

PART ONE

CHAPTER TWO

TE REO MĀORI

Tōku reo, tōku ohoooho

Tōku reo, tōku mapihi maurea

Tōku reo, tōku whakakai marihi

My language, my valued possession

My language, my object of affection

My language, my precious adornment

INTRODUCTION

The negative impact of colonisation on the vitality of Māori society has been examined and articulated elsewhere (e.g. L. Mead, 1996, Stewart-Harawira, 1995). The force of this impact is nowhere more noticeable, or perhaps audible, than in the area of Māori language. Consequences for te reo Māori as a medium of socialisation and communication between successive generations of whānau are powerful indicators of its magnitude. This chapter sets out to locate these consequences within a discussion of educational, political and psychological factors. Together with the next two chapters it serves as an overview. It provides a context for studies reported in Part Two that examine interactions of kura kaupapa Māori children and their parents around printed Māori text.

While this thesis is primarily concerned with Māori language use in home settings, language related conditions exist both in and around the homes. How these conditions came about need to be understood. Understanding why attempts to regenerate Māori language and culture within homes and wider society are or are not successful requires understanding ecological, political and historical conditions within which these attempts are occurring.

Michael Cole provides an eloquent analogy, which sits comfortably with metaphors I use in this thesis around whānau and Māori language regeneration.

Gardens do not, obviously, exist independently of the larger ecological system within which they are embedded. While it is possible to raise any plant anywhere in the world, given the opportunity first to arrange the appropriate set of conditions, it is not always possible to create the right conditions, even for a short while. And if what one is interested in is more than a short-run demonstration of the possibility of creating a development-promoting system, but rather the creation of conditions which sustain the needed properties of the artificial environment without unsustainable additional labor, then it is as important to attend to the system in which the garden is embedded as the properties of the 'garden itself'.

(Cole, 1995a; 35)

All cultures provide 'gardens' or primary institutions for the development and socialisation of a culture's members, including their language socialisation. Language is a major carrier of what a culture is. It carries beliefs and knowledge, it articulates the most basic as well as the most esoteric practices (Schieffelin & Ochs, 1986). The efficacy of Māori whānau, as one such key institution for socialisation into Māori culture, has been particularly undermined in terms of its role in Māori language socialisation. The results have been a substantial decrease in the number of Māori language speakers over the last few generations.

The significance of 'whānau' and 'parents' in Māori language loss and language regeneration is examined throughout this chapter. Māori language transitions over nearly two centuries of contact with non-Māori language(s) and culture(s) are mapped out, in particular against educational and legislative developments.

WHĀNAU AND TE REO MĀORI

'Whānau' and 'family' appear over and over again in the course of this thesis. Julia Taiapa (1995) describes both as words with a number of meanings. Currently, 'whānau' is defined in a range of ways, encompassing traditional and more recently evolved meanings. It is a word applied by Māori (and more and more non-Māori) to an increasingly wide variety of social categories and groupings. Whānau does not directly translate as 'family'. For

instance 'Te Aho Matua' (a document that outlines the philosophies underpinning kura kaupapa Māori schooling) uses the term hūnuku when expressing 'family' in a more nuclear sense of the word through te reo Māori.

Whānau is often translated as extended family, however Taiapa argues that this does not "procure the complexity of whānau or of whanaungatanga" (1995; 11). Some conceptualisations of whānau do however overlap with those of 'extended family'. Traditionally whānau were based on whakapapa, were essential for survival and involved physically working together and living together;

Loyalty, obligation, commitment, an inbuilt support system made the whānau a strong stable unit, within the hapū, and consequently the tribe.

(Pere, 1994; 26).

Today Māori to some extent can choose to opt out of whānau based on whakapapa. Alternatively, whakapapa based whānau may exist as many physically separate households linked together in other ways that contribute to its wellbeing and on-going existence (Metge, 1995).

Whānau is a term also used when describing group activity that involves working together for common purposes on a regular or continuing basis. Taiapa (1995) describes these kinds of 'whānau' as defined through a group consciousness and repeated corporate action. Whānau based on unity of purpose rather than whakapapa lines, sometimes termed 'kaupapa whānau' or 'metaphorical whānau', develop around a particular aim or goal. Members choose to use 'whānau' as a model for working together, attempting to adhere to whānau values and practices based on co-operative action for common good and wellbeing (Metge, 1995; G.Smith, 1995). Although they may include members who have whakapapa links, kōhanga reo and kura kaupapa Māori whānau are often of the metaphorical kind, extending whānau values and practices of child-rearing and the education and socialisation of children and adults to formal sites for contemporary education (Cram & Pitama, 1998; G. Smith, 1995).

Graham Smith (1995; 23) argues that the co-option and use of the traditional concept of whānau by kaupapa Māori educational initiatives is a key intervention factor. Graham Smith (1995, 1997) identifies kura kaupapa Māori as a whānau intervention model that successfully intervenes within homes as well as schooling sites. He describes whānau as an intervention element permeating all aspects of kaupapa Māori schooling including understandings and practices around knowledge, curriculum, pedagogy and discipline. The success of Māori language and cultural regeneration, it is argued, is relative to the successful regeneration of whānau structures and practices (G. Smith, 1997).

While the benefits of co-opting whānau frameworks and processes are many as evidenced in the work of Graham Smith and others, it is not without dangers. One danger is the potential reification of 'whānau' (Metge, 1995). For years the institution and the practices of 'whānau' have been officially and unofficially undermined. As a result many Māori are protective of 'whānau' as a concept and choose to accentuate its more positive aspects. But many Māori know that belonging to whānau, whether it be the whakapapa or the kaupapa variety, involves hard work! The danger is that those unfamiliar with whānau dynamics and who enter into kaupapa whānau in particular with an idealistic and romantic view, may leave disillusioned if their experiences of 'whānau' are not always positive (Metge, 1995).

There are other implications of choosing to be part of albeit contemporary whānau. Linda Smith describes some of the more political dimensions encountered when one chooses to be part of a kura kaupapa Māori whānau. For example, in relation to authenticity of identity it "is at the level of whānau (the parents, teachers, kaumātua and families of the children) that many of the politics associated with deciding what being Māori means are contested" (L. Mead 1996; 408).

