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ABSTRACT

This monograph argues that there is very little contained within recent policy reforms which will significantly alter the educational experiences of Maori pupils. Maori children suffer disproportionate and high levels of schooling failure across a range of indices, from poor achievement levels to high truancy rates. The measure of success of any reform ought to be its ability to deal with what is arguably the worst affected group in schooling and education – Maori pupils. By this measure, the raft of educational changes and reforms are inadequate. Maori educational crisis, it is argued, will continue. Some hope for meaningful intervention is contained within the Maori schooling initiatives of Te Kohanga Reo and Kura Kaupapa Maori. Why do these initiatives gain the support of Maori parents and their children? What are the successful intervention elements contained within these initiatives and how can they be applied across schooling generally to inform policy development which will make a difference?

The author, Professor Graham Hingangaroa Smith is a Senior Lecturer in The School of Education at The University of Auckland.

(This monograph is the keynote address presented at the Post Primary Teachers Association Curriculum Conference in Christchurch, May 1991)
Poroporoaki Mo Hone Tapiata

"Taku manawa e,aku manawa e
Aue, Aue
Kapakapa kau ana te tau o tuku manawa
Kapakapa kau ana te tau o tuku ate
Kapakapa kau ana te tau o tuku uma
Ki aku matua
Ki aku tautau huanga
Ki aku toronga
Taurangatia nei e au
Kapakapa kau ana
Ka paia nei he matua whare
Ka hinga ana, ka hanga ano
Matua tangata, ka hinga ana
Hinga atu tau, ka ngaro ra
Aue, taukiri e .......
"

"No reira e te Rangatira e Hone
Moe mai, moe mai i to moenga roa
Haere te pou totara. Haere te waha Korero,
Haere te puna wananga rapu i te ora
mo te iwi whanui .......
Haere ki te Putahi - nui - a - Rehua
Ki te poututanga nui o Pipiri
Ki te urunga te taka
Ki te moenga te whakaarahia
Waiho ma te hunga i mahue i muri
e whai atu i co tapuwae.
No reira haere ki te timatanga
haere ki te whakamutunga. ....."
Hikohiko te Uira
Papa te whaitiriti
I Kanapu i te Rangi
Ru ana te whenua e
He aha tera?

The lightning flashes
The thunder claps
Covering the sky
The earth trembles
What for?

(From ‘Kura Tiwaka’ a Ngati Porou Haka Taparahi)

PRELIMINARY COMMENTS

Kia ora taatou e huhihi ana, tena taatou katoa -

First of all, thank you for the invitation to participate in this important conference. I welcome the opportunity to join with you in the urgent task of developing an even better education and schooling system for all children of New Zealand. I might also add at this point, that given the tremendous pace of change within our education and schooling system, I should say that I am, indeed, delighted to be still here some sixty seconds into the presentation - ‘touch wood’ and a ‘quick glance over the shoulder’, just in case! I would have liked also, to have begun this address by using one of the more standard opening comments, for example; ‘Education is enveloped in exciting and challenging times ... ’. However, such utterances would seem inappropriate and perhaps trite as we move into our fifth year of major educational and schooling reform. Even more disconcerting perhaps, is that there appears to be no immediate end in sight. On the contrary, the juggernaut of educational reform appears to be gathering momentum. In such times the only certainty appears to be uncertainty, not only for pupils, but for teachers, administrators and parents.
INTRODUCTION

The introductory tauparapara (metaphorical chant) used to preface this paper is particularly pertinent to the themes I intend to develop today. At one level of meaning the metaphor suggests that despite the awesome power and grandeur of the lightning, the thunder and the earthquake people, have endured. At another level of interpretation this metaphor portends the comparative powerlessness and vulnerability of people in relation to wider structural forces. Both of these meanings describe aspects of Maori experience within the current context of major educational reform. The illusion of ‘meaningful reform’ of Maori education on the one hand, and the relative powerlessness of Maori people as a group to control their own lives (within a societal context of unequal power relations) on the other hand, correlates with a crisis of legitimacy of the educational reforms of the moment. The real test as to the degree of success of the present reforms will be in the extent to which they confront and overthrow the most apparent crisis within education and schooling - that related to Maori. While Maori people are disproportionately represented in almost every crisis area of education - little is discernible within the whole raft of current reforms which addresses itself specifically to altering Maori education and schooling outcomes. Judged by this criteria, the current reforms might already be considered a dismal failure - and again, highlights a significant shortcoming of devolution policy as it applies in education, that is, the exporting of increasing responsibility to deal with these issues to the local level, on to Principals, teachers, Boards of Trustees and ultimately on to the pupils themselves. Such an abdication by the State in respect of Maori education ought to be challenged. From a professional educators point of view, such a position is untenable, not only because of the partnership obligations contracted by Maori with
the Crown in the Treaty of Waitangi, and not just because of social justice or equity considerations, nor solely because New Zealand is about to sign the Draft Declaration of Indigenous Peoples’ rights sponsored by the United Nations, but more so perhaps, because of the ethics, standards and codes of practice implicit within our roles as professional educators of children.

