Perhaps this is why I was so welcome as being the facilitator of parent-teacher meetings.

\[1\] I have already described in detail the importance of bonding with research participants in my earlier research (Stewart 1993).
I was also frequently engaged as a facilitator between the teachers and their own principals for much the same reason. During this time, knowing that a friendly working relationship had developed between a number of teachers and myself, I received a number of requests for assistance. This took the form of being asked to be a relief teacher for Māori language classes when teachers were absent. This was a valuable experience in allowing more personal contact within schools on a regular basis. It allowed more time and opportunity for meetings and discussions with pupils and parents, but especially school principals. There was direct observation on the various differing methods and styles of school managements. In this way I could be more certain that observations, recording of field notes and conclusions for this group of schools was as accurate as possible.

Fundamental to the success of the two-year intervention (1996 and 1997) was the use of methodology based on an action research model. Two important ingredients of the methodology were _involve_ment and _improve_ment of the participants, as described by Kemmis & McTaggart (1988). Another and perhaps the most important ingredient was the high level of _kotāhitanga_ (working together as a close group) and _whanaungatanga_ (degree of personal bonding) between all participants. These traditional cultural values of Māori society have also been noted by other researchers in Māori educational research (Stewart 1993; Stokes 1985; Smith 1999; Jones, Marshall, Mathews, Smith & Smith 1990; Bishop 1996). Such values may, at first glance, appear to be limiting or constraining on the research practice and methodology. But the values are what they are – values – that contributed to the success of the research.

The main role of this researcher was that of being a facilitator of all meeting and events, thus any imposition on the subjects was avoided. The following paragraph best summarises the intention of action research:

---

2 This confirms the work that I have already detailed concerning the professional relationships between teachers and their principals; see Stewart 1993.
"As the name indicates, action research is primary concerned with action. Its fundamental aim to improve practice, and it seeks to achieve this by actively involving practitioners in making decisions about how to bring about these improvements. In this sense it is not research that is done on other people – it involves people working together, analysing, and changing their own situations and practices” (McPherson 1994:21).

According to the criteria proposed by action researchers and planners, both overseas and within New Zealand (eg. Bishop 1996) this programme of intervention was very successful. Russell Bishop in his paper Hei Āwhina Mātua: Final report to the Ministry of Education (1996b) suggests five particular standards for the evaluation of the Māori research context: the initiation, benefits achieved, representation, legitimacy and accountability. By all of these standards the research can be judged a success. Bishop (1996) has criticised researchers in New Zealand as having “developed a tradition of research that has perpetuated colonial values” that “have perpetuated an ideology of cultural superiority that precludes the development of power-sharing processes ... ” (ibid p145). But by adopting a Kaupapa Maori research methodology as earlier suggested by Graham Smith (in Bishop 1996) and later by Linda Smith (1999) is no guarantee of protection against the effects of colonisation that have already been established within an existing kaupapa Māori community of teachers and learners. All the participants within this research were all Māori, but the Māori teachers were all observed as following the colonizing practices of their schools. Just because all the teachers and the parents were all Māori it could not be claimed that this research was operating within context that was indeed “defining and acknowledging Māori aspirations” (Bishop 1996:146). Overcoming such a contradiction through a process of leading teachers through the decolonisation of their many mistaken assumptions was the main challenge of this research.

The result of the first year of the intervention was that the teachers themselves came to function as researchers to analyse the problem of their own students’ poor performance in
examinations. Near the end of this year the teachers themselves felt sufficiently confident and competent at understanding the under achievement problem and how to work towards solutions. These teachers who have formerly been working professionally isolated as the sole subject teacher within their schools empowered themselves by group co-operation and action. The implication for further action research was that the facilitation of meetings and the ability to demonstrate successful models works far more effectively than imposing a rigid structure.

In 1996 one particular Māori language teacher began the first part of the intervention by inviting the contributing Māori parent community into the classroom in order to join in the marking and evaluation of the practice examinations. This was further extended during the 1997 year. When and where this practice occurred a dramatic rise in pupil performance was recorded. The conclusion is that the likelihood for school success for Māori pupils in the School Certificate te reo examination is in direct proportion to the amount of Māori parent assistance that is facilitated by the teachers. Conversely, it will be reported that very little apparent parent participation achieves very poor results. This was observed during both intervention years. But the intention of the intervention was always to remain positive in seeking new methods to improve teaching and student outcomes.

Part Two:


The work of providing mid-year practice examinations for the oral language section of School Certificate te reo Māori has already been described in the previous chapter. During 1995, at one particular cluster of schools, the opportunity was taken to test students in their written skills as well as their oral. The Tauwhara cluster for the 1995 mid-year te reo Māori examination consisted of six schools: Kerikeri High, Okaihau College, Northland College, Kaikohe Intermediate, Whangaroa College and Opononi Area School. The rationale for this written test
was that it would first provide all the participating students a knowledge of their examination standard at that particular time of the year and second, give them experience at sitting an external written examination. For both researcher and teachers the written test provided an early opportunity for an analysis of student writing for which remedial and future lessons could be planned.

Data From Students.

A half-length written test paper of approximately one hour’s duration was provided for all students (Appendix F). In all, sixty-seven students participated in this double test. After all students had been welcomed to the testing venue, Tauwhara Marae (at Waimate North), and instructions for the day given, students had the choice of proceeding either with their oral or written assessment. As students completed their work and handed papers back onto the administration desk the task began of reading and grading all the written papers against the national examination criteria. A random sample of twelve papers was given to an Auckland secondary schools’ advisor for te reo Māori in order to cross check my marking ability. All of the twelve samples were consistently marked one grade above what I had done. This established consistency in my marking, but in the interest of conservative reporting the following results only use the lower marks.
Scripts were returned to all students at their respective schools along with a report to all principals of the participating schools (see Appendix G). The feedback detailed a number of problems that were both preparatory and technical in nature. These problems hindered the ability of students to perform well in the test. Too many students came to the examination venue without writing pens and others used colours (other than black or blue) expressly prohibited by the examination regulations. Although I did proceed to read and grade these papers it is my understanding from the Chief Examiner that the use of such prohibited colours results in the lowest possible grade being given. The bad handwriting of many students made their work very difficult to read and comprehend. The number of spelling mistakes made for a number of common words (e.g. marae, Māori) demonstrated that spelling routines for te reo Māori were not being practised at school. It was also very obvious that the majority of students failed to develop any traditional structure (e.g. an introduction, development and conclusion) to their essays. The vocabulary ability of students and basic sentence construction use was very limited. By this age all pupils would be expected to know such words as computers, college, alcohol, etc. It was quite obvious that most students were very poorly prepared and had limitations in both their pre-literacy (equipment preparation) and necessary literacy (writing) skills. What I have noted here is almost identical to the criticisms made in the Chief Examiner’s Report (New Zealand Qualifications Authority, 1996) that was published six months later in March 1996.

Several aspects of teaching were associated with the low performance (see Table 6:1 below). Teachers often said to their students: “just write what you would say” (recorded in field notes). Such teachers failed to instruct their students in the formalities of written language - the structure and content of what a person writes is typically systematically different from how a person speaks (Wood 1998).

Only one grade one (the highest possible grade) was given and only three grade two's. These presentations clearly showed the writers' personality, humour, individuality, likes and dislikes.
They obviously knew what to write and how to write. This was not the case for the large majority of students. Even though the examination paper had been distributed well in advance to all teachers, too many pupils were asking me at the very beginning:

"can I do a mihi?"  "Can I write about my family."

One can assume from these comments that the pupils were not briefed on what was expected in their schools. These are aspects of preparation relating to process and goals. In addition, there were problems of linguistic appropriateness. Most pupils did not know how to express the negative, e.g.:

"Kāhore e haere ana a Kane ki ..."  Kane is not going to ...

Here the noun should have preceded the verb. Correctly put it should read:

"Kāhore a Kane e haere ana ki ...

Students frequently became confused with applying the future tense, e.g.:

"ka tū te hui i tērā wiki"  (the hui will be held last week).

The "i" word always signifies the past tense. Correctly written the sentence should be:

"Ka tū te hui a tērā wiki"

There was also confusion with the use of personal and possessive pronouns, e.g.:

"No Kapiro ahau, ko tino mohio ia."  or "Tekau ma ono anō tau"

(I am from Kapiro, he is very clever)  (Sixteen years old again)

(Wrong third person pro-noun used)  (adding the adverb is unnecessary).

The above examples serve to demonstrate that these pupils had not yet learned basic sentence constructions from Te Rangatahi I (Waititi 1962) and Modern Māori I (Ryan 1984). These two books are the recommended texts within the examination prescription (New Zealand Qualifications Authority 1996). As the basic grammar of te reo Māori is quite easy to learn,
substitution exercises, which are frequently given in the above texts, should have been practised daily.

Analysis of Student Data

Suggestions were made to schools on how pupil performance might be improved, especially for overcoming the above difficulties (Appendix H). Running records for both written and oral marks were kept for each class of students in each school. These were then summarised into class averages from which Table 6:1 was constructed (there were on average twelve students in each class). However, when the end-of-year grades were compared with those from the mid-year test there was still no evidence of any significant improvement.

Table 6:1, Progress of 1995 School Certificate te reo Māori marks;
Comparing six school averages, Tauwhara cluster, mid-year to final.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>test date</th>
<th>mid year written</th>
<th>SC final written</th>
<th>diff</th>
<th>class teacher</th>
<th>moderator oral</th>
<th>SC final oral</th>
<th>diff</th>
<th>6 form certificate grade</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kura tahi</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>+0.5</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kura rua</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>+0.3</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>-0.2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kura toru</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>+1.0</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>+0.6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kura whā</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>+0.45</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>+0.1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kura rima</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>+1.2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>-0.2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kura ono</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>-0.4</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cluster average</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>+0.5</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>+0.1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northland average</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National average</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NB: these schools are not ordered according to the participants as previously named.
Two individual classes had their averages raised by one whole grade. But the class that was raised the most had any benefits negated by the reduction within the oral grade. Only one school was able to actually raise its performance in both the written and oral examination. But overall the 0.5 average improvements within the written grade was not sufficient to lift the total average result up to the next possible grade for the allocation of Sixth form Certificate. Anecdotal evidence within field notes recorded the air of confidence by Māori language teachers at the general and good performance of their pupils. This no doubt referred to the general behaviour and effort made by all students, but not to their final marks. It was at this point in time when the intervention intention of working with parents was delayed until the problem of low performance in schools for the te reo Māori examination was more fully investigated.

From the low results of the 1995 School Certificate te reo Māori examination by the Tauwhara cluster of schools it was clear that an in-service intervention for teachers and students was necessary. Too many teachers were blaming the examination system for pupil failure. Such accusations are not without sympathy. There is clear evidence for the inadequacies in the examination system detailed in the last section of this chapter. If this research had not exposed the incorrect reporting of grades then the extent of the problem may never have been made known. Added to this difficulty was the change in the requirements as already explained in the previous chapter. The work of the New Zealand Qualifications Authority does not inspire much confidence with the Māori language teachers (see the critique below). Nevertheless, these language teachers were making many untested assumptions about their students that needed investigation. There had been a long held assumption by these teachers that having mid-year testing would actually be helpful towards the preparation of students for their final end-of-year examinations. The data results from this cluster demonstrated that for this group of students in this particular year there was no appreciable benefit. Parent participation would have to wait until the teachers themselves were more competent and confident enough both to teach and evaluate essay writing. It was
decided the year would be best spent working with teachers to teach smaller units of written work with an emphasis on quality.

Part Three.

1996, First Intervention Year.

The emphasis for this intervention was to provide an opportunity for in-service courses for a group of Māori language teachers. Here high quality teaching resources were put in place as a basis for dealing with the problem of low academic performance of their fifth form students. The intervention year began by helping the teachers to improve their teaching awareness by the provision of a series of five formal tests (Table 6:2) that covered the required number and type of writing genre as required in the examination prescription (refer back to last chapter). The series of practice papers (see Table 6:2 for the sequence) was made available to all Northland schools. There was an approximate time gap of five weeks between each issue.

Table 6.2  The Sequence of the 1996 Practice Essays.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Essay No.</th>
<th>genre</th>
<th>Time allowance</th>
<th>notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>one</td>
<td>Description writing</td>
<td>One hour</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>two</td>
<td>Picture interpretation</td>
<td>One hour</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>three</td>
<td>Personal introduction</td>
<td>Two hours</td>
<td>To be used as a mid-year examination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Scripting conversation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Written response</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>four</td>
<td>Giving directions</td>
<td>One hour</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>five</td>
<td>8 topics included</td>
<td>Three hours</td>
<td>To be used as a final end-of-year exam.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(see previous chapter)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(The above genre were selected from New Zealand Qualifications Authority newsletter, March 1995)
Data from Teachers.

A systematic running record was kept on the performance of all mid-North students within the Tauwhara Cluster, plus students in nineteen schools forming the Southern Cluster of Whangarei schools. This record contained the five test marks (where completed), the mid year oral marks, plus the final end of year marks for both the oral and written School Certificate examinations. The records were compiled as two separate groups. First (Table 6:3), was the Tauwhara cluster of the same six schools and the same teachers as in the previous years with the addition of one extra school, Bay of Islands College. Second, was a list of all other participating schools in Northland (nineteen in total out of twenty-two as three schools did not participate). It was intended that these schools act as baseline group against which any intervention could be compared. Because of the difficulties and constraints of distance and time no meetings were able to be arranged for the other Southern cluster.

After the sitting of each of the five weekly tests all seven teachers within the Tauwhara cluster were invited to share in the marking of all the student scripts. The meetings took place outside of school hours, on a weekday after school, usually working from four to six in the evening. Each meeting was held by rotation in different schools. All the scripts were marked at least three times during each session. If any script had at least one given grade that was different from the other given two, then the script was set aside for discussion. At the same time exemplars of good writing were selected for demonstration back to students in schools. As teachers read through the scripts they would often read out loud to the group sentences that sounded confusing or contained unsure points of grammar. These sentences were then copied on to a white board so they could be discussed later without any delay to completing the marking process.

These meetings provided the opportunity for teachers to become researchers themselves in order to analyse the problem of low performance in the writing of te reo Māori. This process writing provided an analysis for the provision of extra remedial resources that were compiled.
These mainly consisted of exemplars of student writing “bloopers” that were made up into worksheet type pages, designed for homework. Two of these exemplars were (see Appendix I for the full list):

"I whanau ia i Ākarana me Whakatane"  (He was born in Auckland and Whakatane),

"Kāhore ahau he motokā"  (I am not a motor vehicle).