Taiapa (1995) focuses on economic implications of belonging to whānau. Māori households who choose to be part of whānau may not exist as independent economic units but as parts of a wider group, where resources flow between their households and others. While there is some information available about the educational, linguistic and cultural

benefits of being part of kōhanga reo and kura kaupapa Māori as ‘whānau-driven’ movements (e.g. Hohepa, 1998a; Royal-Tangaere, 1997b; Ruawai-Hamilton, 1994) there has not been any systematic examination of the costs, economic or otherwise, of such choices. This thesis, while not directly focusing on costs, may contribute to our understandings about the nature of challenges facing those who have opted for kaupapa Māori schooling of their children.

How have I chosen to use ‘whānau’ and ‘family’ in the course of this thesis? ‘Family’ has been used when discussing in general a primary socialisation unit that is bound by familial and proximal ties (e.g. Chapter Five). ‘Whānau’ has been used when focusing specifically on Māori families. I had toyed with the idea of using ‘whāmere’, a term that is familiar to many from the Taitokerau and a term used by my father in his ethnography ‘A Māori community in Northland’ (P. Hohepa, 1970).

Parents and children who participated in the studies reported in Part Two of this thesis are identified as whānau in the descriptions and discussions that follow. This is a familiar term used by most if not all the family groupings that participated in the research. This decision was made in the recognition that each of the ten family groupings belongs to whānau through whakapapa connections and that each through their choices of schooling has joined the ‘metaphorical whānau’ of a kura kaupapa Māori. However, for the most part they live in nuclear family arrangements.

So in using whānau, I am acknowledging that although the faces seen or voices heard in the studies dwell mostly in ‘nuclear’ and to a lesser extent in ‘single-parent’, ‘reconstituted’ or ‘extended’ family groupings, they represent whakapapa whānau. They are part of larger ‘flax bushes’ that include others who may not live with them and who may not have participated in any way in the studies. They also represent commitment to kaupapa whānau represented in kōhanga reo and kura kaupapa Māori.

That there is consensus amongst Māori, that energies must be expended to ensure the continuation of Māori as a living, everyday language and culture, cannot be taken for

granted (e.g. Nicholson & Garland, 1991). For the over 60% of Māori households identified as living at the bottom end of the socio-economic heap, daily physical survival consumes a lot of energy and little may be left over to expend on ensuring spiritual, cultural and linguistic survival (M. Hohepa, 1998a). Many Māori are alienated from systems of the wider society of Aotearoa-New Zealand in which they live, let alone from Māori cultural language, educational and spiritual systems. However, amongst Māori there is growing recognition of the educational, cultural and economic importance of te reo Māori, reflected amongst other things by the growing commitment to Māori medium schooling.

One of the obstacles to the continuation of meaningful cultural and linguistic existence is the lack of reinforcement of Māori language and culture in whānau and community contexts. There is a danger facing many of our children and ourselves that unless it becomes an ordinary part of our everyday lives our language will become something essentially learned and used in school settings. Much more than recovering control of the language of education is needed.

Ngareta Timutimu (1995) examines what language loss signifies for Māori at the level of hapū and discusses how this might be addressed. In a case study of members of her own hapū aged between 40 and 60 years she identifies the serious implications of the “middle generation language crisis” for continued existence and growth of traditional knowledge and language. The efforts and the motivations of individuals in this group to learn te reo Māori are highlighted.

Before the interviews I did not view positively the ability of Ngai Tukairangi to maintain and reclaim its language and knowledge. The responses of my whanaunga in the interviews however changed that. Despite inadequacies in language, there exists amongst the informants a powerful will to do better, to address reo. This is reflected in the individual efforts of the informants to improve their language through participation in formal learning situations. What is required is a collective approach to address the language of the hapū, other knowledge will follow from that.

(Timutimu, 1995; 132)

At the level of whānau, processes of socialisation that also effect such regeneration and growth of cultural and linguistic knowledge have similarly been problematised across generations. This is the result of a combination of experiences grouped under the heading 'colonisation' (Cram & Pitama, 1998; L. Mead, 1996; Pihama, 1993; Stewart-Harawira, 1995). Of concern in this thesis is the participation of Māori whānau in the decline of te reo Māori. A critical way whānau have participated in this is simply by choosing not to raise Māori speaking children.

However, reasons for decisions such as these are anything but simple. They are located within a complex of experiences including that of schooling, which will be discussed in more detail below. Suffice to say the impact is clearly reflected in the case of Māori parents of the nineteen-twenties for instance who,

[r]emembering their own experiences at school many brought up their children to speak English from infancy. They did not want the next generation to suffer the disadvantages (and the punishment) they themselves had had to endure. Their children went to school with a fair knowledge of English although many in the rural parts of New Zealand could still speak Māori to their grandparents and other elderly relatives...

(Durie, Latimer & Temm, 1986; 14)

Māori parents of the fifties, sixties and seventies, including those who were fluent in te reo Māori, bowed to the pressure of English in ever growing numbers. Their children were to a large extent reared in homes where Māori was seldom heard. Urbanisation and modernisation, in particular modern media, were also powerful forces impacting on parents' choices around language and the ability of whānau to socialise children as Māori language speakers. Children's often ambivalent attitudes to Māori language were shaped and influenced, along with those of their parents, by increasing exposure to English, over the radio, on television and films and through the printed word.

The children of the sixties and seventies grew up and are now the generation of parents represented in kōhanga reo and kura kaupapa Māori whānau. A substantial number of these parents grew up to be monolingual speakers of English, particularly those of us raised in urban settings (e.g. R. Benton, 1979, 1984; Clay 1982). Many, though by no

means all, parents have become ‘recovering monolinguals’, second language speakers with varying levels of competence in te reo Māori.

HISTORICAL SIGNPOSTS

Before the first contacts between Māori and non-Māori in Aotearoa-New Zealand and for some time afterward Māori was the language of communication in the personal and public domains of Māori life. It was also the major language of communication for economic, cultural and religious exchange between Māori and the first groups of non-Māori (Jenkins, 1991). The ascendancy of Māori language (measured in terms of Māori language speakers who included both Māori and non-Māori) continued during the early formation of ‘New Zealand’ as a colony and during Māori initial experiences of western-style schooling.