It is also acknowledged that Maori needs in education are not homogenous. An unfortunate failing of much of past and present policy directed at Maori tends to be ‘blanket’ policy based on this false assumption and is consequently ineffective. Kura Kaupapa Maori provides but a single option for Kohanga Reo graduates - it is a successful option in language ability outcomes, in general achievement levels and as far as parental choice reflects. It needs to be understood on this basis and because it is ‘successful’ carefully analysed in order to determine what can be learned which might have a broader application in respect of mediating the general crisis engulfing Maori across the whole of schooling.

This paper argues that the current education reforms contain very little which will intervene significantly in the current schooling crisis related to Maori education. Firstly because Maori needs are not addressed to any great degree either directly or specifically and secondly, because the reforms which are suggested for Maori contain elements that have been tried and have failed previously. It is further argued that the most meaningful change which has occurred in this period of major educational reform dating from Picot, has in fact been the emergence of Te Kohanga Reo and
subsequently the primary schooling option based on Te Kohanga Reo, Kura Kaupapa Maori schooling.

Kura Kaupapa Maori initially evolved as a ‘resistance’ type initiative to the educational crisis faced by many Maori within existing state schooling options. It was started by Kohanga Reo communities outside of the mainstream, state schooling structures. Most of these schools now exist within the system as wholly state school options. The arguments developed here are that the changes necessary for Kura Kaupapa Maori schooling have occurred externally to (and perhaps in spite of) the original Tomorrow’s Schools reform package. In these terms the emergence of Kura Kaupapa Maori provide a manifest critique of the Tomorrow’s Schools reforms. In fact, it was argued successfully by Te Kohanga Reo communities as part of the establishment case, that the Tomorrow’s Schools reforms were inadequate to such an extent (despite the 21 pupil ‘opt out’ clause) that they precluded the establishment of these schools within a reasonable time span and that therefore, separate legislation would be required, (although this was not the only reason for legislation). Of interest in this paper are the reasons why these schools were developed, the processes of development and the potential that these schools have to intervene within a general educational crisis faced by disproportionate numbers of Maori. Put another way, given the relative freedom to choose, what choices have been made by Kura Kaupapa Maori parents in respect of what constitutes an appropriate schooling?; what administrative, organisational, pedagogical and curriculum choices have been made and employed within Kura Kaupapa Maori? Finally and perhaps most significantly, out of the successful elements
of Te Kohanga Reo and Kura Kaupapa Maori a tentative theory for successful change in Maori education has begun to emerge.

This paper adopts the stance that Maori cultural struggle (oppression) is not separable from the economic struggle (exploitation) and that there needs to be an acknowledgement of the dialectic between these two positions. There is also a need to devise appropriate strategies and responses in respect of Maori cultural aspirations on the one hand and mainly working class (and underclass) social positioning on the other. Thus the context for the Tomorrow’s Schools reforms and the emergence of the Kura Kaupapa Maori alternative schooling initiative, needs to be understood against a background of wider social, political and economic influences.

The wider context of the recent education reforms in New Zealand have been well summarised and reported by many commentators (see ACCESS 1988) however, a quick overview of the context is also important in respect of the arguments to be developed here and much of this context was also ably described by Professor Bates in his Address this morning.

