

Copyright is owned by the Author of the thesis. Permission is given for a copy to be downloaded by an individual for the purpose of research and private study only. The thesis may not be reproduced elsewhere without the permission of the Author.

**BILINGUALISM  
AND  
BILINGUAL EDUCATION**

**THEIR SCOPE,  
ADVANTAGES,  
DISADVANTAGES**

**AND THE  
IMPLICATIONS  
FOR  
MAORI LEARNERS**

A thesis presented in partial fulfilment for the  
Master of Educational Administration (M Ed Admin) Degree

at  
Massey University.

Monte Rereamoamo Ohia

1993

## **Abstract**

The thesis examines bilingualism and bilingual education both overseas and in Aotearoa/New Zealand. A Maori total immersion unit in a Wellington city primary school and a secondary bilingual unit in the same city are utilised as case studies to uncover, in more detail, the issues facing bilingual education in this country.

International literature, which has particular relevance to Aotearoa/New Zealand, is identified and analysed, and one becomes aware of the variety of models of bilingual education and the numerous forms of bilingualism throughout the world which are duplicated here. It is also interesting to note that although there are similarities in the goals and objectives of bilingual education, the ways in which different schools deliver the objectives may differ. For example, the amount of time teachers spend speaking the second language of the students, which is invariably the main target language, may differ markedly for various bilingual programmes.

The thesis also explores the history of bilingual education in Aotearoa/New Zealand since the establishment of the first Mission school in 1816. Emphasis is placed on examining the relationships between the Maori and English languages as media for the teaching of Maori children. The rationales for the establishment of bilingual education models in this country are also identified and discussed in relation to the programmes.

There is also examination of the perceived advantages and disadvantages of bilingual education. Criteria are identified against which the success or otherwise of bilingual education is measured. The judgements invariably depend on the priorities one places on the different criteria.

The detailed focus on the case studies, and intermittent comparisons with other similar models, provide the reader with insights into the issues faced by bilingual education models in Aotearoa/New Zealand.

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
<b>Tables</b>	5
<b>Introduction</b>	9
Research Methodology	9
<b>Chapter 1 Review of the Literature</b>	<b>11</b>
Definitions of Bilingualism	11
Definitions of Bilingual Education	16
Perceived Disadvantages of Bilingualism and Bilingual Education	22
Perceived Advantages of Bilingualism and Bilingual Education	24
Aotearoa/New Zealand Forms of Bilingualism and Bilingual Education	35
<b>Chapter 2 Rationales for Maori-English Bilingualism and Bilingual Education in Aotearoa/New Zealand</b>	<b>55</b>
Revitalisation of the Maori Language	55
The Education Rationale: Closing the Gap	58
The Religio-Cultural Rationale	59
The Political Rationale	62
<b>Chapter 3 The Case Studies</b>	<b>70</b>
The Research Intentions	70
The Design of the Questionnaires	72
The Interviews, Files and Papers	83
<b>The Schools</b>	<b>86</b>
<b>A Newtown Primary School</b>	<b>86</b>
Establishment of the Immersion Unit	86
The Mission Statement	92

The Results of the Questionnaires	93
(i) The Board of Trustees	93
(ii) The Staff	95
(iii) The Parents/Guardians	98
(iv) The Children	101
<b>B Wellington High School</b>	<b>104</b>
Establishment of the Bilingual Unit	106
The Present Situation	119
The Results of the Questionnaires	121
(i) The Board of Trustees	121
(ii) The Staff	123
(iii) The Parents/Guardians	127
(iv) The Students	129
The Junior Students	130
The Senior Students	132
<b>Conclusion</b>	<b>135</b>
<b>Appendix 1</b>	<b>146</b>
<b>Bibliography</b>	<b>154</b>

**THE TABLES**

- Table 1** The percentage distribution of students achieving the different levels in the 1992 School Certificate Maori Language Oral and Written examinations nationally and in a Late Immersion programme. Page 49
- Table 2** The number of students in the four vertical groups in the 1988 Tauranga Boys' College Bilingual Unit (TBCU). Page 51
- Table 3** The 1987 School Certificate results in four subjects of students in the TBCU compared to the national averages. Page 53
- Table 4** The retention rates of Maori and non-Maori students at secondary schools. Page 58
- Table 5** The attitudes of the Newtown School staff to the immersion unit. Page 95
- Table 6** The Newtown School's staff's expectations of the immersion unit. Page 96
- Table 7** The effects of the immersion unit on the attitudes of the staff of Newtown School to specific Maori development. Page 97
- Table 8** The perceptions of the staff of Newtown School to the amounts of funds and resources available to the immersion unit. Page 97
- Table 9** The percentage distribution of the age groups of parents of children in the Newtown School immersion unit. Page 98
- Table 10** The abilities of the parents of the immersion students of Newtown School in the Maori language. Page 99
- Table 11** The involvement of the parents of the immersion students in Maori cultural activities. Page 99
- Table 12** The effect of the immersion unit on the parents of the immersion unit. Page 100