Following the introduction of western print literacy to Aotearoa-New Zealand in the early eighteenth century, many Māori developed reading and writing skills in Māori. Early written observations document Māori individuals being taught to read and write in both English and Māori language (Jenkins, 1991; Simon, 1998). Missionaries, who initiated print literacy instruction and established the first schools, opted to teach Māori students to read and write in Māori only (Walker, 1991). This made a lot of practical and pedagogical sense given Māori was the language of the students. There were, however, other reasons for restricting Māori access to instruction in English. There was a desire on the missionaries’ part to keep Māori away from the negative influences of secular Pākehā society. Up until the introduction of Native Schools in 1867 much of the printed Māori texts were religious in nature. By controlling the language of instruction, the language of Māori print literacy and the production of printed Māori language texts, missionaries exerted a great deal of control over the knowledge and information Māori could potentially access through print (Cram & Pitama, 1998).

The transition from Māori as the major medium of formal instruction to English-only accompanied a series of legislative ordinances and acts. The Education Ordinance of 1847

enabled mission schools to access subsidies providing that among other things they gave instruction in the English language. The Native Schools Act 1867 established a national state-controlled system of schools for Māori children. Māori contributed land as well as to the cost of buildings and staff. The schools did not receive state funding unless instruction was through English 'as far as practicable' (Simon, 1998). The 1877 Education Act paved the way for non-Māori children to be provided with free, secular and compulsory education, schooling not becoming compulsory for Māori until 1894 (Simon, 1994; Simon, 1998). The Native Schools Code of 1880 allowed for some Māori to be used with young children, but only as a means to help them learn English. By 1903 official attitudes to the use of Māori had largely reversed and its use in school contexts was strongly disfavoured (Simon, 1998). English medium education was to remain the status quo until the late seventies.

Māori as well as non-Māori advocated and lobbied for the shift from Māori to English as the school language, and for the teaching of English literacy only (Beeby, 1992; Simon, 1998). Whilst on the surface Māori and non-Māori educational agendas appeared overlapping, it has been argued that they were separated into notions of power and control on the one side and notions of access to knowledge and power on the other (Simon, 1998).

That Māori proponents of English medium education were aware of the impact such education would have on Māori language in other contexts such as the home is debatable. It is probable that Māori who supported and in many instances advocated 'English only' approaches in schooling did not foresee the impact that such schooling, in conjunction with urbanisation and modern English media, would have on the strength of whānau to maintain te reo Māori across generations (Beeby, 1992). Some of the Māori leaders who were prominent in actively encouraging Māori to embrace 'Pākehā knowledge' were also in the forefront of later moves to have the importance of Māori language and culture recognised in formal education (Te Puni Kōkiri, 1998).

However, years of subtle and not so subtle discouragement of the use of Māori language both in and out of the home, coupled with beliefs that a good grounding in English helped

constitute “good educational experiences before beginning school” (Royal Tangaere, 1997b; 6), had already loosened the links of intergenerational language transmission so important for the viability of a language and culture.

A century later the state of te reo Māori was considered so critical that both Māori and non-Māori believed there was little chance of reversing the trend of language loss. The Māori language survey carried out in the mid seventies found that only 17.9% of Māori were fluent Māori speakers (R. Benton 1978).

Amongst the respondents to the sociolinguistic survey of Māori language use, only a quarter of the fluent speakers stated “an unambiguous preference for Māori as a language for reading and writing” (R. Benton, 1997; 9). A participant of the 1984 follow-up survey remarked that the ability of the Māori language to stay contemporary was seriously undermined by its exclusion from formal educational domains, “...the long-term, cumulative effect was disastrous, especially on the maintenance and development of literacy in Māori, and thereby the continued modernisation of the language” (R. Benton, 1997; 12).

During the period of Māori language retrenchment that spread across over half of the twentieth century, Māori language was kept from disappearing entirely in a number of ways. Isolated pockets of Māori communities provided some Māori hapū and whānau with relatively safe havens in which to socialise their young to be Māori speakers, particularly before the introduction of mass media in the form of English only television. Most if not all community members spoke Māori. Children who were born, raised and schooled in such areas and who then raised their own children in the same areas were more likely to socialise their own children to be familiar with, if not competent speakers of, te reo Māori.

There were also some protective devices available to the language in areas where there was less community generated support to bring children up as Māori speakers. Linda Smith (1989) discusses how Māori resisted total assimilation foretold by the apparent imminent

death of Māori language. Language activities of the marae, of tangi and hui, practices of karanga, whaikorero, waiata and karakia, were some of the mechanisms that kept Māori language in Māori earshot, even though the opportunities to produce Māori may have been differentiated across gender and age. For instance, in some hapū and iwi areas as well as urban areas, practices such as whaikōrero in particular have given Māori males opportunities to learn and to practise Māori in the spoken form. Today women are slightly more likely to speak Māori than men (Te Puni Kōkiri, 1998). This is understandable, given that “the practical work of language revitalisation in the Māori community has been largely the result of the efforts of women” (Holmes, 1993; 9; L. Smith, 1986b). Men however, are more likely to have medium to high levels of fluency (Te Puni Kōkiri, 1998). This may arguably reflect differential access to particular kinds of Māori language experiences.

The increased profile of Māori in secondary schooling in the 1950s enabled native Māori speakers to teach young Māori their cultural language, albeit as a subject akin to a ‘foreign’ language. It provided opportunities for Māori adults to learn Māori as a second language in order to teach it. Māori language textbooks produced for secondary school Māori language programmes such as those written by Māori educationalist Hoani Waititi and other Māori text materials published by the Government Printer found their way into the hands of many adult Māori attempting to learn their native language.

Māori language did not die as predicted, it survived and while still vulnerable is now coming into a state of regeneration. Its continued existence exemplifies Māori cultural persistence and positions of resistance taken against total assimilation. (I think the fact that many of us writing on the survival and revitalisation of Māori do so in English highlights the sometimes contradictory and compromised nature that this resistance takes).