Generally speaking the schooling crisis in New Zealand has developed in relation to a world wide economic crisis, which in New Zealand has become manifest in persistent and high levels of unemployment and in an increasing national debt. The pressure of rising and seemingly permanent unemployment has had the effect of creating a series of legitimacy crises within the state structures generally and within education and schooling particularly. Thus unemployment has not only created a
credibility crisis for the Welfare State it has also put severe pressure on the credibility of schooling and education. Some examples of schooling crises which have emerged alongside escalating public concern over unemployment and subsequent calls for educational reform, are exampled here;

A crisis of educational underachievement
Schools generally are blamed for failing to adequately produce competent and appropriately credentialed students and are therefore seen as being directly responsible for unemployment.

A crisis of the instrumental view of schooling
The hegemony that ‘good schooling’ and ‘good credentials’ will get you a ‘good job’ has been undermined by an unfolding reality where well qualified students also failed to get jobs as there were just not enough jobs available.

A crisis of knowledge in schools
The curriculum has been criticised as being irrelevant and therefore incompatible with the job market.

A crisis of equality
Inequality has persisted as a significant outcome of schooling despite the belief and support for the egalitarian intentions of New Zealand schooling as prescribed in the Beeby dictum extolling social objectives aligned with ‘equality’.
A crisis of declining societal standards

Schools are perceived as failing to adequately influence pupils with appropriate integrating behaviours such as ‘citizenship’, ‘national pride’ and ‘moral’ standards.

A crisis of State responsibility

The boundaries governing the State’s obligations in education have become blurred as the State seeks to divest itself of economic responsibility (in this sense ‘blame’) but at the same time maintain power and control. An important project faced by educators is the necessity to reconstruct the State’s responsibilities and to prevent the State from opting out of its obligations to protect and to maintain democratic principles for all of New Zealand's citizens.

Such crises (and others not mentioned here) have to some extent influenced both the initial Tomorrow’s Schools changes and also subsequent educational reforms. What essentially has been a legitimisation crisis for state education and schooling has subsequently been exported to parents and the local communities through the new reforms. Schools, and therefore parents and communities, have assumed increased responsibility for the delivery of education, although the real power associated with policy formulation and decision-making has remained within a smaller, more streamlined centralised state structure. The shift of responsibility to parents and community has been skillfully facilitated through the development of common sense beliefs related to the creation of schooling crises; thus ideologies such as ‘falling standards’, ‘interest group capture’, ‘teacher incompetency’, ‘overly liberal curriculum’, and ‘greater parental input needed’ have been freely ‘sold and bought’ in this context.
of state self preservation. The fundamentalist doctrinaire of the ‘free market’ which has been used to attack and dismantle the Welfare State structures has also been employed to facilitate the restructuring of schooling. The incorporation of ‘free market’ ideology into schooling has seen a flood of new educational rhetoric; pupils are ‘consumers’, administrators are termed ‘managers’ and the use of concepts such as ‘accountability’, ‘excellence’, ‘efficiency’, ‘standards’, ‘choice’ and ‘freedom of the individual’ are now common place. The National Party of 1991 have taken the original Picot reforms developed under Labour even further, to the point where the reductionist economic logic of the ‘free market’ has been inserted into almost every aspect of schooling policy.

While schooling and education has undergone major change at all levels, to date, very few of the educational reforms, in terms of structural change have been targeted specifically at what is arguably the most apparent crisis in New Zealand schooling - that which is related to Maori. For example, Maori are over represented in almost every crisis statistical analysis; in truancy rates, underachievement rates, retention rates and in expulsion rates. Perhaps even more alarming, is that with the dismantling of the Welfare State, Maori people more than any other minority interest group are affected, in that Maori constitute the major recipients of Welfarism in New Zealand. This contradictory situation posed by Maori people and their cultural baggage has not been missed by the opportunist proponents of new right reform. For example, at the National Party Conference (May 1990), a standing ovation was accorded M.P. Simon Upton’s speech in which he claimed that Maori people were making unjustifiable demands on Crown resources by being overwhelmingly dependent on the Welfare
State. Maori people are in his interpretation, chose to be unhealthy, unemployed; deliberately poor!