- Table 13** The numbers of immersion students in the different age groups. Page 101
- Table 14** The number of students and the amount of time spent in either the bilingual or immersion units of Newtown School. Page 102
- Table 15** The students' reasons for being in the immersion unit of Newtown School. Page 102
- Table 16** The perceived abilities of the immersion students at speaking Maori at entry into the unit and after their time in the unit. Page 102
- Table 17** The frequency of contacts by the students with Maori people prior to entering the unit and after their time in the unit. Page 103
- Table 18** The percentage distribution of students who had perceived their own improvement (or otherwise in the areas indicated). Page 103
- Table 19** The percentage distribution of students who have been fulfilled in the immersion unit. Page 104
- Table 20** The achievements of Wellington High School (WHS) Maori students in the School Certificate Examination. Page 105
- Table 21** The percentage distribution of students in the 1992 School Certificate Oral and Written Maori Language Examinations showing the performances of WHS students in relation to the national averages. Level 1 is the highest performance and 7 the lowest. Page 106
- Table 22** The perceptions of the WHS Board of Trustees of the funds and resources of the bilingual unit. Page 122
- Table 23** A list of some 1980 School Certificate subjects, the numbers of candidates who entered, the number who achieved the different grades and the pass rates. Page 124
- Table 24** A list of some 1992 School Certificate subjects, the numbers of students who entered the subject, the percentage distribution of

grades, and the percentage pass rates for each subject. Note that the Maori language examination was a standards-based system in 1992.  
Page 125

- Table 25 The attitudes of WHS staff to specific Maori developments as a result of the presence of the bilingual unit in the school. Page 126
- Table 26 WHS staff perceptions of the funds and resources of the bilingual unit. Page 126
- Table 27 The parents' perceptions of their own abilities in the Maori language. Page 127
- Table 28 The frequency of parents' involvement with Maori cultural activities. Page 127
- Table 29 The order of parents'/guardians' priorities for allowing their children to enter the bilingual unit. Page 128
- Table 30 The WHS parents' perceptions of the effects on themselves of having a child in the bilingual unit. Page 129
- Table 31 The percentage distribution of WHS junior students' reasons (in order of priority) for choosing to be in the bilingual unit. Page 130
- Table 32 The abilities of the WHS junior students at speaking Maori on entering the bilingual unit and after their time in the unit. Page 130
- Table 33 The frequency of WHS junior students' contacts with Maori people prior to their entrance into the bilingual unit and since being in the unit. Page 131
- Table 34 The improvements of the WHS junior students in specific areas since being in the bilingual unit. Page 131
- Table 35 The perceptions by the WHS junior students as to whether the bilingual unit had fulfilled their expectations. Page 132

- Table 36** The WHS senior students' reasons for choosing to enter the bilingual unit. Page 132
- Table 37** The perceptions of the WHS senior students of their abilities to speak the Maori language prior to their entry into the unit and since being in the unit. Page 133
- Table 38** The frequency of contacts between the WHS senior students and Maori people prior to their entry into the bilingual unit and since being in the unit. Page 133
- Table 39** The percentage distributions of the WHS senior students' perceived improvements in specific areas since being in the bilingual unit. Page 134
- Table 40** The perceptions of the WHS senior students of whether the bilingual unit has fulfilled their expectations. Page 134
- Table 41** The percentage distribution of School Certificate grades for St Stephens School, Te Aute College and Wellington High School Maori Students. Page 139

## INTRODUCTION

This thesis is an attempt to highlight the key issues confronting the managers, administrators and practitioners of bilingual Maori, and English education programmes in Aotearoa/New Zealand. The thesis reviews the literature on bilingual education. It also examines the rationales for the establishment of bilingual education programmes, some of its outcomes, and its implementation in this country.

### Research Methodology

In order 'to narrow and clarify' bilingual education, I consulted, 'what has already been written about the topic' (Dixon and Bouma, 1991, p34). My initial strategy was to review the published and unpublished literature, and I discovered factors I had not thought about previously and discovered a number of options on how to approach this study.

There is no shortage of literature on bilingual education as there are many countries where this form of education is present. However, it is clear that the objectives of bilingual education vary from one country to another. The political and social circumstances of groups desiring bilingual education differ quite markedly. For example, the English speaking parents in Ontario wanting their children to speak French belong to the higher socio-economic echelons whereas Maori people in Aotearoa/New Zealand are from the lower socio-economic groups.

As I moved through the literature and became more involved with the people involved in the case studies, I was able to settle on a particular path which highlighted the issues from the participants' points of view, and I have endeavoured to capture their perceptions, experiences and notions.

The second research strategy involved undertaking two case studies which examined bilingual education in 'real life' contexts. These contexts included a 'total immersion' unit in an inner city primary school, and a bilingual unit in an inner city secondary school. The primary unit was in its fifth year of operations, and the secondary unit was in its tenth anniversary year. I visited both schools four times during the duration of the research. In previous years I had visited each school more than a dozen times. This was in my capacity as an education officer for the Maori and Island Division of the Department of Education from 1984 to 1988, and as part of a team (with Mihi Maloney and Dr Gordon Knight)

researching mathematics teaching in New Zealand secondary schools for the Department of Education.