Te Reo, te Tiriti

Although it was the first human language to develop on these islands, well over a hundred years of post-Māori settlement passed before te reo Māori gained any official status from the colonial imposed system of government. Māori language was not recognised in any

formal way until the Māori Affairs Act was amended in 1974 to declare it as the ancestral language of those of Māori descent.

Such 'recognition' proved to have little practical or legally binding meaning (Fishman, 1991). That New Zealand Governments were and are obliged under the Treaty of Waitangi 1840 to foster and protect the Māori language has been strongly argued (Nicholson & Garland, 1991). The Waitangi Tribunal, established by the Government of 1975 through the Treaty of Waitangi Act of the same year, was largely instrumental in working to realise this responsibility (Walker, 1990). Māori submissions that language was also a taonga protected by the second article of the treaty have been supported and the tribunal has made explicit and repeated recommendations that governments of the day take urgent steps to protect and foster te reo Māori.

In 1986 the tribunal recommended that Māori be given official language status and be available as a language of instruction in schools (Durie, Latimer & Temm, 1986). In the following year the Māori Language Act 1987 declared Māori an official language of New Zealand. Following the Waitangi Tribunal's 1986 recommendation that a statutory body be set up with the mandate to promote Māori language, 'Te Komihana mo te reo Māori' the Māori Language Commission, was established.

Into the nineties

Nineteen ninety-one saw a name change for 'Te Komihana mo te Reo Māori' to 'Te Taura Whiri i te Reo Māori' under the Māori Language Amendment Act. Nineteen ninety-five was designated Te Tau o te Reo Māori, Māori Language Year. During that year Māori people made explicit statements that every day, every week and every year were in fact days, weeks and years of Māori language. "Although this is [the year of] He Taonga Te Reo, it's not for one year, but for the rest of our lives" (Te Taura Whiri i te Reo Māori, 1995b; 2). Such statements reflect the desire that Māori language come in from the cold to become ordinary, an everyday feature of personal and public domains, a language with a past, a present and a continually brightening future.

The achievements made since the late seventies have led Fishman to note that these have been “striking and even have about them a quasi-miraculous mystique” (1991; p230). There is still hesitancy in some quarters to state categorically that the trend of language loss has been reversed. However, the commissioner of Te Taura Whiri o te reo Māori Timoti Karetu, having previously expressed some reservations about the resilience of the Māori language, noted at the 1995 Secondary School Māori speech competition that he was now extremely optimistic given what he had observed of students’ facilities in te reo Māori.

Findings from the 1995 National Māori Language Survey carried out by Te Taura Whiri i te Reo indicate that as we near the end of the twentieth century nearly 60% of the Māori population aged 16 years and over speak some Māori (Te Taura Whiri i te Reo Māori, 1995b, Te Puni Kōkiri, 1998). Language ability and fluency ranges widely with fewer than 17% of the Māori population considered to have fluency levels ranging from medium to very high. Compared with nearly 18% in the seventies, a mere 4% of Māori speakers are now described as having high levels of fluency. These initial results show that there is little room for complacency with regards to the survival of Māori language (Rei, 1998).

The survey revealed that educational settings such as kōhanga reo, kura kaupapa Māori and other Māori medium school sites have become major contexts for Māori language. While contexts such as the whānau and marae had previously protected and sustained Māori language in more isolated hapū areas, English has made substantial inroads. English can be heard on marae in informal language interactions, and can also be heard being used in more formal language protocols. Church settings were the only other contexts where te reo Māori was reported as being commonly heard or spoken (Te Puni Kōkiri, 1998). Findings reflect that in contrast to past generations, educational settings are now significant ones where many Māori speaking children and adults can expect to experience Māori language. They graphically identify the degree of effort required to sustain ‘marae’ and ‘whānau’ as fundamental elements of Māori infrastructure.

TE REO MĀORI IN SCHOOLING

As noted previously, te reo Māori was an integral part of early western forms of schooling developed in Aotearoa-New Zealand. Very early print literacy instruction was carried out in both Māori and English (Jenkins, 1991), although the missionaries who went on to establish church run schooling taught essentially in Māori. However, policies and acts of the last quarter of the nineteenth century culminated in te reo Māori disappearing from formal school instruction.

Māori children were forced not to speak Māori in school (Durie, Latimer & Temm, 1986). There is evidence that sanctions against the language being spoken were extended to include children's parents. Minutes of Waima School located in the papakāinga of a hapū, I belong to show that as early as 1883 school policy forbade both parents and children to speak in Māori. These minutes recorded that,

“[t]o supplement the law forbidding the speaking of Māori in class, or in the school grounds in school hours, no person or parent can engage a child in speaking Māori, and in such cases, any child can inform on that person or parent to the Committee, who shall be empowered to fine that person or parent the sum of five shillings. If it is a matter of emergency, or extreme importance, the child can be removed out of sight or hearing of other children before any communication takes place.

(P. Hohepa, 1981; 23)

The ultimate irony is that the minutes which the above quote summarises were written in te reo Māori. School meeting minutes continued to be recorded in Māori until 1942, when the then head-teacher's wife took meeting minutes in English in the secretary's absence (P. Hohepa, 1981). That the minutes were in Māori signals that it was likely that the meetings themselves involved the use of the language. What is also reflected is that in 1942 there were adults in Waima who were reading and writing as well as speaking in te reo Māori. At present this would be more the exception than the rule.

Through school policies and practices reflected above and in particular those of the first quarter of the twentieth century, Māori children continued being denied opportunities for

intellectual and cognitive development through their language and of their language. The above quote shows that some were possibly being denied opportunities to develop their intimate relationships with whānau in and through te reo Māori. The ongoing effects were not just educational and linguistic, the psychological impact was immense. In some instances young Māori internalised negative experiences and attitudes and in turn developed their own negative attitudes towards their whānau, their culture and their language. Others became very angry - at their parents, at the 'system' - and struggled to understand why they could not understand, let alone speak, their own language. The anger and resolve to interrupt the cycle of language deprivation culminated in groups such as Nga Tamatoa and Te Reo Māori Society in the sixties and seventies, kōhanga reo and kura kaupapa Māori whānau in the eighties and through the nineties. These groups and others lobbied intensively for te reo Māori to have a place in Māori children's education, mounting attack at educational, political and legal levels (Rei, 1998; Walker, 1990).