Maori language, knowledge, values and culture have been directly undermined by both the economic (libertarian) and the moral (authoritarian) sectors of the new right in an attempt to dismiss the viability and legitimacy of Maori language, knowledge and culture, simply because new right theory is unable or has no ‘interest’ in attempting to sufficiently explain or deal with notions of ethnicity. The disconcerting element contained within the new right attacks on Maori language, knowledge, values and culture is that nothing substantive in the way of a positive structural intervention, from the Maori point of view, has been suggested as an alternative. The pervasive feature of these attacks is the dominant Pakeha cultural perspective and the assimilationist stance which is almost always adopted. The criticisms levelled against Maori are inevitably made from a monocultural ethnocentric Pakeha standpoint (c.f. Sexton 1990). For example the equity provisions in school charters have been criticised as ‘unfairly’ advantaging Maori and that everyone, Maori and all other ethnic groups including Pakeha, should receive the same treatment: (horizontal equity). In another example, a Pakeha community in Christchurch complained about having ‘taha Maori’ forced upon them by ‘liberal’ school policy, in the same week yet another Pakeha community from the same city complained about the development of ‘separatist’ schooling for Maori in Christchurch because Maori parents who had apparently become frustrated at not having their needs met within their local school had decided to opt out. The contradiction here is that on the one hand Maori are accused of ‘ramming it down the throats of Pakeha’ when they try and influence existing structures
from within; and then on the other hand are accused of ‘separatism’ and ‘apartheid’
schooling when they attempt to meet their schooling and cultural aspirations for
themselves. In the current climate of general hostility toward things Maori in schooling
and education, very few, if any, meaningful interventions have been proposed or
initiated which reinforce, support and proactively co-opt Maori cultural aspirations in
ways which are desired by Maori people themselves.

The attacks on Maori people, language, knowledge and culture (as exemplified in the
‘Sexton Report’ 1990 commissioned by the New Zealand Business Round Table and
in public statements by Government M.P.s; Eg. Rob Munro’s (M.P. Invercargill) attack
on the judiciary when the Courts ruled in favour of Maori claimants in a recent
‘airwaves’ claim (April 1991); John Banks’ attacks on Maori crime rates on talkback
radio (April 1991)) coincide with the ascendancy of the new right authoritarian ideology
and show links with similar developments in both Britain and the United States. Racist
ideologies and racist policies are instruments used by new right advocates, including
increasing numbers of politicians of all political persuasions, to deal with the anomalies
which ‘race and culture’ or ethnicity, present. Ethnicity has been a difficult and
unwieldy phenomenon for new right theorists to deal with as it contradicts reductionist
economic theory implied in new right thinking. For example the emphasis within new
right logic on individualism (Hayek 1974) contradicts Maori concepts of collectivism
such as iwi (tribe) hapu (sub-tribe) whenau (extended family) and the values implied
in social practices such as utu (reciprocity) manaaki (hospitality) or aroha
(respectfulness). However, the general inability of the new right theorists to adequately
account for culture is also shared by some traditional Marxist writers who have shown
a reluctance to acknowledge cultural elements in respect of analyses involving Maori. Unless an analysis that can also take account of Maori cultural aspirations in relation to language, knowledge and culture is evolved out of our own New Zealand context, then new right theory at one extreme and traditional Marxist theory at the other extreme will only have a limited effect in adequately analysing or developing appropriate interventions for Maori. The development of a New Zealand theory in this regard is a very much needed, and I would suggest, an urgent project for social policy reformers given the increasingly hostile attacks being perpetrated against Maori within the current climate of new right theoretical ascendency. I want now to move from the general problem of waiting for meaningful education reform from the traditional policy making agencies in respect of Maori education and to suggest, in line with the ‘Ka Awatea’ (1991) Report that perhaps a more meaningful starting place might be within those initiatives that are already proving to be successful in intervening in Maori education crisis. ‘Ka Awatea’ also makes the common sense observation that meaningful reform is only possible when it is able to co-opt the goodwill and support of those for whom the reform is intended. Reforms in respect of Maori need to align with the deeply held cultural aspirations of Maori people before they stand a chance to even begin to be successful.