The use of this homework opportunity was the initial way in which some parents first became directly involved in the delivery and learning of the school’s Māori language curriculum. Two teachers (Kura Rua and Kura Toru in Table 6:3) reported at a marking meeting a very positive reaction and were pleased with the interest and efforts their own students had made with their homework. Most of their parents had spent considerable time with their own children. Because their students had points of grammar reinforced outside of the school the teachers thought that they retained a particular grasp of language learning much more than if they had taught it themselves. At this particular moment of the intervention these teachers began to regard themselves not only as teachers but also as facilitators of language learning within a wider family context. From previously thinking that their Māori parent community had no interest or inclination towards homework they began to seek and trial more ways for parent involvement.

The same two teachers were very enthusiastic in their use of the practice essays, and sought all the advice and assistance they could from this researcher. For their benefit I wrote complementary letters to their respective principals to inform them of all the extra work and effort their teachers were making. The reaction back from the two teachers was an emotional one, for they claimed that for the very first time in both of their teaching careers they had been formally recognised in writing. A little praise goes a long way. From this lesson learnt, letters praising the high achievers in each essay test were sent to individual pupils in all schools via their principals. In most cases these letters were given out during formal assembly times at schools.
Analysis of Teacher Data.

The results as listed below on Table 6.3 indicate a trend in the writing performance that was a half a grade better than all other Northland schools for the final written examination. The total average mark of the cluster group began at a low grade of 3.13, then progressively rose to reach the next grade of 2.8, but then regressed in the final examination to 3.5. The end grade was then actually worse than the beginning; the only good point being was that it was well above the average of all other Northland schools. As the intervention emphasis was to improve written skills then the work could be regarded as successful. The oral mark remained static from the mid-year to the final, which suggests a differential effect linked to the area of written skills. Both marks when added together still indicated a low mark for sixth form certificate.

It was clear that just providing the resources and opportunities of in-service courses for teachers of te reo Māori was not sufficient to make any large scale improvements. But what was discovered during this research year was that the closer the teacher worked with the parent community, the more successful were their students in achieving higher grades as indicated by the work of Kura Rua and Kura Toru.
Table 6.3. Average marks for Writing and Oral examinations, 1996:
Tauwhara cluster.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>test</th>
<th>1 written</th>
<th>2 written</th>
<th>3 written midyear</th>
<th>4 written</th>
<th>5 written</th>
<th>SC Final written</th>
<th>teacher mid year oral</th>
<th>moderator mid year oral</th>
<th>teacher</th>
<th>SC final oral</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kura tahi</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kura rua</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kura toru</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kura whā</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kura rima</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kura ono</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kura whitu</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>total averages</strong></td>
<td><strong>3.13</strong></td>
<td><strong>2.65</strong></td>
<td><strong>2.8</strong></td>
<td><strong>2.56</strong></td>
<td><strong>3.5</strong></td>
<td><strong>2.7</strong></td>
<td><strong>2.4</strong></td>
<td><strong>2.6</strong></td>
<td><strong>2.5</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All other 19 Northland schools</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NB: Blank spaces indicate that tests were either not completed and/or the marks were not made available. The common excuse given from teachers was that students were not able to complete the test within the designated time.
Part Four.

Outreaching to Parents.

To help create an awareness of the mid year 1996 oral examination three types of pānui, information notices, were designed for general distribution among the Māori parent community. The first was a press statement that was published in the local newspapers. The text of this statement can be found in Illustration 6.1.

A wall poster was designed and distributed to all schools and community notice boards (Appendix J). This contained an emphasis on parent and family involvement. Thirdly, a form letter to be sent to parents was composed for teacher use. The format and layout of this letter (Appendix K) allowed for easy use by teachers. Space was left at the top for the insertion of individual school letterheads. Space at the bottom was left so as to insert each individual teacher's name as well as a sign and tear off section to be returned to school. High quality laser printed the letter in order to make both an attractive and readable master copy for teachers to duplicate and distribute to their Māori parent communities.

Would this type of intervention, an extra effort and attention to detail, result in a greater attendance of Māori parents at the assessment venue? Does making more publicity make for better attendance? Would any greater attendance of Māori parents result in better measurable improvement in pupil performance than had been achieved?

From the Tauwhara cluster of seven schools (Table 6:3) four teachers (Table 6:4) who showed the most commitment to attending meetings were interviewed and observed on their use of the home notices provided. The three remaining schools of the Tauwhara Cluster are not listed. They were all sent the same written material to support their teaching as were the others. But for various reasons their attendance at marking meetings was minimal and variable. Table 6:3 demonstrates this point by the large number of gaps in missing data. One particular teacher wanted
to post all the completed practice papers to a marking venue to be marked without any
commitment of personal attendance. The request to do so was refused (and one lot of posted
papers returned unmarked) because meeting with the teachers was considered to be an essential
part of the research intervention.

Illustration 6:1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Call for te reo exam support</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School Certificate examinations start for te reo Maori candidates with an oral exam on</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 4. Pupils will be assessed by examiners at marae. They will be required to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>know Maori for at least an hour on topics such as their own home, school and tribal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>background. Te reo teacher Oneone Stewart is concerned with the number of pupils who</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fail to turn up to the examination. Parents need to make sure their child attends, he</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>said. One of the benefits of the day is the opportunity to see and hear other students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>from other schools. Marae protocol is observed but the day is free of the tension that</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>often pervades school based examinations. Family and friends can come to support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>their own rangatahi, Mr Stewart said.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For those students aiming to achieve the top marks a high standard of performance is</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>expected. “As seen in previous years, pupils who are well prepared and supported by their</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>whānau achieve high grades,” he said.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As printed in The Northern News, Kaikohe.

The publicity work done cannot be regarded as particularly successful as few parents
were observed at the mid-year assessment venue at Tauwhara Marae. On the day of the actual
assessment one parent claimed when interviewed that if she had not seen the newspaper pānui then
she would have not known about the event. This informant claimed that as no school newsletter
was brought home by her son she had made the assumption of not being invited to the assessment
venue. She also stated that she did not know how to help with any preparation work. She had the
distinct impression that her role as a parent was just to make sure that her child did not miss
school that day with a sudden attack of nerves.

Perhaps the less than expected attendance can be explained by the varying way in which the
teachers used the take-home pānui provided. One teacher failed to include a copy of the cut-off-
and -return section when sending the letter home with the pupils. Because of this the teacher had
no signed indication of what parents, if any, were committed to attending, or even any certainty of the notice ever arriving home and being given to the parents. Another teacher chose to have the pānui fully retyped in the school office, which resulted in a much less attractive newsletter with very small hard to read lettering³. However, this same teacher was diligent in expecting all of the pupils to return the reply slip.

The third teacher did not collect back any such slips. When interviewed this teacher assured me that as all the parents were personally known and was sure that all of the parents would be supportive in preparing for and attending the assessment. Using a class list of the pupils a sample of these parents was then telephoned at home to ask if they had received the pānui. Only when the twelfth out of eighteen listed parents was contacted was one parent able to positively confirm that the newsletter had been received and read.

The fourth teacher called a special meeting of the parents at school of all the students a week before the assessment. This teacher warned her parents that if they did not come and support this meeting then she would refuse to take the pupils to the assessment venue by herself. She identified

³ I have always encouraged larger format lettering for the easier reading by older parent community members.
a supportive parent to help organise a telephone tree so all parents could be personally contacted and committed to come to this meeting. Field notes indicate that there was a full attendance of parents. They were all thoroughly briefed on the assessment procedure and given practice papers to take as homework. On the actual day of the assessment all of the participating pupils of this teacher had at least one family member accompanying them.

Analysis of the Community Outreach.

At the completion of the formal assessment and with all the marks collated, an average class mark for the four teachers as described above was calculated and is listed in Table 6:4.

Table 6.4: Results of the mid-year assessment 1996, Tauwhara Cluster of schools.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School:</th>
<th>teacher conduct:</th>
<th>class average mark:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>written</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>first teacher</td>
<td>did not print return slip on pānui</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>second teacher</td>
<td>enforced collection of return slips</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>third teacher</td>
<td>did not collect return slips</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fourth teacher</td>
<td>called meeting of parents</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northland average mark</td>
<td>no general intervention supplied</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>for all schools</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It can been seen from the above Table 6:4 and Table 6:5 below that the fourth teacher who utilised the greatest degree of parent participation before and during the examination achieved the highest class average mark. This was the highest class average in the whole of the Northland district from a total of twenty-four schools participating. Teacher 2 who enforced the signed return slips from the pānui also received a higher class average mark. Both the second and the
fourth teacher were the same who used the worksheets as homework exercises that engaged parent assistance (Appendix L). This type of intervention serves to best illustrate that if teachers take the time and effort to make effective communication with their parents a priority then better results for students can be achieved.

Table 6:5 Comparison of mid-year marks, 1996

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>all other schools</th>
<th>no intervention supplied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>teacher 1</td>
<td>non-systematic parent contact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>teacher 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>teacher 2</td>
<td>most systematic parent contact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>teacher 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It can be argued here that these two groups were already more skilled than the other two. But initial testing at the beginning of the year (see Table 6:1) demonstrated that all four classes began at a similar level. Those teachers that maximised parent participation in the delivery of the curriculum (Table 6:5) had their students' performance enhanced much more than the other classes.

Not only is there a measurable and positive rise in the level of achievement of the pupils, but there was also a visible and expressed rise in the morale and job satisfaction of the teachers. The teachers with the two highest levels of achievement were not exiting the assessment venues exhausted and depressed because of low marks as others were. They left in a state of pride and achievement after being complemented so many times on the high ability of their students.
Teacher 1 and teacher 3 above were the same two that issued the homework worksheets at school as in-class exercises (Appendix L). This is but one example of when and where some teachers did not take up the opportunity for promoting such parent involvement.

A decade ago in 1987 when the Taitokerau method of oral assessment first began the average students mark rose well above the national average (see Figure 5:3). At that time there was a large effort by schools to involve their local Māori parent communities. The intervention demonstrated that when the Māori parent community are directly involved in the management of the assessment then their pupils achieve a high performance. This intervention has also demonstrated that teacher practices are also excluding the Māori parent community from taking such an active role, and this is associated with drops in achievement.

Taking an active role by parents is not limited to learning and preparation for the assessment either at home or at the school. When kaumatua have been present at the oral examinations their role has also been a very active one in terms of being critics of both teacher and student performance. This criticism has been important in further promoting a higher level of performance from students. One of the most important aspects of the speaking ability of students is in how they display their mana Māori. Kaumatua have insisted that if pupils are going to speak Māori, then whatever they choose or are taught then all must be done correctly in terms of using authentic and traditional cultural values. For instance, if a karakia (prayer) was intended then it must be recited in the correct format, voice and posture. This often means that the candidate must stand when reciting the prayer, and go from the beginning to the end with as few pauses as possible. The use of non-verbal indicators, mnemonic aids, musical instruments, sole or group performance, can all add to the Māori perspective of communication, but must be used correctly. Family members would soon correct any boy holding a taiaha upside down on the ground.

Observations noted that the tribal elders are perhaps more critical and demanding of their own students than the class teachers. Each student has their own individual style that makes for a
wide variety of performances as seen by others. Having a different person view the performance of pupils always brings a fresh perspective that can lead to improved results. Having a different view was best illustrated in the next year of the intervention when and where parents and kaumātua entered the classrooms to evaluate the performance of the own pupils.

A definite improvement could now be quantified. The average mark achieved by this cluster of students was one whole grade above both the Taitokerau and national averages. When positioned onto the sixth form indicator table (Table 5:1) all pupils were considerably improved. But overall the marks obtained for the 1996 year were really only in the middle of the possible range. Even though these teachers had put an extra effort into improving their teaching techniques these was still missing one important ingredient - the Māori parent community - who had not yet been fully utilised.

Part Five.

1997 – the Second and Full Intervention Year.

As in the previous year the participating schools were provided with five-weekly practice writing papers for students, at the completion of which teachers could come together for group marking, needs analysis and future planning. But during this year only three schools were targeted for assistance as the amount of extra time and travel needed to target parents was obviously limited. Although the three teachers selected (teachers second, third and fourth from Table 6:4) had worked with myself as researcher during the previous two years, each new year began with a new intake of examination pupils. And as the first practice assessment in writing demonstrated each new class of students began with a similar low level of skills that had been seen in the two previous years. But now the teachers were able to very quickly focus on the learning and writing needs of their students. Specific resources that had previously taken many time consuming hours
to produce could be replicated or redesigned far more quickly. There was obviously a strong bond of professional friendship among the group of three teachers and myself that enhanced our determination to continue to seek ways to improve pupil performance and job satisfaction.

Conversations with Parents.

In one particular school (the fourth teacher, see Table 6:4) the teacher was initially self-assured and pleased with the performance of her pupils after the first writing test of the year. She then felt confident enough to invite her Māori parent community to come to the school to read the student work displayed along the classroom walls. Seven parents took the opportunity. Their initial reaction after reading all the essays was not as positive as the teacher’s. The parents expressed first of all their dissatisfaction with the standard of handwriting, and secondly with the written details of respective family backgrounds as told by their students. This particular writing test required students to write an introductory story about themselves that might be suitable to send to a penfriend overseas. The parents were not happy with the number of incorrect or incomplete statements that were written down by the students in terms of their correct use of family names, family relationships (especially with so many common adoptions), and family origins. Seven of the essays were taken down off the wall by parents to be taken home to be rewritten by their own children. The next day all of the seven essays were returned to school and the parents called to another meeting not to view again the marked essays of their own children but to actually do all of the marking themselves.

Just as the teachers were asked to group mark pupil papers, these parents were asked to mark their own children’s work against the national marking criteria that was explained to them by myself as facilitator at this meeting. The marking session took place at 2.30pm on a school day,

---

4 the parents did not approve of the use of common nick names in formal writing - but probably the students never really knew the actual real names of their own relations.
with most of the class pupils in attendance continuing with other set class work at the side of the room. A small group of six pupils who had completed the set work of the day were detailed to go to the school kitchen in order to prepare afternoon tea for the parents.

The parents on the completion of reading all the class essays were still as highly critical of the work of their own children as they were at the time of the first essay. The parents took a more serious and quite intellectual approach to their evaluation. As with the teacher marking groups in the previous year all the essays were graded by at least three different parents and any differences were put up for later discussion. Parents were observed to speak (usually in te reo Māori) at length over problems they perceived in the smallest of details. They would often read out phrases or sentences in the context of their own family history, even quoting lines from waiata and traditional history. During most of the time the actual class teacher hardly spoke, too amazed at the depth of knowledge and critical learning attitude of these parents.

At one particular point during the discussion an argument arose as to whether the correct inclusion of the long vowels in te reo Māori should count in any evaluation. The parent group separated into two quite differing opinions. The older the parent (plus one attending grandparent) was, and so more likely to be a native speaker, the more they were in favour of ignoring or even not marking the long vowels. The younger the parent, and so more likely to be a second language user of te reo, the more they favoured the use of marking vowels. At one point a grandmother made a determined statement that as she knew the language so well, macrons were not needed and so would not bother to use or encourage her moko (grandchild) to use them. But suddenly another parent picked up this same grandchild’s writing script to read out (in translation):

“The big brown kaka flew over the forest.”
This sentence brought roars of laughter from all the parents and the pupils. The grandparent immediately changed her mind and decided that the marking of long vowels was a good idea and should be encouraged, not so much for her but for those learning the correct pronunciation of the language.