The exclusion of Māori language from the primary school curriculum lasted through to the nineteen seventies. In contrast to the primary school curriculum, Māori language was recognised as suitable for Māori secondary school students in Native Schools (e.g. New Zealand Parliament, 1909, E-3; 9). It was offered as a secondary school subject at University Entrance level in 1923 and was available at School Certificate level in 1945. While approved as a university degree subject as early as 1925, it was not taught until 1952 at the University of Auckland.

In 1970 the recommendation was made that Māori be offered as an optional subject in primary schools with appreciable numbers of Māori students, making some inroads. My first school-based Māori language learning took place in 1971 on the floor of the school staff-room, an 'optional extra' that was largely dependent on our 'real class' teacher releasing us. Prior to that, arguably the only significant Māori language context available for primary aged Māori (and a few non-Māori) children growing up in West Auckland suburbs was in the form of 'Manutaki Juniors'. This Māori performing arts group, set up and run by Pita and Aroha Sharples in the late sixties, along with other Māori community

people the late Tuini Hakaraia and Don Rameka to name but two, foreshadowed what now is often described as a period of 'Māori renaissance' (Walker, 1987).

The development of a Māori language syllabus began in 1980, with the draft syllabus entitled 'Tihē Mauri Ora' being sent to all primary schools in 1987. Many of the teachers who responded to the accompanying questionnaire reported that they did not feel confident enough to teach Māori language in their classrooms. A draft of 'Te Ata Hāpara: A starter Māori language course for teachers' appeared in 1989. It provided ideas on how teachers learning Māori could start passing on the language to children in their classes. 'Te Ata Hāpara' led directly into 'Te Matariki', a three-tiered Māori language programme for primary schools released in 1990. The accompanying introduction of 'Taha Māori' into the official national curriculum in 1984 was subjected to heavy critique from Māori educationalists (see L. Mead, 1996; L. Smith, 1986a; G. Smith, 1997). Suffice to say, the appearance of 'Māori language and culture' under the auspices of Taha Māori, into essentially non-Māori, English-medium classrooms was not seen as the harbinger of the regeneration of te reo me ōna tikanga, or as an effective intervention into Māori underachievement.

Developments involving the introduction of Māori language and culture into schools did not go unnoticed or uncriticised by non-Māori, albeit sometimes for different reasons. For instance, commentary from the end of the seventies reflects a negative view about the amount of attention and energy being expended on teaching Māori language and culture, at the seeming expense of other kinds of intervention into the education of Māori children. In particular in relation to intervening and overcoming Māori 'educational disadvantage';

New Zealand educators are well aware of the literature on disadvantage and that it could be applied to the education of Māori children. Were this done we would see many more projects directed at skill acquisition to supplement the education of Māoris in the ordinary classrooms or take them out of the classroom altogether in order to provide an appropriate education...

Instead of this we find a great deal of attention paid to the advantages of teaching Māori language and culture. Since most Māoris are disadvantaged in their own culture, chiefly because there are too few people and institutions to teach it to them, this effort is

worthwhile. But the argument that this alone will overcome educational disadvantage is implausible. Pride in one's culture is a fine thing - everyone should have it - but one should also be able to read, write and spell, and develop the capacity to communicate in English.

(Ritchie & Ritchie, 1978; 116)

This viewpoint reflects the hardness of the dominant ideological view of the time, that English was the critical element necessary for Māori children's educational and societal wellbeing. Any softening towards te reo Māori was in terms of seeing it as an optional (though desirable) extra. For a good part of the twentieth century the key tasks identified as facing Māori whānau and their children still essentially involved becoming more like Pākehā and less like Māori. While many Māori and non-Māori work hard to shake off such ideology it still surfaces regularly, even amongst sectors most committed to validating te reo Māori including kura kaupapa Māori whānau.

Continued linguistic and cultural activism through to the eighties saw the emergence of 'Te Kōhanga Reo'. A number of reports centring on te reo Māori as it pertained to Māori schooling appeared during this time. One such report by Spolsky (1987) predicted some of the shortfalls currently being experienced by Māori language education, in particular the shortage of suitably qualified teachers. The Māori Educational Development Conference held in 1984 at Turangawaewae (Walker, 1984) was an indication of Māori recognition of the need for the development of schooling through te reo Māori. However, successive governments failed to show much in the way of real commitment other than the production of reports, the recommendations of which were seldom fully actioned. Meanwhile, children in kōhanga reo reached the age of five and pressure was exerted by their whānau on local schools to meet their needs.

Disillusionment with schools' and Ministry of Education's responses (or more the lack of it) to the learning needs and aspirations of kōhanga reo whānau resulted in some parents opting into independently set up and operated schools. The first of these schools began in 1985, involving some of those who had set up or had been 'Manutaki Juniors' almost twenty years before. The schools later became known under the umbrella term 'Kura

Kaupapa Māori'. By the time Kura Kaupapa Māori was recognised as a school type under Section 155 of the Education Act 1989, there were six kura operating (G. Smith, 1997).

Kura Kaupapa Māori as a school type was the first to provide Māori language medium education within Māori cultural and philosophical frameworks (Rata, 1991; G. Smith, 1997). Parents and whānau who shaped it were driven by desires for their children to continue as Māori speakers and many were also influenced by their own painful educational and linguistic pasts (L. Smith, 1992). Arguably a significant ingredient of the early and continuing development of Kura Kaupapa Māori was the emergence of 'Te Aho Matua' as a philosophy statement. This document has guided the attempts to provide a schooling type in which Māori knowledge and world views are an integral part (Nepe, 1991).

The naming game

The development of kaupapa Māori schooling was pre-dated by other school types offering instruction through Māori, notwithstanding schools operated by missionaries in the nineteenth century.