KURA KAUPAPA MAORI

Kura Kaupapa Maori are total immersion Maori language and culture schooling options offered at the primary school level. These schools are not to be confused with ‘total Immersion’ schools in the traditional sense such as the Welsh school model or the French Canadian model. Kura Kaupapa Maori Schools involve much more than total
Immersion schooling within mother tongue language, they also operate within a specific cultural framework and mediate a particular social and economic context. Kura Kaupapa Maori Schools are uniquely New Zealand and lead the rest of the world in many aspects related to Immersion type education. Currently there are six ‘funded’ schools which form part of a national trial following the inclusion of Kura Kaupapa Maori within the legislation of the Education Amendment Act 1989 (December). The six schools participating in the official trial are Hoani Waititi (Glen Eden), Waipareira (Kelston), Maungawhau (Mt. Eden), Mangere (Mangere) and Pripipono (Otara) in the Auckland region. A sixth ‘trial’ school has been established in Palmerston North. Some twenty other Kura Kaupapa Maori schools of varying degrees have also been established outside of the state system, the most notable of these being Ruamataa in Rotorua. In the mid-year budget of 1990 the government made funding provision for the further establishment of ‘up to’ five other schools. It is however, important to acknowledge that Kura Kaupapa Maori were originally established and developed for some years outside of the state schooling structures by independent Maori communities wishing to capitalise on and continue the successful language gains made by their children in Te Kohanga Reo (pre-school language nurseries). While Kaupapa Maori schools are concerned with Maori language revival and survival they also involve much more. For example, in these schools ‘to be Maori’ is taken for granted and the legitimacy of Maori language, knowledge, culture and values are assumed to be ‘normal’.

It must also be acknowledged that Kura Kaupapa Maori parents originally chose to move outside of the state school setting in a conscious effort to resist the inhibiting
structural elements embedded within state schools, these structural impediments being perceived by these parents as contributing to the poor performance of many Maori pupils in state schooling and to also being antagonistic to their cultural aspirations. In seeking alternative schooling outside of the State system Maori parents moved to assume greater control and autonomy over the important educational decision making related to the schooling of their children. Parents often couched their reasoning for such action in statements such as:

‘we can’t do any worse than what the state school system has done for our children’ (Awhirenga Parent).

Greater influence over the curriculum, administration, pedagogy and learning outcomes were able to be achieved through Kura Kaupapa Maori existing outside the state structures as an independent alternative. Major sacrifices were made by many parents and whanau in support of Kura Kaupapa Maori as they struggled to exist in the early stages of this development;

‘I have to get up at six thirty in the morning, get the kids up, take the youngest to Kohanga Reo, the oldest to Waipareira across the other side of town, come back to work by 8.30 so that I can earn money to pay rent on our school buildings. I really feel for our kids - we don’t get home till after six most nights of the week - but I’m prepared to do this for as long as it takes.’ (Waipareira Parent)
Kura Kaupapa Maori provide a schooling option not provided for elsewhere in state schooling, (nor in the Tomorrow’s Schools Provisions). Notwithstanding that Maori schooling needs are not all the same, the need for a total immersion schooling option has increased as the children from Te Kohanga Reo have sought to have their language needs met in the formal schooling structures. Through total immersion in Maori language, Maori children are provided with an opportunity to develop fluency in their mother tongue, and their mother culture.

‘Our children argue, laugh, play, cry, talk in their sleep and are able to cheat at cards all in Maori, all very naturally.’

(Maungawhau parent)

These schools provide not only a total Maori language experience but also a wholly Maori cultural experience all day, every day for their children. Taha Maori programmes and bilingual schooling are not to be confused as fully providing for Maori language and cultural needs. Nor is the meeting of these needs achieved by pursuing a curriculum grounded only in the traditional past. Kura Kaupapa Maori parents have expressed repeatedly that they want for their children excellence in both Maori and Pakeha languages and culture. Kura Kaupapa Maori schooling is not a question of either Maori or Pakeha language and culture; parents want excellence in both languages and cultures for their children. The outcome of Kura Kaupapa Maori total immersion schooling therefore, is bilingualism and biculturalism although formal moves to teach English language skills are not made until the children are ten to eleven years old. For the most part, children have shown that they easily pick up English language
anyway through other everyday activities and experiences outside of the school; through their parents at home, through television and radio, through trips to the supermarket, through playing with other children, through road signs, through other printed media and so on. Almost without exception Kura Kaupapa Maori children speak very good Maori and very good English.