This incident is a good example of how the rules of the engagement between teachers and parents continued to be modified through meetings and resulting discussions. But perhaps as this teacher took very little part in any of the discussions, the process of engagement really took place between the parents themselves. Just as the teachers themselves during the previous year had begun a process of self-empowerment, gaining more confidence and competence in what they were doing, so the process was being repeated with this group of parents. In defining the rules of the engagement between both teacher and parents each must first be satisfied that what they are actually doing is correct. The same can be said of myself as the intervention researcher. I began to facilitate the above meeting with the parents by outlining the national criteria for the marking of the school Certificate te reo Māori written examination. Added to this I had carried into the meeting my own academic and teaching background that had a strong bias for correct use of grammar. Handwriting, as long as it was basically readable, did not really influence my opinion of any student’s final grade. But the parents took a very different view. They insisted on better presentation of work as a priority, correct content second, then rated the finer points of grammar a definite last. There was no real point of conflict as all of these three aspects of essay writing are important. The result of this engagement was that the class teacher, as well as myself, modified our teaching practice in the order of priority established by the parents.

In addition to holding regular monthly marking sessions, the parents were encouraged to supervise the reading of set school journals issued from the school. After each story was read the parents were asked to sign the running record sheets attached inside the journal folders. This type
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5 kākā is the name for a native parrot, while kaka is used for human excrement.
of read and sign system was copied off what is a common practice in primary schools home reading methods. Attached to the folder were personalised lists of words to learn and spell. When pupils wanted to know a particular word from the teacher or parent so it could be used within a story it was first written down on this list, then transferred to the story. In this way the class teachers were able to keep a running record of what the vocabulary needs of their own students were. It was a valuable asset for the analysis of their process writing.

Analysis of the Parent Conversations.

With a combination of a good teacher, open to any ideas to improve pupil performance, and the direct involvement of his/her parents in the delivery of the curriculum it was not surprising to find that at the end of the academic year this class of students (Kura Whā below in table 6:6) achieved the highest class average for both the School Certificate te reo Māori examinations in all of the Northland district.

From Table 6:6 it can be seen that the students in one particular school, Kura whā, had achieved an almost 100% perfect score in both final examinations. In fact, only one student out of the whole class achieved a grade two, thereby dropping slightly the class average in the written examination. It can be seen that at the beginning of the intervention year, that this class of pupils began their first test in writing (tuhituhi) at a similar level to all the other schools, then proceeded to increase their grade levels during the course of the year. This school had a te reo Māori teacher who was sufficiently confident to invite the parent community into her classroom, the fourth teacher as in Table 6:4. This adds to the evidence that it is not sufficient to supply te reo Māori language teachers with in-service opportunities and diagnostic resources then expect their pupils to generally achieve higher grades in final examinations. This is the same mistaken assumption made by the proponents of school reform: that time and money spent on particular resources will
be sufficient to improve Māori education outcomes. Any programme of resourcing that aims to improve the interaction between teachers and Māori students and ignores the full utilisation of the Māori parent community is likely to have very limited success. This acts like the distorted model of what should be an equilateral triangle of relationships referred to at the end of Chapter Two.

Table 6:6 Progress of 1997 School Certificate Te Reo Māori Marks:

Tauwhara Cluster.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test no:</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>SC</th>
<th>Tch mid</th>
<th>Mod year</th>
<th>Tch end</th>
<th>SC year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Test Date:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>19/5</td>
<td>26/5</td>
<td>27/10</td>
<td>2/11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kura tahi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kura rua</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>4.12</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kura toru</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kura whā</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kura rima</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kura ono</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kura whitu</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cluster average</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taitokerau average</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.01</td>
<td>2.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National average</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: the National Average written and oral marks have been calculated from Ministry of Education supplied data that contained fifth form students only; whereas the Taitokerau averages contain all form classes that sat the examination.

No school was able to complete tests three and four because of other commitments.
Part Six.

Intervention Context.

From what was intended to be low key observation and assistance, the research work grew to involve an in-service programme in schools for Māori language development, community contact and public relations consultant, with my role restructured as an advisor and advocate for Māori education. Although the primary research interest was in developing ways and means of improving literacy in te reo Māori, and so aiming for higher academic achievement, there were a number of occasions when other unintended assistance was given. The specific focus of research interventions always occurs in the context of other events. This chapter concludes with an account of the work in the area of school suspensions for Māori students, that of home-school communications through the local media, and finally a critique of examination reporting by the New Zealand Qualifications Authority. Each of these impacts directly on the significance of the interventions by demonstrating how both internal and external matters can affect both teacher and pupil performance.

School Suspensions.

The work in the area of advising and assisting pupils and their parents during school suspension proceedings began quite incidentally when I discovered that the leading ability pupil within a particular class was absent one day without explanation. The first concern was that such a gifted and well performing pupil would be missing out on the distribution of set material. Thus contact was made with the home to advise the parents. It was only at this point that I learnt from them that the student had been suspended. I also learnt that I had been the only teacher from the school (albeit only a relieving teacher for three days) to make personal contact with the family. This was apart from the standard school letter from the principal advising of the suspension. Not
one other teacher in the school (I specifically asked the guidance counsellor, the form dean and the form teacher) had attempted to initiate any home contact whatsoever.

This state of affairs signalled the type of peculiar relationship between the school and the home. It was a relationship that seemed to be repeated (seven individual suspension proceedings were observed) at most other schools when pupils were suspended. But what could be considered stranger is that when students returned to class after the specified period of the suspension the observed interaction between pupil and teacher was as if nothing had ever happened or that students had never been absent. There appeared to be a ritual code of silence between the offending student and the classroom teachers, similar to any student returning from a type of enforced holiday, of a type not to be discussed.

No specific debriefing or evaluation meetings with the Māori parent community were held in the days or weeks after the pupils were returned to their general classes. Parents, during interviews after the suspensions began, were all unanimous in asking that the school at the very first sign of trouble with their children inform them. Parents wanted to be the first to know, not the last. The parents called for a change in class management procedures.

Students and their parents were quite happy to talk to me personally about their experience of the suspension, and so were the teachers, but they never appeared to be talking to each other. The school principal will have made contact with the pupils and parents as separate individuals, but teachers, pupils and parents were never observed as meeting together for any discussions.

I was able to take the opportunity to assist parents of suspended students and observe the proceedings on seven different occasions. Illustration 6.1 is a summary list of my observations from my field notes along with my recommendations.

The need for school suspensions is not in dispute, especially when it involves a very serious offence (such as the possession of a loaded firearm at school), as the safety of pupils and staff at
school must always be of prime concern. The involvement of the police has become mandatory for serious offences. Schools are making attempts to find new ways and types of suspensions. These include in-school suspensions that involve the isolation of an offending pupil from the general class setting. It is common for school Boards of Trustees to direct their principals with zero tolerance policies in a determination to get tough and make examples of such serious behaviour. Because of this attitude school principals have become less than neutral towards offending pupils. In the cases I observed I would conclude that school principals and teachers were more concerned with being rid of pupils, rather than the recovery back into the classroom. Removing disruptive pupils was the simplest way of relieving classroom stress.

Table 6:7 Conflicting approaches to school suspensions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Observation noted:</th>
<th>My recommendation:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Schools tend to make contact with parents only when a crisis erupts.</td>
<td>Schools should make contact much more early rather than parents being a last resort.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After formal notification of suspension school contact ceases.</td>
<td>There could be an independent arbitrator to mediate informally to identify key problems.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal meetings with Board Disciplinary Committees are very confrontational.</td>
<td>The focus should be getting the students back into learning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents have to request a copy of the principal’s report on the student.</td>
<td>They should have this by right well before the meeting, just as the Board Chairperson would.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In European tradition and culture silence means consent, an admission of guilt.</td>
<td>Silence to Māori means shame as well as disagreement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The majority of those attending disciplinary meetings are School Board members.</td>
<td>When the majority are whanau support the whole direction and atmosphere of a meeting changes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The group of Māori language teachers closely involved with this intervention study decided if ever they were experiencing comparatively minor difficulty with their pupils, such as those requiring school penalties or detentions, then the teacher would on the same day attempt to make home contact. I was very reluctant to become embroiled in contentious side issues such as school suspensions, but at least something worthwhile resulted. These teachers decided to become proactive and make home contact a priority, albeit for a negative occasion but wanting to pursue a positive outcome for their pupils.

School communications.

An advocacy role for parents and students developed during the intervention. I was encouraged by parents to check the quality of information in the media. The items reported in the community newspapers best illustrate this. Several schools had released press statements that were directly opposite to my research findings. These tended to exaggerate the performance of Māori pupils within their particular schools. Several reasons may have contributed to this, including the raising of their school’s profile in public so as to attract new students.

The Statistical Index (originally called the “Snap-Shot Report” by Hon Lockwood Smith, the former Minister of Education) contains all examination pass rates for all individual schools with the country. It was not published 1997 (for the 1996 year). Instead only selected information was sent to all schools, each receiving individual information pertaining to their school, along with national pass rates. There is now no one publication by which two or more local schools can be compared. Instead such information must be requested directly from each individual school. Thus schools now control the release and use of such information. The following press release best illustrates how information can be misleading.
Kerikeri High School can justly claim a very high retention rate (pupils who enter from three and complete form seven) that is well above the national average. But proof of success for Māori students is not given that is in keeping with the claims of the headline. In actual fact, according to the Statistical Index, the retention rate for Māori students for the same year (1995) was at a rate three times less than for European students. In the following year (1996) it was six times less. A reply to the newspaper was written to fully inform the public:
Mistakes with Reporting.

A third example of being a public advocate for Māori education is detailed here. It was only by chance and a determination to double-check the collection of data and information that a number of serious mistakes were discovered in the reporting of examination grades. The consequences of the discovery were beneficial to students in terms of improving their reported examination results. Unfortunately for some students the discovery came too late.
An important part of the intervention assistance to teachers and students during the first year (1996) was to supply schools with practice papers (see below) in preparation for the official end of year School Certificate te reo Māori written examination. A formal three-hour examination paper for the last school-based examination was made available to all Northland schools. This examination is usually held within the first two weeks of the final school term. It is very important that the standard of these final examinations are as close as possible to the official examination, not only to give the students the best possible practice, but as the final examination at school any marks would have the possibility of being used for aegrotat purposes. I considered the process of comparing the marks part of my own self-evaluation process - was the work of supplying practice papers accurate in terms of the official examination? In order to determine this I would compare the list of marks from the practice examinations against those of the official written examination.

The examination prescription for the te reo Māori examination as published annually by the New Zealand Qualifications Authority (1997) contains a guarantee that results from the various assessment venues for the oral examination will not be altered. The oral examination is taken early in November, after which preliminary confidential copies of the results are sent in December to the schools for checking. After this process the results are declared as final on the individual results slips delivered by post to all candidates in mid-January.

At the beginning of 1997 a request was made to all northland schools for a copy of the marks schedules for pupils who had sat the examinations late in the previous year. As these schedules (the summary of marks for all students as supplied by the New Zealand Qualifications Authority) contained both oral and written examination results, both set of examination marks were compared with the school based examinations.

After the completion of the gathering and listing of all the marks (as used to construct Table 6:6 ) I expected to see a close correlation between those students who used the supplied practice
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6 An aegrotat pass is given to students unable to sit their examination because of health or personal reasons.
papers for the written examination and their official examination result. This was not the case. At least seven of the high schools had unexpected results - differences of two or more grades that were in all cases reduced. In one particular school (see Illustration 6:4 below) at least one third of the class had their final marks each lowered by at least two grades. Overall, I calculated that approximately one quarter of all given grades in Northland had been lowered, particularly within seven high schools. My first reaction was that the work I had been doing was not up to the standard of accuracy required.

However, a closer look at the oral examination marks revealed a different explanation. Some of the students whom I had personally known and tested myself had been given grades that I knew were well below expectation from earlier testing. The schedules of marks supplied to the schools were then re-checked against the original mark sheets completed at the various venues for the oral examination. It then became clear that the marks awarded at these venues, then supplied to the New Zealand Qualifications Authority with the understanding that these were to be the final allocated grades, had all been reduced without explanation.

I then wrote to all schools and suggested that all te reo marks on the schedules be double checked against those on the individual result slips and an appeal be made against all the lowered marks. This was because individual students must make an appeal against any mark. This resulted in further surprises. The mistakes were officially admitted by the New Zealand Qualifications Authority a month after schools had begun their new year but took up to three months to correct. At Bay of Islands College one pupil was officially given a mark of T3 and K4 on his January result slip. On April 11 of that year he was upgraded to T2 and K2.

This moved the student from a grade six indicator for sixth form certificate up to a grade two. But it was unfortunate to learn from teachers that some students intending to study te reo in the sixth form had dropped this subject option having been demoralised by their low marks.
In my letter to the New Zealand Qualifications Authority (that first alerted them to the mistake) I suggested that a personal apology be given to the affected students. No reply was ever received to my letter, nor after my enquiry, were any apologies given. From my own kumara vine it was rumoured that a sub-contractor made the original mistake to the NZQA as "having technical processing and programming errors."

At one particular school where I also knew that a number of students had their marks reduced the slowness of their teacher to check marks was detrimental to the students. On the first day of school I contacted this teacher by telephone to alert her of the situation and advised a check on all the marks for the whole class. I specifically asked, as I did with all other teachers, that contact back occur when this check was completed. After two weeks with no reply I again phoned this teacher who then explained that due to being so busy at the start of the year the check had not been done. After waiting another week I then wrote the principal of the school an explanation. He was not amused because some students had decided not to continue with the subject after having been demoralised with such low results. This incident was the only time during the research when I felt compelled to speak directly to a principal regarding the professional competence of a teacher.

In summary, the added work completed on suspensions, challenging the misinformation and finally being able to change final results are typical for a Māori researcher (Smith 1991). The suspensions demonstrated that the work of a teacher cannot isolate one event from another, either with parents or pupils. Both Māori teachers and researchers have wide contexts in which they operate and cannot be divorced from the Māori community whose interests they serve. The misinformation and the mistakes made demonstrated that all authority must be put under scrutiny. The role of the action researcher is then to challenge and to change. As I stated at the beginning of this chapter it is "not a simple matter" to encourage teachers to let their parents become involved in their students' learning and evaluation practices

7 refer back to previous chapter for an explanation of T and K, page 99.
Incorrect marks in North

By Michael Daly

Incorrect School Certificate marks were given to about 60 Northland Maori language students. It has been revealed.