By the early nineteen-seventies there were still a small number of rural Māori speaking communities. Communities where children were still being socialised in their homes as Māori language speakers were identified as potential locations for piloting bilingual schooling. During 1973-74, the Māori Unit of the New Zealand Council for Educational Research examined the feasibility of Māori bilingual schooling at a district high school at Motatau in the Bay of Islands. Plans to develop an integrated programme across the primary and secondary levels were abandoned as a consequence of changes within the Auckland Education Board (R. Benton, 1981). Manawatu was identified as another possible site for bilingual schooling but the community comprising of several cultures was not as enthusiastic. In 1977 Ruatoki School in the Bay of Plenty became the first officially designated 'bilingual' school to use te reo Māori as a medium of instruction in the twentieth century. During the eighties the number of bilingual offerings increased to nine.

The first bilingual schools differed from later developments in Māori medium schooling in significant ways. Firstly, these schools were initially set up to cater for children from homes in which Māori was a primary language of communication and socialisation. Objectives of these schools could be stated as supporting the 'mother tongue' and increasing achievement (A. Smith, 1979). One of the objectives of these bilingual schools then was to turn Māori speaking children into more successful achievers in English language, in a sense the early bilingual programmes were effectively maintenance and transition programmes (Baker, 1996).

By the eighties and on into the nineties there was a significant shift in definitions and expectations of bilingual education. More and more non-Māori speaking parents who had not been able to provide their children with primary Māori language socialisation in the home were wanting bilingual schooling options for their children. The push was for such schools to take on a Māori language teaching and regeneration role, rather than that of maintaining a language being developed in the homes. Some schools and units tried to meet the changing needs and aspirations of parents and children. Immersion options also became available. However it was often a case of 'too little too late'. As noted above, local schools and the Ministry of Education were not able to, or not willing to, effect changes needed to support and facilitate the education of children from *kōhanga reo* *whānau*. This resulted in children not being enrolled in or being removed from their local schools, whether they provided some form of bilingual education or not. By the late nineties there had been a distinct movement away from the provision of 'bilingual' options.

'Immersion education' and 'Māori medium education' are umbrella terms that have come to describe, not without controversy, programmes with Māori language as a medium of instruction. Both are problematic. Immersion as a school type emerged out of social, historical and political circumstance far removed from that of Māori (Lambert & Tucker, 1972). The initial development of immersion education reflects wider social and linguistic contexts in which the status of the school language was not compromised, and in which children's native or cultural language was secure as the home language. In the case of the

French immersion experience, cultural and philosophical underpinnings of conventional schooling were not considered potentially problematic and were not challenged. Similarly, parental and societal aspirations in relation to French immersion education as a school choice did not incorporate the wider goal of the regeneration of a threatened language.

Māori medium education as a catchall term is also problematic as it does not differentiate amounts of instruction being carried out in Māori. But more significantly, “Māori medium education” nowhere near adequately captures or reflects the wider cultural, political and philosophical tensions that have underpinned the development of such initiatives as kōhanga reo and kura kaupapa Māori.

For kōhanga reo, it is not only the label “Māori medium education” that is problematic. It is argued that the term ‘early childhood education’ has been similarly misapplied to this initiative (Royal Tangaere, 1996).

Kōhanga reo is more than early childhood education, it’s a revolution...Kōhanga is not a kindy, its a revolutionary movement as much for the parents and whānau as it is for the kids.
(Sandra Lee, MP in Tapine & Waiti, 1997; 26)

Whānau and te reo Māori are essential elements of te kōhanga reo and kura kaupapa Māori. Iritana Tawhiwhirangi (in Tapine & Waiti, 1997; 22) observes that

Kōhanga reo came from the simple statement of our old people who said, mena i hiahia tātou ki te pupuri i te reo, kia mau tonu mō ake tonu ake, me hoki anō ki te āhua whakatō te reo a ō tātou mātua tipuna. [if we want to hold onto the language forever, we must return to the way it was instilled by our grandparents and ancestors]

In 1996 the number of children enrolled in kōhanga reo had reached 14,032 (just under half of all Māori children in some form of ‘early childhood education’). Non-affiliated kōhanga reo and whānau playgroups run through te reo Māori were also in operation, approximately totalling 700 kōhanga reo or the like (Ministry of Education, 1997d).

In the same year, there were 3,222 children were enrolled in 43 kura. In comparison, the number of conventional or 'mainstream' schools offering instruction through the medium of Māori increased from 50 to 251 between the years of 1987 to 1993. By 1996, the total number of Māori primary school students in some form of 'Māori medium education' including kura kaupapa Māori was 27,669, 20% of all Māori school-aged students (Te Puni Kōkiri, 1997; 17). Māori participation in kaupapa Māori programmes ranged from nearly 50% for kōhanga reo to just over 2% for kura. Kura kaupapa Māori, specifically developed to cater for kōhanga reo graduates initially for 'primary school' years, now extends through 'secondary school' years. By 1998, forty-two new kura kaupapa Māori had been built and seventeen existing state schools had been re-designated as kura kaupapa Māori.

These figures seem to show that more and more Māori children are having substantial formal learning experiences through te reo Māori. However, 'Māori medium education', officially divided into three levels, ranges from 30% to 100% instruction in Māori. This meant that in actuality only 8565 Māori students were enrolled in Māori medium education that reached levels of at least 80% immersion in 1996 (Ministry of Education, 1997d; 45).

Given these statistics, it is highly probable that large numbers of kōhanga reo children are ending up in classrooms that have low levels of actual Māori language use. It is also highly probable that many parents of Māori children coming out of kōhanga either choose to or have no choice but to send their children to English medium classrooms. It is evident that very little real heed was taken of warnings made in the last decade that unless dramatic measures were taken, there would be a chronic shortage of human as well as other resources required to provide quality education through the medium of te reo Māori.

At the closing of the twentieth century Māori medium education is a site of significant struggle, particularly in terms of who should be in control of its development and its definition - government or the movement itself. The common feature that underpins all Māori medium options is commitment to the maintenance and promotion of te reo Māori me ōna tikanga through whānau control and involvement. However, the growth in demand

for these programmes has been such, that a major educational challenge of the nineteen-nineties has been the development of appropriate and adequate curriculum, resources, teachers and evaluation and assessment procedures for Māori medium settings. Another major challenge involves articulation and realisation of the forms and functions that 'whānau control and involvement' needs to take.