Kura Kaupapa Maori have also been able to successfully intervene within Maori homes through the whanau administrative structures which require full parental participation and support for the children at school. These structures have been successful in cutting across the deep-seated mistrust that many Maori parents have of schooling given their own bad experiences of school. All parents within the whanau network have a contribution to make, and therefore have responsibilities through the whanau structures to assist meaningfully in the education of their children. Many of the Kura Kaupapa Maori also run adult education classes - usually Maori language learning, for their parents in order that they can better support their children’s language, and schooling development in the home.

Te Kohanga Reo communities are still engaged in the struggle to fully establish Kura Kaupapa Maori; for example the development of a teacher training course at the Auckland College of Education; the development of a Kura Kaupapa Maori Resource Centre in West Auckland. Fund raising activities, resource production, mediating political structures and conscientising the community at large to the ‘intervention’ potential of Kura Kaupapa have all had to continue, largely from within and through the resources of the community itself despite the development of enabling legislation and
the flow of some funding support from government. However, throughout the historical development of Kura Kaupapa Maori dating from 1985, the notion of ‘struggle’ has been an important element in not only refining the Kaupapa (guiding philosophy) but also in making parents more resolute and unified in respect of it.

Kura Kaupapa Maori are arguably the only real change within all of the present education reforms which attempts to implement a structural overthrow of the existing Maori schooling crises in that it endeavours to effect some change, albeit limited, at the power relations and ideological levels. For example through increased control over knowledge, through increased control over the curriculum, and therefore through increased influence over the credentialling processes. Kura Kaupapa Maori is a positive and proactive force which has the support and commitment of the Maori community out of which it has evolved. It is acknowledged that Maori educational and schooling needs are not singular or homogenous, and therefore Kura Kaupapa Maori schooling provides but one option for Maori pupils. These schools are also concerned to provide an excellent education within the national curriculum guidelines. Maori parents as an outcome of such schooling want for their children the ability to have access to a full range of societal opportunities. Despite attempts by ill-informed commentators to the contrary (very few, if any who have actually visited such a school and who are caught within other social, cultural and political agenda), Kura Kaupapa Maori education is not a choice of one culture or language at the expense of another, this point being clearly expressed by Kura parents themselves, for example;
"My daughter is going to be the real New Zealander of the future, in fact better off than most Pakeha kids. She’s going to speak both Maori and Pakeha, think in both Maori and Pakeha. Most Pakeha can, and I suppose a lot of Maoris too, are only able to korero and think in one language - they’re the ones disadvantaged."

(Hoani Waititi Parent)

The potential of Kura Kaupapa Maori schooling to ‘speak’ to the Maori educational crisis generally needs to be acknowledged, explored and capitalised upon if we are genuinely concerned to alleviate the current circumstances. Given the choice to make key decisions in regard to curriculum, pedagogy and so on, what choices were made? What are the successful elements of Kura Kaupapa Maori and how might they be effectively employed to the benefit of Maori pupils generally?

KAUPAPA MAORI AS EDUCATION INTERVENTION

The crisis of legitimacy currently being experienced in New Zealand schooling, while being inextricably linked to other major crises on an international front, can also be attributed in part to effective critical analyses of the education system by social policy analysts from both the Left and the Right. A historical review reveals that prior to the 1960s, non-educational achievement by Maori pupils was not a major social concern, and that it was the Hunn Report in 1960 which centralised this issue. Since the Hunn Report, New Zealand education has embarked on a series of intervention strategies to deal with Maori ‘underachievement’ (Smith G. 1990). During the 1960s and early
1970s interventions focused clearly on the Maori child, family, home or culture as the 'problem'. This focus tended to produce a 'victim-blaming' orientation in both research trends and subsequent interventions and failed to make any significant impact on Maori underachievement.

The 1970s and 1980s saw the focus begin to shift from the Maori individual and cultural explanations to an increased emphasis being placed upon the questioning of the system and its structures such as, knowledge, curriculum, pedagogy, teachers, administration, the ‘hidden curriculum’ and so on. To be fair, critical enquiry into the ‘system’ has only just begun and has not yet been fully developed, consequently it is too soon perhaps to assess the limitations and possibilities of these types of interventions. However, it has been this emphasis upon critical enquiry of the 'system and its associated structures' (although still in its early stages), which has contributed to the legitimation crises in New Zealand schooling.