Schools from Rodney College, Welsford, north yesterday received faxes with corrected marks from the New Zealand Qualifications Authority.

At Whangarei Girls High School, five of 22 students who sat the exam late last year received incorrect marks.

Principal Annette Joyce said the problem was with the marks given for the oral assessment part of the student's results.

She said the error had taken far too long to be corrected.

School Maori department head Rawiri Piripi said the marks of three students at the school had now been increased, while two had been lowered.

The Awhera had a different method of assessing oral examinations than did the rest of the country, he said.

Rather than having Ministry of Education assessors do the work, schools were grouped into clusters with students able to choose their assessor from the teachers in the cluster. NZQA exams manager Peter Morrow today said the problem arose when results from the Northland schools were entered into the authority's files.

The exact source of the problem had not yet been identified, he said.

The results had come from a final series of assessment meetings carried out by teachers from clusters of schools in Northland in early November.

Those results had been sent to the NZQA by a regional moderator.

A series of checks was in place to attempt to ensure marks were correct.

Where schools submitted marks, as was the case with oral Maori in Northland, those results were sent back to schools for verification at the end of the school year, Mr Morrow said.

Some schools had returned amended marks, which had been corrected in NZQA files, as a result of that.

Mr Morrow acknowledged the marks were sent to schools at a difficult time of the year. He stressed he was not being critical.

About 80 students in Northland who received the incorrect marks would be sent amended results notices, with all students to receive their final certificates in April or early May. Two WANGHS students - Sarah Eddie and Kaylem Corkery - were surprised and disappointed at the results.

The pair were fourth formers last year who sat the fifth-form exam which was marked from one to five, one being equivalent to an A and five being an E.

There were two parts to the exam: oral and written. Kaylem said her exam assessor had indicated her oral exam had gone well and her mark would be a one, so the three on her results was a surprise.

Kaylem said she had begun planning to sit the exam again this year, until finding out she had got a one yesterday.

"I was pleased, but I was disappointed in one way because I could have been in a sixth-form class," she said.

The new mark has meant Kaylem has switched fifth-form Maori for sixth-form Maori, but she has to remain in her fifth-form class while studying the subject.

Sarah's mark was changed from two to one. She said she was not too surprised to receive a two in her results as that was what her mid-year mark was, but she was still pleased to get the one.

Chapter Seven:

Conclusion and Recommendations.

This thesis has represented the results of a three-year intervention study of a group of Māori language teachers, their pupils and Māori parent communities in the Northland region of New Zealand. The study was motivated by the problem of continuing low academic achievement for Māori students in state mainstream schools. At the beginning (1989) of major school reform in this country the low achievement rate for Māori students was specifically targeted for improvement. Yet today Māori students in New Zealand schools still achieve a rate that is at less than half of their European peers. Research evidence presented including the annual published examination results for all Northland schools still indicates decreasing average grades and numbers of students of Māori language at the School Certificate level over the last ten years. There appears to be few indicators of any change.

Initially the thesis examined the claim that existing teaching outputs of Māori language were quite strong and so could be used to model improvements for other school subjects and teachers to follow for Māori students. In fact this was found to be a mistaken assumption as serious problems were located for the teaching of the Māori language. These problems included Māori language teachers not always recognising their own need to up-skill their teaching practice in order to meet the changing needs of their students; the lack of any co-ordinated Ministry of Education efforts for performance appraisal to address the specific needs of Māori education; Māori language teachers over rating the ability of their “top” students; and the assumption that many teachers made that their Māori parent community was not very interested in assisting with academic work, either at home or at school. These assumptions were found to be not particular to Māori in New Zealand schools but part of an international problem of disadvantaged minorities in England (Vincent & Tomlinson 1997) and the United States (Jencks & Phillips 1998).
Two school areas were selected to locate possible solutions: Treaty of Waitangi policies in charters and the operation of Māori Language Resourcing. These were considered to be areas in which it was most likely to find an established and active role for the support of Māori language programmes by the parent community. But what was actually found in common to the areas of teaching, policy and operation was that very little, if any, regular parent participation ever occurred. All the schools participating within the study were often reluctant to encourage their parents to engage in the management school curriculum issues. The role of Māori parent community could best be described as being mainly that of spectators to various school events. Although there is a new “partnership” language being used by schools “a closer examination of the uses of “partnership” by education professionals reveals an implicit marginalising and controlling of parents, aspects of the relationship which are masked by warm references to consensus and congeniality” (Vincent & Tomlinson 1997).

The nature of the research intervention was to design and offer teachers assistance to improve the frequency and quality of parent contact in order to improve teaching, student learning and outcomes. The targeted assistance was in the provision of literacy resources for both teachers and parents to improve the performance of students in the school certificate written examination. This intervention proved to be very difficult, as the Māori teachers themselves were largely ignorant of the issues of school governance, school management, and examination assessment. In one school the teacher felt sufficiently confident and competent to invite the parents and elders into the classroom on a regular basis to actually co-mark written composition exercises in preparation for the national School Certificate examination. When this occurred a dramatic improvement in pupil grades was observed.

This thesis argues that the nature of “ownership” within the Treaty of Waitangi provides a unique rationale for Māori parent participation, one not restricted to school governance (parent teacher associations and school boards) but for direct involvement in school management
(teaching issues) both for Māori students and the Māori language. The analysis has addressed the need "for new understandings of what constitutes an appropriate parental role" (Vincent & Tomlinson 1997:361). It has also responded to the challenge by Chapple & Jefferies (1997) to explain why there exists a continuing gap between Māori students and their European peers. They have argued that the disparity gap for Māori students is "mainly driven by economic factors outside the school gates rather than by structural changes within the school" (ibid p47). But I have demonstrated, especially in the operation of Māori Language Resourcing, that any structural changes within the last decade of school reforms have continued to exclude Māori within school policies and practices.

This concluding chapter outlines two main areas of change for improving the teaching, learning and outcomes for Māori language students in New Zealand schools. The changes that are required are explained within both the micro and macro level of the New Zealand system of education. The case is then put for the analysis of the meaning of the Treaty of Waitangi, to be implemented in all New Zealand schools. Three models for the change are commented on: the establishment of Māori Education Authorities, Runanga-a-Iwi (local tribal councils) and the extension to the pan-tribal programme currently working in some schools called Tū Tangata.

It is concluded that a successful school for Māori students depends on both the strength and shape of the tripartite relationship between the school, the home and the students. According to Jencks & Phillips (1998) successful theories will pay more attention to the way all the participants interact with each other. The triangular relationship between the Ministry of Education, Boards of Trustees and the Māori parent community, as depicted on page 53, needs to be re-constructed as an equilateral working model. While Māori in mainstream schooling are encouraged to work within the distorted triangle, the question needs to be asked if the triangle is valid. Perhaps it would be better to reconstruct the triangle as a circle, a continuum for reflection and action (Friere 1972).
To assist in the process of reconstruction a five-point plan for improving the relationship is suggested. This includes developing longer term plans for each group of Māori students, the wider use of language immersion classes, the construction of performance appraisal specifically for Māori language teachers and the formation of Māori parent school committees committed to improving school outcomes for Māori.

The low retention rate for Māori students in our schools will remain until an effective change agent is implemented. The failure of Tomorrow’s Schools for Māori has been a failure in giving effect to well-intended legislation. This has been a macro-problem over the whole country and is also described in recent international literature (Vincent & Tomlinson 1997, Gilborn 1997, Halpin 1997). It has been argued that Māori teachers in schools have for some time had minimal impact in their attempts to reverse this failure for Māori (Bloor 1996, Capper 1994, Hirsh 1990, Johnson 1992, Marshall 1991, Mitchell & Mitchell 1988, Reedy 1992, Stewart 1995).

Any new legislation or official regulations are unlikely to solve the current low retention rate for Māori students in schools. The official opinion for the future outlook seems pessimistic (Ministry 1996a). The problem to be solved is one of changing long established attitudes, assumptions and managerial practices, the micro-problems (as detailed in Chapter Four) that have been ingrained into the culture of New Zealand schools. One cannot simply legislate for a change of attitudes.

It is predicted that the changes to the National Administration Guidelines (Education Gazette 30/8/99) for schools will also be a similar failure to the original Tomorrows Schools (Lange 1989). There appears to have been a reduction of the strong and directive (“will be required”) language used in the first official announcement (Education Gazette 30/8/99) to the “should” language used in the later information from the Ministry of Education (ibid 13/12/99). The staggered announcements that have been made over the last year (August 1999-2000) give the distinct impression that no one person really knows what is actually going on. The reasons for
the changes are well argued and seem convincing, but effective implementation will be crucial to overcoming the low retention rate. School trustees are not going to be happy with all the extra work that they are expected to perform. Nor perhaps will the Education Review Office enjoy the burden of their extra reporting responsibilities. Within schools, it is most likely that their senior managers will do such planning and reporting. Thus the status quo of Māori student performance, or rather the lack of it, will remain because the same policies and regulatory practices also remain unchanged. If this happens then no effective change agent will be possible. Senior managers have been well aware of the low retention rates over the last five years (by the annual baseline data given to all schools) but have been ineffective in making real changes for Māori (Penetito 1997). I am not laying blame on all senior management teams (who all work under very stressful conditions of service) but simply outlining the reality problem in order to locate a solution.

The micro-problem.

The intervention research on school practices for Māori language students has provided a theoretical account to explain why so many Māori language students do so poorly at school. The biggest obstacles to improving Māori education outcomes are the mistaken assumptions that both Māori teachers and Māori parents hold of each other. Each made the assumption that the other does not know how to properly handle their pupils / children. Teachers make the assumption that their parents do not know how to properly help their own children with the likes of homework, uniform and correcting behaviour. Parents are constantly making the assumption that their teachers don’t really know how to teach their pupils properly. Similarly, school managers make the mistaken assumptions that parents are not really interested, and are still within a fixed tradition of parents having no rights or expertise in school management issues. This then reinforces the behaviour of managerialism (Chapter Four). The mutual and mistaken assumptions set distinctive beliefs and behaviour patterns of classroom teachers that are particularly noticeable in lower decile
schools. The disparity gap for Māori pupils at school equally applies to Māori parents. Tomlinson & Hutchinson (1991) also have described the problem of parents and teachers blaming each other for school failure rates.

The mistaken assumptions can only be corrected by improved dialogue between the teachers and parents. What is needed is an appropriate and regular forum at which both teachers and parents can meet and generate more confidence and reality in each other. Where it can be clearly demonstrated to pupils that both teachers and parents are co-operating together in an expectation of higher achievement then the pupils will follow this lead (Johnson 1991; Marshall & Peters 1991). Blaming the victim (Stewart 1993) and blaming poverty need to be rejected (Ohia 1994). Poverty, as argued here, is characteristic of low retention for Māori in schools but not the single cause. Evidence has been given that even the lowest decile schools can have high retention rates (Chapter Six). This finding is consistent with the results of overseas studies that conclude that poverty is only a minor cause of low performance in tests (Myers, in Smetanka 1997; Jencks & Phillips 1998).

The meaning, frequency and quality of teacher / parent co-operation is a major determinant of higher achievement. If the co-operation is just a casual occurrence then the achievement results are more likely to be determined by chance-encounters. Some students will achieve while others will not. If either teachers or parents have preconceived agendas (such as at the meetings described in the last chapter), apart from the common aim of improving student outcomes, then the co-operation can be stalled until any conflicting issues are resolved. The extra work completed on seven school suspensions, as detailed in the previous chapter, demonstrated the wider issues of schooling.
The Macro-Problem.

It may be stated that parents have entrusted teachers to educate their children for the future. This is an enormous responsibility for the teaching profession, one in which the interests of Māori pupils within the mainstream schools have not been served as well as Europeans. The forced assimilation policies that begun with Governor Grey’s Education Ordinance of 1847 (when native schools were forced to teach in the English language, Stewart 1992) and the lingering ignorance of deficit model thinking (Ohoia 1996) are still very strong in the European public mind (Stewart 1997). Official attitudes may have reversed, policies may well now say that they aim to support Māori, yet the majority of Māori students continue to fail within the mainstream education system (Ministry of Education 1996). Even though many millions of dollars have been spent as equity funding for Māori education (Parata 1996), “Māori educational achievement continues to lag far behind the attainment of other students” (Ministry of Education 1996:18).

But two major difficulties are hindering the process and future progress. The first is the present state of the disparity gap in school politics in New Zealand, and the second is the way in which the Māori language is taught and evaluated within the school system, especially by School Certificate examination. These difficulties are interrelated. The empowerment of the Māori people (as a political group) is being indicated and determined by the promotion of the Māori language. The language use, as the most vital part of the Māori as a distinct people, is awakening the political consciousness. Going to school must be thought of more than simply gaining an education, but gaining political consciousness, for:

"knowledge of the alienating culture leads to transforming action resulting in a culture which is being freed from alienation" (Freire 1972:148).

The transforming action needs to be centred in the use of te reo Māori in education, for this is where the Māori people themselves have the greatest expertise, and the European are the weakest. A change of language will mean a change of power.
The question needs to be repeatedly asked: what are the current reforms in education doing for the Māori people and the Māori language? The answer has been demonstrated several times (Marshall 1991; Sutherland 1994; Filipo 1993; Johnston 1992) - the status quo of traditional power relationships by control of the State in the management of schools remains basically the same, perhaps more reinforced. Because of this the power and control by schools over their students remains basically the same. The reforms that promised empowerment to school communities (Lange 1988), their pupils and communities have not been achieved. The knowledge imparted has been imposed, therefore it is not empowering.

More research is needed in schools to promote the liberation. Tino rangatiratanga means that the Māori people must take local control, kaupapa Māori provides the philosophy and methodology, and tikanga Māori ensures excellence (Penetito 1996; Grace 1997; Benton 1985; Reedy 1992) and the liberation of an indigenous people (Cummins 1986; Cummins & Swain 1994; Hastings 1992).

Teachers of te reo Māori with their Maori parent communities need to become involved in and learn about school politics. The technological power that has made the English language so dominant in the world needs to be harnessed by the Māori language, in order that Māori will be used in the twenty first century. Māori teachers have always been under such heavy workloads at their schools, aiming just to survive each day as it comes (Mitchell & Mitchell 1993). If empowerment is to be achieved then it means much more than existing in a survival mode.

Any school can have the best-written charter in the country, but unless there exists a commitment and an attitude to carry out all that was intended, then the document counts for very little. Knowing how to make a difference in order to make changes is the key to being the change agent. Because it seems that schools have other interests as the change will not come from inside schools, but only from pressure from without. Māori parents must organise and demand action. The legal framework of Tomorrow's Schools is in place so parents can exercise their rights. There
are four important ingredients for successful parent action. The first is the dialogue, the process of coming together as a whānau. The second is in the making of a democracy, the commitment to partnership. The third is to gain political improvement, changing the power structure. The fourth is to make a social improvement, equality of outcomes for all participants.