Māori language development in 'educational' settings

A small number of studies have been carried out in kōhanga reo and kura kaupapa Māori that focus on children's Māori language development. As described earlier in Chapter One, research for my Masters thesis examined te kōhanga reo as a context for language teaching and learning (Hohepa, 1990; Hohepa, McNaughton & Jenkins, 1996; Hohepa, Smith, Smith, & McNaughton 1992). The study involved regular observation of three children's language experiences in a kōhanga reo. Activities and routines in the kōhanga reo provided an environment that supported the children's learning and use of Māori language. Evidence of a reciprocal interrelationship between children's socialisation as Māori language speakers and socialisation into Māori preferred beliefs and values fundamental to kōhanga reo philosophy was provided.

A study carried out by Tania Ka'ai (1990) compared and contrasted Māori pedagogical patterns she observed across three kōhanga reo with those of the bilingual and English medium new entrant classrooms that six kōhanga reo five year-olds went on to. Systematic observations of the children's transitions into school settings revealed that they experienced varying degrees of mismatch in terms of the pedagogical principles in operation. Ka'ai argued that the best match for kōhanga reo children is achieved through the provisions of kura kaupapa Māori.

Mere White's (1995) study also looked at language use in a kōhanga reo, focusing on scaffolding (Wood, 1988) of children's language interactions in structured, ritualistic routines of karakia and mihimihi. These language-mediated routines were identified as providing a "quick start" for children's use of te reo Māori as they came into kōhanga, regardless of whether they were starting as first or second language learners. A secondary

aspect of the study involved discussing connections between Te Whāriki, the national early childhood curriculum guidelines and the philosophy and practices of Te Kōhanga Reo.

These three studies all argue for the existence of distinctive Māori pedagogical structures in kōhanga reo settings. They provide evidence that such settings can work effectively to support children's acquisition of Māori linguistic and cultural knowledge. Ka'ai (1990) in particular has shown the need for this support to extend beyond pre-school years into formal schooling.

To date there has been very little formal research undertaken on the language development of children in Māori medium schooling settings. Murphy and Hollings (1993) describe some of the features in the Māori spoken by children in a kura kaupapa Māori. They focus on "interlanguage" and "aberrant grammatical fossilisations" in the language of the children and consider the implications these have for teaching in these settings and for language change. The doctoral research of Tania Ka'ai (1995) involving the development of culturally responsive assessment theories and practices in written language for kura kaupapa Māori provides information about children's oral and written competencies in te reo Māori. The approach taken is similar to that of Murphy and Hollings, one that focuses on use as product, rather than process. The study had as a primary objective, the strategic linking of the New Zealand National Qualifications Framework and standards based assessment as an emancipatory mechanism for kura kaupapa Māori schooling. What both studies do reflect is the need to explore ways to extend and broaden Māori language uses and functions, as well as language contexts for children who speak Māori.

TE REO MĀORI OUTSIDE THE CLASSROOM

Today, Māori adults are learning to speak Māori as a second language in a variety of ways, motivated by a range of forces. For some, the motivation and the learning is philosophically and physically located within hapū or iwi epistemologies, values and forms of Māori language (Timutimu, 1995). For many kura kaupapa Māori parents who live out of their hapū and iwi areas, myself included (a Te Māhurehure Irish, English Ngā Puhi

bringing up children in West Auckland who are also of Ngāti Porou, Ngai Tahu and Danish descent), our motivations and experiences in trying to gain Māori linguistic and cultural knowledge are additionally complex (e.g. Hohepa, 1998b). Although 'parenthood' is not necessarily the initial or primary motivator, the desire for one's children to be Māori language speakers can be implicated in the motivations of parents.

There are a number of potential avenues by which adult whānau members might pursue te reo Māori. Universities, technical institutes, private training establishments and various teacher education institutions provide courses in Māori language, a few provide instruction through Māori. Provisions of these institutions include courses at diploma and degree levels. Te Kōhanga Reo National Trust and Te Ataarangi Incorporated also provide Māori second language courses for adults and parents involved in kōhanga reo and kura kaupapa Māori.

A recent survey of te reo Māori provisions did not identify many at "grassroots" levels (Keegan, 1997; 7), although this may reflect the avenues used to gather information. A significant 'flax roots' development is Wānanga reo. Wānanga reo initially developed out of a growing iwi or tribal focus. Ngāti Raukawa ran the first such Māori language courses in the early eighties, primarily for Ngāti Raukawa descendants, although people from other iwi did attend (Rei, 1998).

(I took part in a Ngāti Raukawa wānanga reo in 1983 and feel enormous gratitude to this iwi for providing my first opportunity to use our language as a living, 'natural' language within contexts of daily life, after having studied it through school and university ostensibly as an academic exercise. During this wānanga I even dreamed in te reo Māori, albeit in black and white! He mihi, he whakawhetai nui ki a koutou o te Wānanga o Raukawa. Nā koutou tēnei i whangai i tō tātou reo ataahua).

Wānanga Reo o Raukawa were an integral part of 'Te Whakatupuranga Rua Mano' or Generation 2000, the strategic plan developed by Ngāti Raukawa to take their iwi into the twenty-first century (Nicholson, 1987). They provided a blueprint from which other iwi and communities of interest (e.g. Māori tertiary students) have developed their own forms of wānanga reo.

Te A'u Rei, (1998) highlights the potential of wānanga reo to support language regeneration at whānau, hapū and iwi levels. In particular he identifies how it can provide effective support for kōhanga reo and kura kaupapa Māori by helping to bridge the intergenerational language transmission gap. He proposes that;

[i]n order to maintain an on-going commitment to the pre-school and primary school Māori language programmes, education authorities need to subsidize language enrichment classes for the parents and care-givers of these children as is done in Hawai'i. Support programmes are offered to parents and care-givers of children in the Hawaiian immersion equivalents of Punana Leo (Kōhanga Reo) and Kula Kaiapuni (Kura Kaupapa).