One of the obvious shortcomings of education research in New Zealand is that it has often been extreme, either tending towards Deficit or Deprivation theories, that is, a 'victim blaming' orientation or towards the other end of the scale, focusing solely on 'structural impediments'. It may seem obvious, but in terms of a meaningful schooling intervention for Maori, a more 'balanced' intervention strategy is required, one that is able to work on all fronts, and one which is able to incorporate where necessary both cultural and structural considerations.
Thus Kura Kaupapa Maori, building on the successful elements of Te Kohanga Reo have produced an intervention that is already proving successful at many levels for the children in these schools and when considered against the schooling experiences of many Maori children within mainstream state schooling. Some of the key intervention elements which are embraced within Kura Kaupapa Maori and which have the potential to speak to the general Maori crisis in schooling are briefly outlined here.

1. **(TINO) RANGATIRATANGA** (relative autonomy principle)
   - the goal of ‘control over one’s own life and cultural well-being’ has made gains within the relatively autonomous development of Kura Kaupapa Maori. Greater autonomy over key decision-making in schooling has been attained for example in regard to administration, curriculum, pedagogy and Maori aspirations. Key points are that Maori people have made these choices and are therefore more committed to making them work.

2. **TAONGA TUKU IHO** (cultural aspirations principle)
   - In Kura Kaupapa Maori, to be Maori is taken for granted. Maori language, knowledge, culture and values are validated and legitimated. Maori cultural aspirations, particularly in a wider societal context of the struggle for language and cultural survival, is more assured. One of the common faults of previous schooling interventions has been the inadequate or serious attention paid to this aspect. In incorporating these elements, a strong emotional and spiritual factor is introduced to support the commitment of Maori to the intervention.
3. **AKO MAORI** (culturally preferred pedagogy)

   That teaching and learning settings and practices are able to closely and effectively connect with the cultural backgrounds and life circumstances (socio-economic) of Maori communities. That these teaching and learning choices are selected as being culturally preferred. Other pedagogy is also utilised including general Pakeha schooling methods, and some cross cultural borrowing, e.g. Japanese pedagogy. ‘Soroban’ maths programme; learning of Japanese language. The move towards Pacific/Asian cultures and language is a logical development given close cultural similarities, and given the shared commonalities of the Austronesian group of languages.

4. **KIA PIKI AKE I NGA RARURARU O TE KAINGA** (mediation of socio-economic and home difficulties principle)

   The Kaupapa (philosophy) of Kura Kaupapa Maori is such a powerful and all embracing force, through its emotional (ngakau) and spiritual (wairua) elements, that it commits Maori communities to take seriously the schooling enterprise despite other social and economic impediments; it impacts at the ideological level, and is able to assist in mediating a societal context of unequal power relations; it makes schooling a priority consideration despite debilitating social and economic circumstances.

5. **WHANAU** (extended family structure principle)
This structure supports the ideological support ‘won’ in the previous category. It does this by providing a practical support structure to alleviate and mediate social and economic difficulties, parenting difficulties, health difficulties and others. Such difficulties are not located in individual homes but in the total whanau; the whanau takes collective responsibility to assist and intervene. While the whanau structure implies a support network for individual members there is also a reciprocal obligation on individual members to ‘invest’ in the whanau group. In this way, parents are culturally ‘contracted’ to support and assist in the education of all of the children in the whanau. Perhaps the most significant aspect of whanau administration and management is that it brings back into the schooling setting many parents who were once extremely ‘hostile’ to education given their own ‘unhappy’ schooling experiences. This is a major feature of Kura Kaupapa Maori schooling intervention - it has committed parents to re-invest in schooling and education for their children.

6. KAUPAPA (Collective vision; philosophy principle)

Kura Kaupapa Maori have a collective vision which is written into a formal charter entitled ‘Te Aho Matua’. This vision provides the guidelines for excellence in Maori; what a good Maori education should entail. It also acknowledges Pakeha culture and skills required by Maori children to participate fully and at every level in modern New Zealand society. ‘Te Aho Matua’ builds on the Kaupapa of Te Kohanga Reo, and
provides the parameters for the uniqueness that is Kura Kaupapa Maori. Its power is in its ability to articulate and connect with Maori aspirations, politically, socially, economically and culturally.

(Please note that the above list contains only some of the key elements of Kura Kaupapa Maori schooling which contribute to the success of these schools. It is not a definitive list.)