The present interest and revival of the teaching of te reo Māori within mainstream schooling can lead to a lift in the academic performance of Māori pupils. This has been shown by the academic success of the Te Reo o Te Taitokerau Project (Marshall & Peters 1987, 1988; Peters & Marshall 1989b). I have also demonstrated this within the intervention reported here. Greater parent and community involvement, along with rising pupil expectations were key elements for success. As more mainstream schools begin immersion units there is an urgent need for the Māori parent community to own the curriculum and control the pedagogy. This appeal is supported in the literature:

"The best case scenario for future developments in the area of bilingual and immersion programmes within the mainstream rests with whānau increasingly recognising and exercising their power. The strength that we have observed in the schools has been evident from collective action in whānau rather than from individuals trying to negotiate change on their own" (Irwin & Davies 1994:103).

Although the cognitive benefits of additive bilingualism have long been described in overseas studies (Cummins & Swain 1994) only in the last few years have such benefits been officially recognised within the New Zealand Māori/English context. Those students who do well in te reo Māori do well in other subjects such as mathematics (Anderson 1994). The converse is that those Māori students who do not do well in te reo do not perform well in school. As language is always taught within a framework of a culture (McNaughton 1995), the most appropriate language for the culture should be used within the education process. The promotion of te reo Māori for an improved academic performance has been put forward by Hirsh (1990) and Ohia (1994). The
Education Review Office (1995) reports that the more te reo is used for school instruction the better the student attendance at school and the less likelihood of any suspensions. It is now becoming increasingly clear that the more te reo Māori is used for instructional purposes the more Māori pupils benefit (Anderson 1994). Māori students themselves have clearly stated that the use of te reo Māori in secondary school curriculum has been the most attractive feature of their lessons (Te Puni Kōkiri 1994). All schools should therefore aim to take maximum benefit from learning with te reo Māori.

However, many mainstream Māori language teachers claim (Mitchell & Mitchell 1993; Bloor 1996) that they are not being employed in the most efficient way in order to teach te reo and therefore make the expected cognitive gains and improved educational outcomes. Ever since the Māori language first became an academic subject in schools, such as for School Certificate in 1945, te reo Māori teachers have seen their role as primarily that of teaching te reo as an academic subject. Complaints about the ability of Māori teachers to teach effectively were first published over forty years ago by Parsonage (1956) and Dewes (1958). The employment of Māori language teachers in other associated subjects such as social studies, where the medium of instruction has been in English, has contributed to the scholastic decline of te reo Māori. The submissions of the New Zealand Post Primary Teacher’s Association to the Inquiry into Māori Education (1993) proposed a type of Iwi Kainga Authority made up of local kaumatua, parents and teachers as the most appropriate form of regional management with each authority having control over finances and allocations within its respective jurisdiction. A National Iwi Education Authority would assist in co-ordinating such Iwi Kainga. The Ka Awatea (1991) report had earlier detailed similar proposals. The report by the Inquiry into Māori Education (Māori Affairs Committee 1995) sees this as the only viable option if they are to ever survive as a distinct people and achieve equal outcomes in schooling.
The Māori Education Authority Model.

The submissions of the New Zealand Post Primary Teacher's Association to the Inquiry into Māori Education (1993) proposed a type of Iwi Kainga Authority made up of local kaumātua, parents and teachers as the most appropriate form of regional management with each authority having control over finances and allocations within its respective jurisdiction. A National Iwi Education Authority would assist in co-ordinating such Iwi Kainga. The Ka Awatea (1991) report had earlier fully proposed this idea. The recent report by the Inquiry into Māori Education (Māori Affairs Committee 1995) sees this as the only viable option if Māori are to survive as a distinct people and language, and achieve equal outcomes in schooling.

Many Māori pupils and their families have avoided the danger by attending kura kaupapa schools, but the limited number of these schools means that the great majority of Māori pupils will remain within the state mainstream system for many years ahead. The 1995 Parliamentary inquiry voiced its concern:

"Although many of the problems have been identified in numerous reports and studies, Māori educationalists seem to be loosing confidence that the existing education structures have the will and the capacity to address the problems effectively. Consequently, many have drawn the same conclusion in different forms: that a national origination be set up to facilitate the evolution of responsibility for Māori education by Māori organisations" (1995:7-8).

The report suggests first, that the whole vote for Māori education be devolved to this authority. Second, that the authority be contracted to monitor and evaluate all Māori programmes, and third, that the authority be involved in all levels of education. Fourth, that the authority be representative of all Runanga and iwi organisations, and fifth that the authority would be the primary source of advice of to the Ministry of Education. Such an authority does not mean the return to the re-building of a huge bureaucracy because it would capitalise on the existing runanga.

1 Iwi Kainga are recognised districts and tribal boundaries.
structures of flax root support (Irwin 1994). The authority would be the co-ordination centre for all the above functions.

Here could be the real beginnings of tino rangatiratanga - true Māori self-determination (Jenkins 1994; Jones 1990). Only in this dimension can I remain optimistic with the reform process with the more confident Shuker (1990). The struggle for the Māori speaking voice to be heard within mainstream state schools will continue for some time yet. For the millions of dollars spent in all aspects of Māori education the Education Review Office says that Māori pupils in mainstream still continue to receive a poor quality education (NZPPTA 1994:3). Some Māori, in a very limited and fortunate number, have opted already to escape out of the main stream system to kura kaupapa Māori schools. (Ministry of Education 1993), and yet the Ministry of Education is convinced that te reo Māori is the most vital factor in promoting greater success for Māori pupils at school (Ministry of Education 1994). The benefits of immersion education have been known for many years both within New Zealand (Ranby 1979; Hirsh 1990) and overseas (Swain & Lapkin 1981). The Prime Ministerial Task Force on Employment (Anderson 1994) has commended immersion education:

"Preliminary evidence shows that Māori children who have progressed through Kohanga Reo to kura kaupapa Māori schools have higher levels of achievement across all subject areas, including English and mathematics, than other Māori students" (ibid 1994:30).

The problem here, I hope, has been well defined. The right of Māori parents to decide as a community on this aspect of funding for their own language has been captured and dominated by other more powerful individual interests within this era of Today’s Schools. David Lange’s promise seem empty:

"The role of government is to be the ameliorator and the rescuer and the enhancer of the lives of those people on whom the inequality of the market place would be terminal and damming."
In the provision of education you cannot possibly allow the devil to take the hindmost” (NZPPTA 1988).

It seems clear that others have captured the best interests of Māori, as a community, within mainstream school. The formation of a Māori Education Authority, one that has the necessary power to act and implement all its proposals, does at the present give us the best hope of rescuing the community from *homo economicus* (Fitzsimons & Peters 1994) on the far right of the polar type back towards the centre. We must remember that we are making people, not machines. We must learn to value our community.

Diana Bloor’s (1996) survey on *The Workloads of Māori Secondary School Teachers* reports that Māori assistant teachers are spending a large and increased workload on professional duties and administrative tasks at the expense of teaching. Other findings included the inadequacy of undergraduate and postgraduate training for the profession, a perception of lack of support from Boards of Trustees with regard to the teaching and application of Māori language in schools, the preparation for classroom teaching, the teachers’ health and well-being.

The research work done by Mitchell & Mitchell (1993) supports the findings by Bloor, but includes an emphasis on the frustrating inability of Māori teachers to influence policy and participate in decision making in schools. A typical example of this problem has been in the provision and decision of Māori language factor funding. In Chapter Four an account was given where Māori parents had to lay a complaint with the Ombudsman’s Office in order to force a school to reveal the financial accounts for the MLF. Another appeal to the Ombudsman by parents is detailed in an editorial of the New Zealand Herald (12/6/90). A national survey completed by Dorothy Urlich-Cloher (1995) concluded that:

"Without being very aware of it the survey touched upon a very raw nerve by asking about funding arrangements for Māori language, how decisions were made to allocate funds, and the reasons” (ibid:4).
The goodwill of all participants is vital to the process of change. The statement of the parties means that all participants (teachers, employers and parents) each have important roles to fulfil. One can write an employment contract with a job description to match corresponding rates of pay, but one cannot legislate to enhance people's attitudes and behaviours. Yet Henry Giroux (1988) views these as vitally important as the hidden curriculum - not just what is taught but how it is taught.

The important role is to be taken by Māori parents. It was intended within the original concept of Tomorrow's Schools that the role of parents would be incorporated into their official school representatives, the Boards of Trustees. As far as Māori parents were concerned David Lange promised that: “The reformed administration will be sufficiently flexible and responsive to meet the particular needs of Māori education” (1988:iv).

We now know that Māori parents have continued to have very little input and influence as members of Boards of trustees. Even in Boards that do have elected or seconded Māori members, their influence continues to be very minimal (Bertram 1988; Ministry 1996). Such members have found themselves to be working as grounds committee members, instead of tackling the essential reason for their position - the advancement of their tamariki Māori in their school (Johnston 1992). Instead of being distracted by such menial school board tasks, perhaps Māori parents should withdraw from such board work as have many minority language parents in the United States (Stewart 1993).

The most important role for Māori parents is to focus undistracted on the educational outcomes of their children. As an appropriate forum every school could have a komiti Māori for this purpose. Such forums would do much to allay the fear that is commonly found in the thinking of school principals that: “parents are basically antagonistic towards teachers and, if given the opportunity, will try to take over from them” (Ramsay, Hawk, Harold, Marriott & Poskitt
Parents need to know that “bad teachers” are the result of “bad systems” that continuously fail to address teaching problems and outcomes.

The continuing unacceptable high rate of school failure for Māori students (Ministry of Education 1996a), the near extinction of te reo (Te Taurawhiri 1996) and the enormous difficulty of recruiting and retaining Māori teachers (Mitchell & Mitchell 1993) make it imperative that all Māori teachers, communities, school managers and Ministry of Education Officials re-evaluate the common commitment to education. The call for such a re-evaluation is not new. Many generations of teachers have recognised the problems (Dale 1931, Jennings 1952, Parsonage 1952, Dewes 1958 & 1968, Mitcalfe 1969, Benton 1973, Jackson 1978).

We must be determined to succeed in our task to make effective whole-school approach to change (Peters & Marshall 1989). Failure not to make changes will bring-forth large numbers of uneducated Māori who will remain at the bottom of the socio-economic lifestyle of lower pay, higher likelihood of unemployability, poor health and housing. The cost in social welfare alone will be enormous and be born by all taxpayers. Thus by reason of economic costs alone it makes very good sense to urgently address the problem of Māori under-achievement in school.

The Treaty of Waitangi.

The Māori parent community has to get past being passive listeners and observers of staged presentations in schools (eg. open days, report evenings, etc) to become active evaluators and deliverers no less than the teachers. It is therefore now necessary to explore beyond the traditional participation of parents in school governance or kawanatanga (e.g. commonly limited to BOTs and PTAs) and engage in school and curriculum management or tino rangatiratanga, where cooperation between teachers and parents can help in the recovery of te reo and the higher achievement of Māori pupils.
The Treaty of Waitangi puts New Zealand Māori in a unique world position to claim this right for Māori parents. Clause two of the Treaty of Waitangi specifically details the parental rights of what is known as *tino rangatiratanga*, or the right to self-determination and ownership of the language. This implies much more than the mere idea of any partnership or equality of relationships. It implies total ownership by Māori of the delivery of the te reo Māori curriculum in all schools. This is not a particularly radical statement as other exclusive ownership of resources by Māori, such as land, fisheries and forests, have become common and accepted. But whereas these resources have been identified and claimed by various legal processes with specific named owners, any similar process is proving very difficult to action in schools. The Kura Kaupapa Māori schools have made a beginning for a very small number of Māori students. However, the eighty-five percent remaining in state mainstream schools with such low retention rates and big disparity gap is the reality of the difficulty of implementing *tino rangatiratanga* as a change for the better.

The legitimacy of such exploration is by right of the Treaty of Waitangi. Te reo Māori has been declared as a taonga belonging to the Māori people. While principles of partnership (or governance / kawanatanga) are often stated in educational policy documents and school charters, the principles of cultural rights (or management of / *tino rangatiratanga*) for te reo seem to be missing or non-existent. At the beginning of Tomorrow’s Schools back in the late 1980’s there were promises of high expectations for the future. Mair’s (1989) long list of minimum Treaty of Waitangi criteria for Boards of Trustees seems to have been neglected.

Much has been written with school charters about consultation with the local community. But consultation has become dominated by managerialism (Chapter Four) - those who are appointed to positions of responsibility make the false assumption that they have all the required intelligence and so make expedient and expeditious decisions. Consultation often means deciding what to do then telling us what to do. Phillip Capper’s (1994) study revealed that 70% of schools “consult” in this way by the sending home of regular newsletters. Face to face (kanohi ki te
kanohi) meetings with schools and their contributing Māori communities to talk about the management of the curriculum are unknown outside this research.

The policy statement reproduced on page 19, "having full responsibility with full accountability," is about empowerment. But even the word "empowerment" has become misused because it is not conceptualised. As an example, take the concept of "unique." We often qualify the term by saying something is "almost unique." Unique means just one of a kind. Either it is one of a kind, or it is not. So it is with empowerment. Empowerment is not about feelings, it is not an emotion, but a state of accomplishment. It is being able to decide on a course of action, completing that action, then deciding on the next action. Paulo Freire (1972) refers to empowerment as being reflection, action, reflection, a continuum of self-determination.

To start this process the Treaty of Waitangi needs to be restored into school charters. The National Administration Guidelines (Ministry of Education 1993b) that were issued to all school boards in October 1993 omitted any mention of the Treaty. On the long list of curriculum policies that all schools are required to develop and implement, the needs of Māori are not even mentioned. From 1989 all schools were required to develop Treaty of Waitangi policies, but now such policies are simply considered as an optional extra. With now having no compulsory emphasis it has been shown that school boards are clearly ignoring developing any such policies (Chapter Three).

Of twenty schools surveyed within the Bay of Islands district only nine had formulated Treaty of Waitangi policies that were incorporated within their school charters. Attempts to comprehend the content were most difficult (Stewart 1996b). Three models for implementing the Treaty of Waitangi in schools are outlined below. Current research with seven schools of the Taitokerau district indicates that Māori teachers are lacking the necessary time and resources to outreach to their local Māori communities, a task which is considered essential for the successful implementation of Treaty partnership (Peters & Marshall 1989; Stewart 1997).

The Runanga-ā-Iwi model.

Rather than setting up a new bureaucratic system to oversee local education perhaps the answer lies within a different type of parent forum that is further from the opposing polar type, the whānau model. Runanga are groupings of large extended families or whānau called hapū. But not how Tomorrow’s Schools stated:

“The whānau will be able to have access to and participate in education. This will be possible through individuals within the whānau being eligible for election to the board of trustees, and also through the close partnership envisaged between the community and the institutions ...” (Lange 1988:26).