(Rei, 1998; 56)

There are other contexts that potentially contribute to whānau levels of Māori. Whānau involved in studies described and discussed in Chapter Eight and Chapter Nine participated in a range of activities, providing exposure to and demanding the use of, te reo Māori. For example, parents belonged to and participated in kapa haka and waka ama groups, they learned about the use of taiaha and other weaponry, and they belonged to Māori churches. In all of these contexts, Māori language was described as an integral and audible feature.

Te reo Māori in the home

There is little information on Māori language use and development within the confines of homes other than that it is a rarity (personal communications; see also Benton et al, 1996; Te Puni Kōkiri, 1998). By far the most troublesome findings of the 1995 Māori Language Survey pertain to the use of Māori language within the home (Te Puni Kōkiri, 1998). Only 14% of those who identified as speakers of the language (over half of whom were highly fluent) reported having whole conversations in Māori in their homes on a daily basis (Te Puni Kōkiri, 1998; 49). Thus the majority of Māori adults can expect to hear Māori in their homes irregularly. Only the more fluent can expect to hear Māori spoken in other people's homes, and this is likely to occur in one or two households that they regularly visit.

A finding that has critical implications for Māori speaking children is that only 10% of Māori speakers younger than 45 years tend to have whole Māori conversations in their

homes. These adults represent the Māori language speakers in the age group to which parents of children attending kōhanga reo and kura kaupapa Māori could be expected to belong. Over half of this group said that they never had such conversations. According to survey findings, the adults who do use the language are likely to have begun speaking Māori before the age of six.

The survey found that nearly a quarter of adult Māori lived in households that included Māori speaking children aged 15 years or under. Twenty percent of this group described themselves as medium to highly fluent speakers, 52% had low levels of fluency, and 28% were non-speakers. Just under 40% of those who could speak Māori said that they spoke mainly in Māori to the children. Indications are that it is the more fluent adults who interact in Māori with children in the home. From this we can infer that kōhanga reo and kura parents who have low fluency levels or who are beginning to speak Māori as a second language are not likely to be using it as a means of communication in the home to any great extent. Such findings and inferences that can be made from them highlight the critical need to generate contexts and activities calling for the use of Māori language in homes. Further, it points to the need to identify ways of utilising these opportunities efficiently in ways that facilitate and support the language learning of adults as well as children. Keegan (1997; 3) recommends that;

Funding be made available for research to find out to what extent the whānau members of kōhanga and kura kaupapa Māori/bilingual units are actually learning the Māori language, and if they are not, what are the barriers preventing them.

Identifying a need for parents to have access to information about ways they can support their children in te reo is not recent (e.g. Nicholson, 1987). There are now growing calls to put more formal energy into supporting Māori language development and use in personal domains such as the home, for example by establishing personalised advisory services in the community (Chrisp, 1998).

A study carried out by Arapera Royal Tangaere shows that whānau relationships in the home can be a resource for older whānau members learning Māori. Royal Tangaere

examined the role played by her kōhanga reo daughter Rangi in the transfer of Māori language and cultural knowledge from kōhanga reo to home, through her home-based interactions with her parents and siblings. Royal Tangaere describes how Rangi assisted her mother's Māori second language development in strategic, purposeful ways, as well as how Rangi unconsciously supported her own learning, mainly through the medium of waiata (1997; 54 and 58).

While whānau interactions are a naturally occurring potential source of 'Māori language data' for second language learners, they are not a guaranteed one. Royal Tangaere (1997) poignantly describes how and why Rangi preferred to interact at home in English, particularly with her mother. Reaping linguistic and cultural benefits from having kōhanga reo or kura kaupapa Māori children in a whānau is not a simple task. It is not necessarily something that will 'just happen'. It requires a lot of thought, hard work and sensitivity and it needs to be done in a way that protects children's integrity as children, rather than positioning them as would-be saviours of a language and culture.

There is evidence that children are developing Māori language, however it is less certain that other whānau members, including parents, are also developing higher levels of fluency (Keegan, 1997). For initiatives aimed at regenerating Māori language through socialising and educating children as speakers of Māori to be effective, those who have intimate contact with these children, in the personal domains of home and whānau, also need to be learning and speaking the language.

SUMMARY

Māori-led initiatives in education have emerged in the last two decades to intervene in the continued and sustained loss of Māori language and knowledge, coupled with severe Māori underachievement. Underlying many of these initiatives has been a re-assertion and reconstitution of 'whānau' as practice as well as a valued concept. It was in the private practice of institutions such as whānau, as well as in other personal domains significant in Māori culture, that Māori social activities and the use of Māori language continued. While

Māori culture was being systemically attacked as well as subtly undermined in public and institutional domains, homes, hapū communities and marae provided ‘ahi kā’ for te reo Māori. Now it is personal domains, the home in particular, that are being identified as a weak link in attempts to regenerate the language and to re-attach the chain of intergenerational language transmission. It is no surprise that Te Taura Whiri i te reo Māori is currently distributing a book titled ‘Using te reo Māori at home: some common questions and answers’.

People working at the flax roots of educational initiatives aimed at regenerating Māori have voiced concerns such as Māori language ‘seeming to be a nine to three school day language for members of kura and kōhanga whānau’. Observations are that it appears to be making disappointingly few inroads into the majority of kōhanga and kura children’s homes and communities. Are there chilling echoes of the deficit-oriented observations made in the seventies, about the less than adequate nature of Māori parents and homes for supporting Māori children’s English language development needed to meet school requirements (e.g. Department of Education, 1972)?

Alternatively, what such observations might indicate is that the ‘home-school’ split, which kura kaupapa Māori and kōhanga reo in part evolved to mediate, still needs to be addressed in strategic and effective ways albeit now for differing reasons. The split is not so much one of culture, language and agenda, as it was for many of the parents’ and grandparents’ generations, but one of language. Given that the agenda out of which kōhanga and kura developed included the realisation of language regeneration, one potential way of bridging this split is by working in homes to claim space for te reo Māori as a significant medium of communication.

The following chapter examines efforts to regenerate endangered languages more closely. In particular, the roles that ‘family’ and ‘literacy’, play in language regeneration are discussed.