CONCLUSION

The extension of ‘free market’ logic into schooling and education ought to be continued to be vigorously resisted by Maori people, given that support for meritocratic principles and structures will only serve to entrench inequality as the inevitable and ‘common sense’ outcome of New Zealand schooling. The consequences of such a scenario for those already disadvantaged within present structures do not look good. While some groups will benefit (mainly those who are benefitting in the present structures) significant numbers of New Zealanders, and probably disproportionate ratios of women, Maori, and working class will continue to be disadvantaged.

The efforts of those who would seek to reduce education and schooling to purely economic considerations also needs to be challenged by professional educators. The diverse cultural and class composition of New Zealand society should suggest that a major project for state schooling and the education system is to struggle against societal inequalities. New Zealand can not afford to entrench inequality as a taken for granted outcome of schooling. In this sense, Beeby’s dictum on equality of
opportunity is worth striving for, even if we do come up short. The potential of schooling and education to provide for social and economic mobility needs to be protected by all those engaged in the professional activity of schooling and education.

The recent Porter analysis ‘The Competitive Advantage of Nations’ (1990) and The New Zealand hybrid of that work, ‘Upgrading New Zealand’s Competitive Advantage’ (1991) and also the New Zealand Planning Council’s publications ‘Tomorrow’s Skills’ (1990) and ‘curriculum: Core or Corset’ (1991) all make some telling and compelling analyses of the New Zealand economic predicament. All of these publications posit the centrality of education programmes linked to human resource development in the recovery process. The Porter analysis of the ‘problem’ while contentious in some areas still has some merit, I believe. However, it is the development of the processes or how we ought to respond to this analysis which differs across all of these publications. A further complication is the increasing intrusion of New right libertarian economics into the New Zealand education reform process - ostensibly as part of the ‘right’ (some would believe the ‘only’) answer toward realising the Porter goals toward economic recovery. Capture by New Right reductionist economic ideologues is certainly not part of the original Porter schema. While agreement can be reached on what needs to be done in education deriving from the Porter analysis, the process or means is not necessarily as clear cut.

Political expediency has seen the imposition of libertarian economics inside education. The full debilitating effects of New Right economic intrusion - the commodification of
education and schooling - is yet to be felt. Perhaps more importantly, the human face of teaching and learning has been sharply diminished.

Before I conclude, I would also like to make some final generalised comments about an appropriate curriculum framework which might give space to the structural accommodations required for such initiatives to overthrow Maori educational crisis. All participants in the schooling and education enterprise, including politicians, Principals, administrators and parents at the local level, have a collective responsibility within our ostensibly democratic context to ensure pupils educational entitlements. An accord between the State's interests and parental interests is significant - the State has a responsibility to protect those who would be disadvantaged by dominant interest groups. At the same time the State must allow for flexibility for parents, teachers and schools to have some freedom to respond to local needs and aspirations. A key issue here is the struggle over the National guidelines in terms of the State's interests on the one hand and parents' interests on the other. I emphasise at this point a distinction between a curriculum of 'selected interests' and one that is driven by the notion of 'pupil entitlement'. An example of an entitlement curriculum has been described by the Working Party of the National Union of Teachers in Britain (1991) as:

A nationally agreed curriculum which gives considerable scope for local initiative and decision making. It should also provide all pupils with knowledge, skills and understandings to which they are entitled, and encourage and develop attitudes which will enable them to learn and to take a full part in society. (1.1; P.2. A Strategy for the Curriculum 1991)
Finally, Kura Kaupapa Maori, linked closely to the ideals and principles of Te Kohanga Reo, offer a completely new alternative intervention strategy to the Maori schooling crisis. The critical ‘change’ factor is embedded within the guiding principles of ‘Kaupapa Maori’. Some of the ‘change’ principles inherent in Kaupapa Maori have been identified elsewhere in this paper as key elements underpinning the success of Kaupapa Maori schooling. The emergence of Kaupapa Maori out of the New Zealand context as a theory of change provides exciting potential for an intervention into Maori schooling crisis generally. In terms of Maori language and cultural survival, this may be our last chance.

"Kura Kaupapa Maori is here to stay ..... and its going to happen with you or without you ..... our people have had enough ...."

(Kura Kaupapa Maori Parent)
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