Johnston’s (1992) research set out to test just how effective Māori participation was under such conditions of individual membership. Her conclusion was that:

“Māori members were generally involved in decision making that had no great impact on the policies of the school” (Johnston 1992:38).

The concept of whānau being reduced to individuals competing for a place on boards of trustees is a concept that is antagonistic to cultural values and practices. It seems doomed to failure because of important cultural differences. European board members may regard themselves as individual members voted into office with the necessary authority to do a job on behalf of their constituents. But Māori members would be most whakamā (reluctant) to exercise such authority without consultation to the whānau (other Māori parents).

A good example of how whānau has been reduced to individual members of the Māori community has been shown on the way some schools are gaining the necessary endorsements for the Māori Language Funding:

"some schools have gone down to the local nanny or koro to sign their applications, thereby usurping the mana of the hapū or iwi representatives and we all know this strategy to divide and rule us!” (NZPPTA 1994:2).
The whole system it seems is open to abuse by the rubber stamping signature of whoever the school can get to sign as an individual. Such an action is contrary to the Māori cultural values and identity of whānau, hapū and iwi (Stewart 1992).

However, the solution for asserting effective control might be the use the local Runanga structure. Each major tribal area (iwi) is divided up into a number of District Councils (Runanga), these in turn are divided up into a number of Takiwa (sub-districts) to which local marae are directly affiliated. The takiwa could in turn provide the necessary endorsements to local schools as a tribal voice. The Runanga-a-Iwi (local tribal authority) structure is the government's official system for the delivery of many services and programmes (such as health, Kohanga Reo, social welfare and housing) to Māori people, and such experienced structures as the Māori Trust Boards could play an expanded role (O'Reilly & Wood 1991). Shane Jones states:

"*The strength of the traditional iwi structure is reflected in their continued existence today. They are strong, enduring, sophisticated systems of co-operation and community effort and as such provide an appropriate means of delivering government programmes to Māori*" (1990:67).

**The Tū Tangata Model.**

Although I have criticised the Tū Tangata programme in Chapter One it may be the most promising change agent for the promotion of higher achievement for Māori students. This is because it opens up classroom doors that have previously been closed to the view of the Māori parent community. Parents can see for themselves how each participating class learns. The stated aim is to bring into schools a "*permanent, long-term attitudinal change at a fundamental level ... to bring the community into schools with ownership of the reform process*" (Puketapu 1998:32). The training and work of Education Service Personnel (ESP) as teacher-aids focuses on the needs of the students (eg. uniform, finance, health and welfare, attendance, behaviour, etc) in order to improve their conditions of learning. The in-class support given to both students and teachers will
do much to lower some of the barriers to better leaning. But there seems to be a simple assumption that improved teaching, student learning and outcomes will result. There is quantifiable evidence (Puketapu 1998) within the Tū Tangata system of running records of improved school attendance, less disciplinary problems and improved teacher morale. But schools running the Tū Tangata programme appear to have retention rates that are no better than any other comparative school. Is it, therefore, a false assumption to equate better class behaviour with better learning outcomes? Perhaps Tū Tangata is only solving the pre-conditions of learning but not the actual learning conditions.

If the “barrier to learning for Māori is the classroom itself” (Education Gazette 30/08/99:9) then the Tū Tangata programme acts only as a limited change agent for only two out of three classroom participants. The programme expects that pupil behaviour and performance will improve. There is an expectation that with better home-school communications, that parents will become much more active in their support for their children at school. But what the expectations of the third party, the teachers? If both students and parents are expected to evaluate and improve their performance then are the teachers expected to do the same? How then are teachers to accomplish such a task? If the teacher has the power to critique the work of both students and ESP’s then who critiques the teacher? If the power to critique the teacher is made the sole responsibility of senior managements (as is the status quo) then any benefits of bringing the community into schools with ownership of the reform process is denied. There is no effective change agent. The specific guidelines for ESP’s exclude them from directly critiquing the work of the teacher. The weekly evaluation meetings for ESP’s may record any concerns about some of the teachers that may then be passed onto senior managements for any action as they may seem appropriate. But in working through such an external fourth party loop is not culturally appropriate for Māori who would always prefer to work kanohi ki te kanohi, face to face, directly to those concerned.
Long gone are the days when the teachers in schools were regarded as knowing everything. The remaining disparity gap proves that. But there are still many in the teaching profession who “sit in fear of Māori taking over the place” (Ramsay, Hawk, Harold, Marriott & Poskitt, 1993). There seems to be an attempt in many schools that if Māori are ignored then perhaps they will keep quiet and go away. It is now rare to find a school with a current Treaty of Waitangi clause within its school charter document was reported in Chapter Three. I have not been able to locate any school with an appraisal document for teachers that has any specific content to the needs of Māori pupils (Stewart 1997). It is clear that unless there exists an outside change agent for both action and attitude then change will never happen.

Tū Tangata programmes cannot grow and develop without support. There exists a lack of funding to implement the programme and a lack of independent evaluation research. The lack of funding has meant that many school communities who have been initially sold the idea with high expectations of the programme and the glossy programme brochures have fallen back into disempowerment because of the financial hurdles (as is the case with two major colleges in Northland).

As the Tū Tangata programmes have been running since 1995 it is appropriate to evaluate the programme. It is especially important to test the assumption that providing for a better learning environment actually does improve learning outcomes. Evaluation work, similar to the work of Marshall & Peters (1989), would be the most appropriate research model. Here the researchers became part of a whānau of a community of Māori language teachers encouraging the teachers themselves to become researchers so as to be change agents. Research would help answer a further number of important questions. I have already mentioned above that improving learning conditions does not necessarily improve learning. The effect of employing the education support personnel workers (he mātua kēkē) rather than actual parents (he mātua tūturu) is not known. Does having “ownership of the reform process” (ibid) mean that a model of tino rangatiratanga
(Te Tiriti o Waitangi) in education can be more precisely defined? There are dangers in such a programme remaining as a type of defacto social service agency that has been observed in other overseas programmes (Stewart 1993).

An extension to both the content and aims of the Tū Tangata programme will enhance its delivery. The status of the ESP workers should be raised to that of kaiāwhina or teacher aids. This means they could enter any national qualifications. To enhance the academic aims of the programme all ESP’s should be trained in supporting programmes such as Reading Recovery (Te reo Māori version). They could also be used for the evaluation of student writing and more important, help facilitate the entry of the Māori parent community into the classroom for the same task. Specific performance appraisal needs to be developed to enhance the performance of pupils, parents and teachers. All participating students should be at least placed on one immersion level for Māori Language Resourcing (see Chapter Four). There should be an expectation that such participation should eventually reach immersion level two. A te reo Māori focus and input will help ensure Māori ownership and cultural identity implied within the Tū Tangata name. Finally, there needs to be for each group of students a well-defined long-term plan that will lead and promote all Māori students to complete the seventh form at school. Only with such an expectation and result will the life chances of Māori students be maximized at school and the retention rate improved.

Perhaps the problem has been that we have had too many lists and projects to work with. It is far better to focus all our energies on one particular aim and purpose. Let us do one thing and do it well, rather than many things only partially completed. In this way the role and responsibility of the Māori teacher can be clearly defined and the burden of extra responsibilities can be eased.

Within the Māori teachers’ section of the national secondary union is a Collaborative Action Plan. Three priorities and nine distinct goals are listed. I would therefore like to suggest that we focus one central issue that I have already mentioned - the maintenance and revitalisation of te
**Tikanga Māori** (line one of priority one). All the priorities mentioned (eg. Treaty issues, content and delivery, language integration, learning needs and structures, etc) are how we achieve the primary aim. In my own intervention work the main aim was to help improve the standard of written te reo Māori. While the aim was highly successful it did not prevent other school issues being addressed.

There are five key elements necessary to achieve the focus on quality teaching. First, is the formulation of an action plan. Second, that all teachers of te reo be given the option of developing immersion level classes in all schools. The time frame to implement such classes should ensure that the highest level of immersion is eventually attained. Third, that performance appraisal be specifically developed for the quality assurance of programme delivery. Such development needs to be done by Māori for Māori. Fourth, that all schools have attached whānau support/komiti Māori for the specific purposes of advancing the learning of te reo and, finally the up-skilling of teachers in second language learning, new technology, curriculum and assessment development. Each of these key elements is discussed below.

**Action planning.**

Each school must develop an action plan that details the implementation of all four methodologies in the headings below. Included within the plan should be specific targets for the retention of Māori students into the seventh form or Year Thirteen, the last year of secondary school. The plan must become part of the school charter, and must be reported annually, similar to the reporting of the Education review Office. If the promises made within the charter are not kept then the legal status of schools charters (Lange 1989) needs to tested within the courts, as has been done in the USA (Stewart 1993).
The action plan would parallel the time line for students attending school and would have a minimum target time of five years. It would focus on the question: where will the Māori teacher be in five years time? Any such plan needs to work as a continuum:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year nine entry of Māori students, <em>ngā rangatahi</em></th>
<th>growth, achievement and maturity with te reo</th>
<th>Year thirteen exit of Māori students, <em>ngā rangatira</em></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Good Employment of Māori teachers</td>
<td>The Action Plan</td>
<td>The end result.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Immersion classes in all schools.**

As explained earlier the number of secondary schools offering immersion classes may have dropped in number (at least in the Taitokerau district). The cause of this seems to be a resistance by other teachers in other subjects to give up "their" time for the extra te reo Māori time required. Schools with falling rolls, as often found in country areas with high Māori percentages of Māori pupils, can not absorb surplus time made by teachers giving up their classes to Māori immersion classes. The solution seems obvious that teachers with surplus teaching time be given the necessary training in te reo Māori so as be absorbed into the immersion programmes. To start this process the te reo teacher could follow the immersion class to the other subject to act as a kai-awhina reo and team teacher. The process would be funded by the MLR. All parties would be set to benefit: the Māori teacher gains experience in another subject, the other teacher gains te reo and an extra teacher, the students gain a greater exposure to te reo.

Knowing the benefits that te reo brings to students a good employer would make Māori immersion classes available by right to all students in all schools. The argument given against this
is always that there are not enough qualified teachers for the implementation. But this argument echoes the familiar old saying: what came first, the chicken or the egg? A search through the situations vacant advertisements for teachers does not indicate a high demand for te reo teachers, no more so than most subjects. A closer look at the advertisements shows that some schools appear to be only going through the motions of advertising by attaching the additional clause such as: “ability to teach te reo Māori would be an advantage.” Other advertisements are obviously very keen by their wording and appear in many different newspapers. Schools that have dedicated te reo immersion classes seem to have no problem in attracting good qualified teachers.

A good school would have a long-term plan for the introduction of immersion classes that would target the provision of adequate staffing. The plan would also detail such items as class time allocations sufficient for the appropriate immersion level, the subjects that will be targeted initially for incorporation in the immersion programme, the up-skilling of the te reo teacher into other subjects and new technology, the up-skilling of other subject teachers into te reo Māori, the evaluation of the learning outcomes, and the implications of the programme on future staffing and resources.

Up-skilling of Māori teachers.

The up-skilling of Māori teachers must always be focused on strengthening the teacher’s knowledge of te reo Māori and the teacher’s ability to teach the subject especially in an immersion method. Most Māori teachers have complained that their undergraduate training for teaching has been inadequate (Bloore 1996). Professional development has often come to mean learning how to improve in administrative tasks. Short courses, especially single days, are too limited in time to make the extension of knowledge possible in any depth.

Every professional development course should be aimed at increasing the qualifications of Māori teachers, with the minimum target for a Bachelor’s degree level. At issue is the argument
that a post-graduate degree does not make for a better teacher. A teacher of te reo needs a preparation time similar to an old time tohunga (expert), and cannot be respected unless s/he has obtained a knowledge well above that of the students. Recent research on teacher education makes similar arguments (Darling & Hammond 1997), and there is evidence that the teacher’s attested ability has a direct outcome on student performance (Jencks & Phillips 1998).

Where Māori teachers achieve Positions of Responsibility (now referred to as Management Units or MU) the extra responsibility involved is usually in administration not in direct classroom duties (Bloor 1996). There is little financial incentive to improve the academic qualifications of all teachers. The salary service increment available to teachers who improve their academic qualification (that is then lost when a PR is achieved) is minuscule compared to the high cost and effort needed to complete an extra degree.

A good employer will be proactive in encouraging its staff, especially Te Ataakura³ teachers, to complete their degrees. Being proactive means meeting with the Māori staff member and discussing ways in which to make a course of study possible. A good employer would also promote degree courses within STA area meetings.

Prescribing performance appraisal.

The Secretary of Education has recently released the prescription (Fancy 1997).

"The prescribed requirements will help ensure that teachers are provided with clear directions based on an agreed set of school goals and with opportunities for professional growth and for reflection on performance ... and will directly benefit all students" (ibid:1).

The prescription is a directive to all Boards of Trustees to implement in all schools. The document on paper appears to be based on desirable goals, improving teaching and good management. In reality, school boards would be most unlikely to do the actual work of individual
school policy writing and implementation because of the length of time necessary, the professional and expert knowledge required by the participants. It is expected that the work will be completed in whole by the principals and senior management teams of all schools. As there is nothing in the document that specifically addresses the crisis of continuing failure of Māori in our schools, so it is expected that the status quo of failure will continue.

Ten policy booklets on performance management have been reviewed. The documents range in size from 14 to 50 pages in length. All were written in very formal language and all contained language that most non-teachers would not be familiar with. One booklet attempted to remove the phobia from teachers by its extensive use of humorous cartoons. But again not one of the booklets used any Māori language to encourage the participation by Māori. Again, knowing the crisis of continuing failure of Māori students, one would think the matter would be of top priority. The use of peer appraisal forms, where one teacher comments on the performance of another, are not culturally appropriate for Māori. There was no provision made for the use of te reo Māori in the appraisal process, _kanohi ki te kanohi_, as a more appropriate process for Māori. As a final comment, performance appraisal may be like the process of impression marking against some known criteria. We do not always agree with the criteria or process but it is probably the lessor of a number of evils.

A good employer would make good use of the various regional associations of Māori language teachers and regional Māori language advisers to assist in the development of performance appraisal.

Community Participation.

A good school would have an action plan detailing the extent of the participation of the Māori community in the management of the delivery of the te reo Māori curriculum. All schools

---

3 _Te Ataakura_ are native speakers of the Māori language whose language abilities are given university degree
should have policies that provide for the kaupapa and tikanga (the format and processes) of all parent meetings, what power of decision making will be done, the identification and involvement of community resource people (kaumātua, kuia, kaiāwhina, future teachers and leaders), adult education programmes enabling parents to learn with their children.

Final words.

How this research programme was originally intended and how it has finished are quite different. I had originally intended to attempt to locate examples of successful school practices that utilised their Māori parent community to the benefit of their Māori students. I had high expectations that someone somewhere would have had up and running systems for successful parent involvement giving successful student outcomes. But nothing useful was found. I was in fact, quite disappointed in the three initial investigations (as detailed in Chapters Three, Four and Five) during the 1995 research year. But I do feel that I have been rewarded by the exciting possibilities discovered during the intervention phase of this research.

As a Māori language teacher of some twenty-five years experience I can now say that I now know more about effective ways of linking between the school and the homes. The best link is myself. It costs nothing but the prioritising of my time and effort to involve the Māori parent community to improve my teaching, student learning and outcomes. During the whole of the research and intervention I can accurately observe that I never came across one Māori parent who was not interested in improving his or her child. The time I have spent in evaluations of programmes and practices, the development of theory especially in the understanding of the Treaty of Waitangi has made me a better teacher.

The Ministry of Education has published an excellent book called Guidelines of Successful Consultation (1990) that details five levels of consultation. It also focuses on attitudes and
behaviours of the people involved and their willingness to make changes. But the depth of the problem is enormous. Knowing where to start and gaining initial support is important.

The charter and appraisal documents seem all to refer to the essential task of "improving the school." For Māori teachers this has been a continual compromise of limiting the time and use of te reo in order to "fit in." Clearly the result has been a long history of continual disaster and deprivation of the mana of our reo and our people. School management and boards of trustees need to reverse their thinking and make "the school fit te reo." I believe now that for the Māori parent community there has not been so much as a deliberate act of exclusion of participation, but rather a lack of positive, focused and appropriate plan to allow any participation.

We do not need to establish another national office with a Māori name to control Māori education. We have tried that and it failed. The establishment of any type of Māori Education Authority must work from bottom up, not top down. What we do need is a performance and evaluation service equipped with the mana of intervention in order to make progressive changes to school management.

Māori teachers need to be specifically focused on how to improve the performance of Māori students in our schools. Good schools will see far past the technical appointment processes of their Māori teacher with a vision to ensure the improved outcomes of all Māori students. All te reo programmes must have a demanding and challenging academic content. It is imperative that we all remember that we all need to push scholarship as much as we do ideology.

From the time of each third form intake to each school there should be a five-year time line of action to promote Māori to the seventh form. If this is done then we can expect to see a restoration of both mana and reo in our Māori students that will lead to an accelerated academic performance.

When given the opportunity the Māori parent community can give a strong moral, cultural and linguistic force for the benefit of the Māori language teacher and students. What was perhaps
most surprising to discover during the interventions was that parents also provided a strong academic force. These parents were in no way intellectually ignorant of the finer points of grammar and were in many respects as capable as teacher on debating language issues. Having Māori parents as extra eyes and ears giving a double check and a double reinforcement to the work of the teachers and provided a learning environment in which the pupils excelled. There was no escape and no excuses for any pupils – they all just had to do as expected.

Dick Grace (1997) has some sound advice: “However, while many contributors see the need for change, most of their suggestions appear to be aimed at bandaging the same body rather than performing drastic surgery! Patching up a shoddy system is not likely to deliver the goods” (ibid p8).

I interpret this statement as a call for a radical change. The critical issue for Māori is in school governance and management “ownership” in terms of the Treaty of Waitangi.

Our schools cannot continue to perform in some sort of Darwinian survival of the studious mode. The inputs of school programme need to be more focused towards achieving academic outcomes for Māori. The Tū Tangata programme in schools seems to be the most likely attractive and effective change agent for Māori students in our high schools. For this reason I would support a wider implementation and evaluation of the programme. Whatever happens, such programmes cannot afford to remain static but they must continue to develop and grow into the future with our children for:

*Ko ngā rangatahi ināiane, ā, ko ngā rangatira āpōpō*  
*The children of today are the chiefs of tomorrow.*
Survey on Māori Language Resourcing.

The good news is that the fund will be progressively doubled over the next two years. The bad news is that from a recent indication by teachers at the last in-service day only five secondary schools in the North may be taking advantage of the funding. Please remember that the funding was given to all enrolled Māori students at your school, but now is only available to individual classes that have a dedicated immersion level as described in MOE Circular 96/17.

In order to assist your school to take the maximum advantage of the funding we need the following information so we can all plan ahead together in terms of providing more in-service training and information, etc:

1. do you have any immersion classes at your school? yes / no.
2. if no, do you intend to begin one in the near future? yes / no.
3. if you currently have immersion classes can you complete this table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>class level</th>
<th>no of classes</th>
<th>total no of pupils</th>
<th>immersion level 1 - 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>form one</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>form two</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>form three</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>form four</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>form five</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

class level | no of classes | total no of pupils | immersion level 1 - 4
-------------|---------------|--------------------|-----------------------|
4. The ministry intends sending verifiers to a selection of schools to examine the curriculum, the Māori language ability of the teacher and roll numbers.

Has your school been visited by any verifiers this or last year? yes / no.

5. Did you / have you encountered any problems with the verification process? yes / no.

6. Any comments:

7. this survey was completed by ________________

on behalf of ____________________________ school / college.

Please return this survey in the attached envelope.

Aroha nui.

Kath Sarich.


Ps: the regional moderator for School Certificate te Reo Māori has reported that some marks appear to have been scaled down for last year's results. Please return your schedule of marks as sent to you so we can check the extent of the problem. Oral marks to Pare Nathan and written marks to Oneroa.
Thankyou very much for your recent reply to my request for information on the verification process for Māori Language Funding. Your reply represents a very big improvement in replies to requests made over the last two years. On discussing your letter with our executive we were very pleased to see that "emphasis should be on supporting schools which are making genuine attempts to deliver the programme at the stated level."

No reira, kia ora koutou!

You stated also that the results are still being analysed. When completed can we have a copy of any analysis report produced? In particular we would like to know the names of the schools visited in the Taitokerau district and the process by which these schools were selected.

Our own survey on the funding has shown a wide gap between what certain schools are being funded for (from information from your Beau Reweti) and what pupil numbers in classes are. More disturbing is the big information gap between the schools and homes, and the decision making processes. In fact, only two out of some 25 teachers here could tell me exactly what their full budget entitlement was. We are committed to making sure that all our Māori teachers, iwi and hapu communities are fully informed as to what monies their schools are receiving. It is very clear that schools are not doing their community consultation.

And speaking of consultation and te mana o Nga Puhi, did your Māori Liaison Officers make any attempt to consult with any of our Taitokerau iwi authorities before carrying out the verification process?
Aroha nui.

A G (Oneroa) Stewart

Kairapukōrero

Doctor of Education Student at the University of Auckland.
Kainga noho: 26 Hone Heke Rd, Kerikeri, Te Taitokerau.
Karere rorohiko: agstew@voyager.co.nz

Waea: 09 407 9228.
Ki a Tau Henare,
Te Whare Pāremata.

Tēnā rā koe, e te Rangatira.

Māori Affairs Select Committee - He Whero.

On behalf of this Runanga I have been researching the application of Māori Language Resourcing for a number of years. I have attached a copy of a letter recent sent to the Ministry of Education outlining my concern about this funding. During my discussions at the Ministry in Wellington I again expressed my concern that parents of our Māori students have almost no input into spending decisions (as emphasised in the 1995 First Interim Report of the Māori Affairs Committee). The reply given to me at the Ministry was that as the MLR is “bulk funded” to school each board of trustees has full responsibility for its use. There is no requirement that schools consult (whatever that means) with their local mātua/hapu.

The funding was originally intended to promote higher achievement of Māori in schools through the greater use of te reo. Now, after nine years and millions of dollars of this funding, the Ministry’s Interim report to the incoming government shows that 82% or more of Māori are not completing the seventh form.

I was very disappointed to hear of your comments on Mana News last week that you intend to “monitor the situation.” While schools are not accountable for the purpose of this funding there will never be a change in higher educational achievement for Māori. We would hope that the first priority of the Māori Education Commission will be to regain the control of the MLR by Māori for Māori. As nothing moves school principals and boards than fear of funding cuts there must be prescribed performance appraisal for this funding. Schools that do not perform for Māori must loose this funding.

Aroha nui.

A G Stewart
Kairapukōrero

Doctor of Education Student at the University of Auckland.
16 July 1997

A G Stewart
Te Runanga O Te Reo O Te Taitokerau
26 Hone Heke Road
KERIKERI

Dear A G Stewart

Thank you for your letter of 13 June 1997 in which you requested information under the Official Information Act relating to the Maori Language Resource verification process. Unfortunately the original request was not received in this office. A copy was forwarded on your behalf to the Minister of Education from John Carter MP, and received in this office on 3 July 1997.

The verification process took place during May and June 1997, and the results are being analysed. Visits took place in schools in the Auckland/Tai Tokerau and Waikato/Waiairiki areas. A total of forty-eight schools were visited.

Details of the process and contract details are enclosed as requested. The two verifiers employed were former Maori educators with considerable experience in Maori language education.

I appreciate your concern about the levels of funding being claimed by schools. Apart from the verification process the Ministry is reliant on receiving accurate information from schools in order to set entitlements for the funding.

Yours sincerely

Eric Pedersen
Acting Group Manager
Process and procedures

- Visits held May/June 1997
- Approval/verification teams will consist of a Liaison Officer (Maori) and a contracted approver/verifier.
- The Approver/Verifier will be contracted by the Ministry of Education (Budget ECSR, Manager CCRI). Approvers/Verifiers will be selected because of their considerable experience in Maori medium education.
- Management Centres will manage the travel so that expenses of their liaison officers can be met from the overall verification budget. Claims should be sent to National Office (attention: Chris Randall).
- An appeal and review procedure will apply whereby schools have the ability to appeal any decision resulting from the verification process and any sanction applied by the Ministry.

The verification process will examine the following:

a. The proportion of time that the curriculum will be delivered in Maori
b. The ability of the teacher to sustain the immersion programme at the level stated.

Emphasis should be on supporting schools which are making genuine attempts to deliver the programme at the stated level.

As was the case in 1995/96 Liaison Officers (Maori) may also like to discuss on an informal basis during these visits the following areas with schools which are unrelated to the approval/verification process:

a. maintenance of the programme - can it be sustained for a year
b. Risk factors and prevention strategies - in the event of teacher leaving etc
c. Future programme and intentions.

Any changes to levels of immersion, will need to be notified by the Management Centre concerned to Early Childhood and Schools Resourcing Division for adjustment. (STANDARD LETTER)

Schools which have had their levels adjusted should also be advised in writing by the Management Centre concerned (STANDARD FORMAT).
MANAGEMENT CENTRE ACTION

- Possible temporary accommodation for approver/verifier.
- LO Maori to design itinerary in conjunction with the verifier, and arrange travel
- Send letters of "Advice of Visit, Maori Language Resourcing" to schools at least two weeks before the actual visit (STANDARD)
- LO Maori to accompany verifier on visits
- During visits, investigate, on an informal basis the following:
  a. maintenance of the programme - can it be sustained for a year
  b. Risk factors and prevention strategies - in the event of teacher leaving etc
  c. Future programme and intentions.
- Prepare list of results and advise ECSF of any changes to levels of immersion (STANDARD) (Implications for DMA)
- Advise schools of adjustments to levels.

ACTION FOR VERIFIER

- Finalise itinerary in conjunction with Maori Liaison Officer
- Examine, through the verification process, the following:
  a. The proportion of time that the curriculum will be delivered in Maori (This will involve: resources available, structured programmes in place, Timetable)
  b. The ability of the teacher to sustain the immersion programme at the level stated.
- Discuss outcome of visit with principal
- Complete result form for each programme examined (STANDARD)
- Prepare report at completion of visits on findings and suggested improvements/changes.

REVIEW PROCESS

- An appeal and review procedure will apply whereby schools have the ability to appeal any decision resulting from the verification process and any sanction applied by the Ministry.
- All schools must be advised of the ability to appeal the decision
  - Review panel to consist of a contracted arbiter; the decision to be approved by:
    Senior Manager Early Childhood and Schools Resourcing
    Group Manager Maori
- Issues to consider
  - reasons for change of level by verifier
  - programmes being operated by school
- It is expected that appeals, if any, would be in terms of the proficiency of the teacher in te reo Maori. Any appeal must be endorsed by the local Marae and Kaumatua. The review will be conducted by a contracted arbiter.
Contract of Service

This letter will serve to form the basis of the contract for your services by the Ministry of Education.

1 Position

Your position will be on a contract basis for a maximum period of ten days carrying out the selected duties of a liaison officer, and reporting in the first instance to the Senior Manager Early Childhood and Schools Resourcing, and to the Group Manager Maori.

2 Responsibility

During the period of the contract for your services you will comply with all Ministry of Education (referred to as the “Ministry”) policies, regulations and rules, including those contained in the Code of Conduct applicable to public Servants.

3 Duties

The duties you are to undertake are listed in Appendix A.

4 Payment

Payment for your services will be $....... (GST inclusive) for each itinerised day where required, including time to complete reports. Payment will be paid upon receipt of an invoice.

All travel and responsibility of the Ministry of Education.

5 Hours of Work

The hours of work will vary depending on the travel.

Eric Pedersen
Senior Manager
Early Childhood and Schools Resourcing

Contractor
Te Runanga o te Reo o te Taitokerau
Northland Māori Language Teachers’ Trust.

Vision and Direction.

Priority Aim:

te whakaoranga o te reo Māori.

Priority Concerns:

All Māori teachers must actively work to reverse the decline of the academic standard of te reo being achieved, the low numbers of students choosing the subject as a school option, and the huge early drop out rate of Māori students.

Priority Direction:

At the beginning of high school create an interest and enjoyment of te reo Māori, at a standard that is academically challenging in order to make cognitive benefits in all subject areas.

The parent community must be involved in the delivery and evaluation of the te reo curriculum in order to support better teaching, student learning and outcomes. Their management of te reo Māori programmes is clearly expressed within the intent of the Treaty of Waitangi.

In order to achieve the above all te reo teachers must seek to develop a sound professional attitude to their teaching. There must be thorough planning and preparation of schools schemes in line with the new curriculum documents that include very specific pathways and time lines for these tasks. In order to reach and teach the new generation all teachers need to take maximum advantage of all professional development opportunities.

Priority Objective:

is for all Māori students to reach the seventh form confident and competent in te reo Māori:

ngā rangatahi ināiane, ngā rangatira āpōpō

(the students of today will be the leaders of the future).
School Certificate Written Maori

First Trial Examination for 1995.

Panui to principals and teachers of te reo:

This trial examination is to assist all participating pupils and teachers to achieve a better standard of written te reo Maori well before the end of year examination. It will achieve this by earlier formal practice by pupils and having all teachers as markers so that we all learn to be fully confident and competent as to what is required at the School Certificate level.

This trial examination date can be either the Monday or Tuesday of 23 or 24 April 1996, during any one hour period of the day. Please enter your preferred date on your school timetable now.

All papers (3 from each pupil) are to be collected and brought to the marking venues at either:

   Kerikeri High School on Monday, 1st May, for far and mid north teachers, or
   Tauraroa Area School on Monday, 8th May for Whangarei district teachers.

Although the assessment will be done out of class time (starting 4pm on both days) some time consideration may need to be given by schools to support those teachers travelling long distances. At our next Runanga meeting Maori language teachers will have the opportunity to comment on this draft trial paper.

If you have any queries or need extra help in preparation please feel free to contact me.

Aroha nui kia koutou.

Kaiwhakahaere: A G Stewart, 26 Hone Heke, Kerikeri. ph 407 9228.

This first trial examination aims to produce one page of quality descriptive writing by using a step by step method by:

1 - choosing a familiar topic,
2 - the writing down of the intended vocabulary,
3 - construction into basic ordered sentences as a draft,
4 - proof reading with additions and alterations, then
5 - the writing of the final page for assessment.

All teachers should re-read chief examiner’s reports from previous years, especially my 1995 report on the mid-year written examination for the Tauwhara cluster. Some might think that this step by step method is a bit primary schoolish, but the pupils from Kaikohe Intermediate who followed this method achieved the highest marks as a school group last year. We all need to get back to basics. All pupils must:

keep to their chosen topic,
know clearly what is expected,
show their personality, such as likes and dislikes,
express their mana Māori by knowing all the necessary words,
know the difference between tātou and mātou (and all common pronouns),
know that spoken language is not always the same for written language,
use handwriting that is readable (this is really important!),
hand in all three pages, plus one spare allowed.
Te Whakamātautau tuatahi a te tau 1995.

Ko toku ingoa ko __________________________ Ko te ra _______
Ko toku whare kura __________________________ Ko te taima inaianei ___am/pm

**He kōrero whakaahua** (Writing a description).

Whiriwhiria tetahi kōrero whakaahua mo enei kaupapa mai:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Taku hararei Kirihimete.</th>
<th>Toku whare noho.</th>
<th>Toku whanau i te kainga.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tetahi pukapuka pai.</td>
<td>Tetahi tangata rongonui.</td>
<td>To matou whare hui.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Tuhia mai te ingoa o tou kōrero: __________________________

2. Na, tuhia mai etahi kupu awhina mo tenei kōrero:

   **ngā kupu ingoa:** iwi / wahi / mea atu (nouns):

   he kupu ahua (adjectives):

   he kupu mahi (verbs):

   he kupu kōrero / whakatauki / pepea (expressions / sayings):
3. He Tauira (draft copy):

Te ingoa o taku kōrero: ___________________________  taku ingoa: _______

(insert one whole page here from exam book)

4. Whakatikatika tenei kōrero (make the necessary corrections).

(insert page break here).

5. Taku korero pai (final best copy).

Te ingoa o taku korero: ___________________________  taku ingoa: _______

(insert two whole pages here from exam book)
Te Runanga o te Reo o Te Taitokerau
The Northland Maori Language teacher's trust.

Examiner's Report
for the mid-year School Certificate Te Reo Maori
oral and written examinations,
Tauwhara Marae cluster, 2 August 1995.

Ki nga Rangatira o nga Whare Kura
no te Whangaroa ki te Kerikeri, Okaihau ki Kaikohe
whiti atu ki Opononi tena koutou katoa.

A big thank you to you all principals for releasing pupils and teachers so that the assessment day could happen. In the nine years I have been attending these examinations this would be among the most smooth running and best behaved group of pupils.

I hope that this report will be a useful aid to our professional development. I emphasise with the italics because I firmly believe that we can best improve our teaching by working together. To me this type of examination represents the best possible value in-service day for both teachers and pupils. It is important therefore that the day be supported by any attendance of principals, senior teachers and parents.

The language skill improvements needed are, I suspect, not just "Maori" ones but would probably apply to all curriculum areas. As te reo Maori appears to be the top scoring subject for many individual pupils how then can this lead subject be used to help make progress in other school subjects? I am not going to answer the question now except to say that the responsibility is not the Maori language teacher's alone.

If you or any of your staff would like more information on this report please feel free to contact me.

Aroha nui ki a koutou.

A G Stewart MA(Hons) DipTch.

Trust Research Office: Te Kauri, Waimate North, RD 2 Kaikohe.
Te Wahanga Korero

Sixty five candidates presented themselves for assessment. This included five form two pupils from Kaikohe Intermediate and three from Whangaroa College all of whom achieved top grades. Kia ora koutou.

The in-school grades given by all teachers again proved to be very accurate. The average mark given to pupils by their own teachers over all schools was grade 2.2. This resulted in a final assessed grade of 2.4. This minor difference of 0.2 clearly demonstrates that this group of Maori language teachers is quite competent to interpret and correctly apply the national guide-lines for School Certificate.

There were, as expected, a number of pupils, eight in total, whose predicted grade was two levels above their assessment. When all were re-tested two pupils remained at their teacher's grade, four were lowered and two were raised.

On listening in to some oral assessments it seems that many of the presentations are rather stylized and formal, which indicates a continued reliance on rote learning. This is satisfactory as a beginning, but if higher grades are to be achieved then candidates need to practice a dialogue with the listener. We want humour, passion, personality and a variety of voice and presentation. Be less formal after the initial beginnings of the assessment and develop more colloquial expressions.

All this only comes with practice and especially by mixing with adult speakers. I urge you to try and arrange one adult (or senior pupil) to visit your class each week. Try to record some spoken Maori (the radio news is excellent) and analyse by written dictation.

Simple dialogue that can be found in the Maori language school journals is also a valuable resource. Try to tape and play-back as much pupil spoken material as possible. Each pupil could have a homework tape.

It would be great if all schools could have at least one pupil speaker each to participate within both the mihi and poroporoaki.

Kia maia.
Te Wahanga Tuhituhi
the written examination.

All pupils individually chose their own time to enter the Whare Hui and start this assessment. After collecting their papers all settled down very quickly to the task of writing. In my experience as a teacher there was no more noise or detractions than would have been in any examination room back at school. But the relaxed atmosphere sure was different.

At the next cluster examination I would like to see all teachers hand in their own grade predictions for their own pupils (both oral and written) at least a week in advance. This is important as I hope it will emphasise the continuing problem of the standard of written work being way below that of speaking. Engari ko te kai o te rangatira he korero. Most pupils achieved the grade average of only 4.0.

This is rather disastrous because if the average oral grade is 2.4 (or more) and the written is 4.0 then the best possible generated grade for their next year's Sixth Form Certificate will only be a 6 or 7. Remember that even though the course design and intention may emphasise te reo, the final allocated grade is generated from the lowest mark which is usually the written work (see the enclosed table).

Even though this may be unfair, I think the standard of the written work is far too low. It is the simple things like basic spelling and handwriting that might be tackled first. Are all the subject teachers of our language pupils meeting together to discuss the standard of written presentation of pupil work? The pupil essays are enclosed here for your analysis. Please spend some time reading and writing up some plans for improvement.

Please encourage your pupils to title their work. Secondly, a short explanation (an opening paragraph) as to what they intend to write is important. Write it just like the outline that the very first speaker on any paepae does.

One particular student wrote one page of really personal writing (in pencil) that deserved a grade one, but the pupil only answered one question (and I'm not sure as to which) and not the required three.

Only one grade one was given and only three grade two's. These presentations clearly showed the writers' personality, humour, individuality, likes and dislikes. They obviously knew
what to write and how to write. (How about writing to students at other schools?).

Even though the examination paper had been distributed well in advance to all teachers, too many pupils were asking me at the very beginning:

"can I do a mihi?" "Can I write about my family."

Only practice makes perfect.

Most pupils do not know how to express the negative, eg:

"kahore e haere ana a Kane ki ..."

or the future tense, eg:

"ka tu te hui i tera wiki" (the hui will be held last week).

Too many cannot use pronouns correctly, eg:

"No Kapiro ahau, ko tino mohio ia."

What do you think of these:

"Tekau ma ono ano tau" "He mahita ana ia"

"Nga wha maua tamariki"

And I really liked:

"E haere ana ki te kati pahi ki te kura."

All of the above makes me think that these pupils have not yet grasped the basic sentence constructions from Te Rangatahi I and Modern Maori I. Because basic grammar is quite easy to learn substitution exercises should be practiced weekly. This an excellent method of extending contemporary vocabulary knowledge. By this age all pupils would be expected to know such words as computers, college, alcohol, etc.

Regular revision is important - don't presume your pupils know it all until you have proved it by testing.

If your pupils choose to write up a whole page of spoken dialogue then once after the invented characters are named use the first letter of their names only down the margin.

And what can I say about those who turned up without any pens or pencils!

I would strongly suggest that you all establish a class routine (even with forms three and four) to require all pupils to complete at least one page of formal writing per week on the
examination's answer book type paper. These scripts could be kept in individual clear files so that by the end of each term a solid revision resource base was established for each and every student. And it would provide each teacher with a type of unit standard.

Please, please, stress to your pupils the great importance of neat and attractive presentation. If they choose to write up the panui question then poster layout type skills are required. The details should be printed line by line, in an attractive eye catching format, using a whole page. Only one pupil used colour to enhance the work! Pupils must use the correct type and colour pen.

Finally, can I express again the importance of working in partnership as an aid to improving standards. Try peer marking among your own students by displaying work around the classroom walls, improving presentation first then the content. Get together with another subject teacher to see how you can work together to improve your teaching and thus pupil standards. Tell someone among your senior staff so they can help and appreciate what you are doing. How often does your tumuaki make a supporting visit to your room? But the real question may be as to how often s/he is invited?

Above all create the opportunity to let parents and kaumatua hear and see the work being done. From my research I would suggest that this is the most crucial factor in determining success or failure for our pupils.

Wait for the book.

Meantime its back to the chalk face for us all. Three months left.

Aroha nui ki a koutou. Na,
Achieving at level one for school certificate te reo.

I have identified a number of pupils in your school of whom I think with a little more guidance and encouragement could achieve at level one in te reo. The SFC table for the allocation of grades has changed to our advantage. Now all students who achieve a 1,1 for te reo generate a 1 for sixth form certificate next year. Last year only eleven students in all of Aotearoa achieved this mark! In the final push in the last term I suggest you target your academic leaders within your class as the best model and peer support for all other students. I think it would be a much more satisfying and easier work to further lift the performance of our bright pupils. The best way to do this is in the planning of a team approach.

1 - make a commitment to try making an extra effort to achieve some 1,1’s.
2 - identify the target pupils (only four or five are needed).
3 - tell the teachers of other subjects what you want to do. Identify with them any common problems (eg poor handwriting, punctuation, etc), and plan for skill building (eg more reading, study time, etc).
4 - tell parents what you are trying to do. Send a letter home (co-signed by your principal). Follow this up by personal contact and a meeting with all participants (ie parents, pupils, interested teachers, etc). Set one or two targets for all participants. Pupils should keep their own diary.
5 - Evaluate your progress weekly as you go. This includes exchange visits to the classroom of your support teacher. Keep your own diary in your workbook.

And remember, if you would like help in contacting your parents or in facilitating meetings then I am happy to help. Operators are standing by our phones right now!

Aroha nui.

A G (Oneroa) Stewart
He rua te tamariki.

E pehea ana to wahine me ona tamaiti.

Kei te pai ahaua.

E noho ana ahau kia pipiwai.

He maha ana nga mahi i te kura raua ko i te whare.

Ko Fred rawaka Paul aku hoa i te kura.

Ko Willie, Fred, Max taku hoa.

Ko June raua ko Hare i roto i te akarana.

I pai ana ahau.

No Ingarangi ahau me no Ingarangi oku matua.
He Pānui

Ki ngā mātua, ngā kaitiaki, ngā kautmātua o te takiwa Ngā Puhi ki te Marangai haere mai ki nga whakamātautau kura tiwhikete te reo Māori ki Tauwhara Marae a te 23 0 Hongongoi 1996.

Haere mai ki te āwhina, ki te hapai i nga rangatahi o te wā.

All parents and kaumatua of school certificate te reo Maori pupils are warmly welcome to attend the mid-year examinations to be held at Tauwhara Marae, Waimate North, on the 23 July.
He Panui

Ki nga matua, nga kaitiaki, nga kaumatua o te takiwa Nga Puhi ki te Marangai haere mai ki nga whakamatautau
Kura Tiwhikete te reo Maori ki Tauwhara Marae
a te Taite, 25 o Hongongoi 1996.

Haere mai ki te awhina, ki te hapai nga rangatahi o te wa.

All parents and kaumatua of school certificate te reo Maori pupils are warmly welcome to attend the mid-year examinations to be held at Tauwhara Marae, Waimate North, on the 23 July. You can help make a big difference to the results by just talking to your tamaiti about what is expected at the examination, helping with homework if you can, or asking the teacher for more help. It would be great if you could even come to the exam!

Kia ora. Na, ____________, class teacher at High School.

Please cut off and return to school:

The mid-year 1996 te reo exams:

Ae, ka haere atu ahau ki te whakamatautau, yes, I will come to the exam.
Kahore, but I will help prepare my rangatahi at home.
Taihoa, we need more help please.

Ko ahau _______________ Taku tamaiti _______________
He Korero rōnei:
Kōrero tuhitahi ēnei rārangī kei raro. Hoatu ēnei pepa ki tou matua, tou kaumatua. He aha a rāua whakaaro? Whakatikatika ngā kupu hē. Tuhia anō ngā rārangī tika i roto i tau pukapuka hei mahi. Kāua e wareware ki te tuhi i ngā tohuto.

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>He whereo te kara o toku whare me ma.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Ko Anaru raua ko William toku tungane.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Ko BJ rāua ko ahau.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>E noho ana te whare mo ahau.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>... ki te huritau e Whanagrei.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Ko ahau me oku matua.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Ko au raua ko Cindy Crawford.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>E mate ana ia i te tau 1995.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Ko Mere kia Hone: “I really got to haere.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>I whanau ia i Akarana me Whakatane.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
11 Kahore ahau he motoka.

12 Ko ahau te tokoono i roto tuku whanau.

13 he aha te kara? Mangu me kahurangi.

14 E hoa! E haere ana koe ki hea?

15 Ko wai tona tau?

16 I te po, e haere atu ki te hoko nga aihikirimi.

17 Ko te ingoa o taku tamariki ko Hemi, Fred me Hone.

18 Kahore e haere ana a kane ki te hui.

19 He 8am te timata

20 Ko ahau e hoko te tepu me turu

21 Homai te pene, pukapuka, me rura.

22 E rere ana te kaka ki te ngahere

23 I haere ana rewi ki te whare hui.
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