In 1987 I completed a survey of 17 secondary school bilingual units, noting the staff involved and their qualifications and interests, the subjects being taught in the units, the implications of bilingual units for timetables, and the facilities in which bilingual education was occurring. During my time with the Ministry of Education in the Bay of Plenty in 1989 and 1990, I visited bilingual/total immersion schools and units, and Te Kura Kaupapa Maori o Ruamata. I have also been involved with various kohanga reo in the Bay of Plenty, Wellington and the South Island, and with Te Kohanga Reo National Trust in the writing and monitoring of their Tino Rangatiratanga Whakapakari Training package which is the programme on which people will train to become kaiako (teachers) in kohanga reo.

Therefore during my observances and consultations with key personnel in the case studies regarding the implementation of bilingual programmes, I was able to gain a broad view of the developments and changes which have taken place over the last five years.

The case study approach is able to ask the question 'What is going on?' (Dixon and Bouma, 1991. p107). It also enables specific practical issues to be studied in context and to ensure that people with a wide range of involvement with the units are able to comment from their points of view.

The conclusions I came to as a result of the research were that bilingualism and bilingual education cover a wide range of variables in their definitions. The variables depend primarily on the beliefs and ideas that are within the instigators of, and participants in, the programme. Similarly, the advantages and disadvantages of bilingualism and bilingual education depend on the criteria used to measure success and failure. However, with the criteria used by Maori people, such as ability in the Maori language and progress in education, bilingual education in Aotearoa/New Zealand is successful. Bilingual education has stymied the loss of the Maori language from the mouths and hearts of young Maori people. Therefore, instead of witnessing the demise of Maori, Aotearoa/New Zealand is experiencing a renaissance of the Maori language and culture.

## CHAPTER 1    Review of the Literature

It is clear that the forms of bilingual education vary from the use of a few words of the second language (L2) in the classroom to the exclusive use of L2. In the first situation, the first language (L1) of the students is the dominant language of teaching and learning. In the second situation, L1 is not used at all.

### Definitions of Bilingualism

In any discussions of bilingual education, one needs to be aware of what bilingualism is, as the learners' acquisition of bilingualism is inherent in the goals and objectives of bilingual education. Does bilingualism only mean the ability to speak two languages partly or fluently? Is reading and writing two languages included in a definition of bilingualism? Clarifying the definitions of bilingualism will assist us in Aotearoa/New Zealand to be more precise about our objectives when we consider bilingual education for this country. We will need to be clear about the forms of bilingualism we are aiming for.

Factors which are involved in **bilingualism** include:

- 1    Speakers tending to show different degrees of competence in their literate and oral abilities in the two languages. Some may be literate in their first language (L1) but have only oral command in their second language (L2); others may have stronger literacy skills than oral competence in L2; still others may be able to write in L2 but not in L1. During this research I observed that fluent speakers of Maori who are over 50 years are not able to write as well in Maori (L1) as they are in English (L2). However, I also met and spoke with 10 Japanese people who could only write in Japanese, their first language. Although they could make themselves understood in English, not one of them could write even the simplest statements in English.
- 2    The ease or otherwise of learning a second language may depend on the distance between the speech varieties, L1 and L2. For example, English and German have more in common than say English and Japanese, and it probably follows that it will be easier for an English speaker to learn German than Japanese.
- 3    The degree of cultural duality involved varies from speaker to speaker. For example, in some cases the bilingual person may feel a strong identification with two cultures; in other cases the speaker may identify with one culture

more than the other. In Aotearoa/New Zealand it is clear that Maori bilingual people either identify more with the Maori culture or with both the Maori and English cultures equally.

- 4 The sociological significance of the languages may not be the same. For example, there is a difference between a speaker who is fluent in two languages of high status (such as two European languages used internationally), and a speaker who possesses a local dialect and a regional language. The parents in Ontario are in no doubt that if their children speak and write both French and English fluently, the career prospects are better than for children who speak local or regional language varieties.
  
- 5 Finally, the languages used may have specialised functions. For example, the speaker may choose to use one language in one context (such as in the office), and the other in another context (such as socialising with his/her friends). During my research I have become aware that young parents whose children are involved in kura kaupapa Maori (Maori total immersion schools) are forcing elders to speak Maori in all situations. Elders have generally reserved Maori language for Maori situations are now being forced to abandon English during social occasions by these young parents who have just begun to speak Maori.

The definitions of **bilingualism** cover a wide range, as can be seen by the following examples. Linguistic scholars speak of a **continuum of bilingualism** from Bloomfield's (1933) view of 'native-like control of two languages' to Halliday's observation that 'bilingualism is recognized wherever a native speaker of one language makes use of a second language, however partially or imperfectly'. Taylor goes one step further and suggests that anyone is bilingual who speaks two or more 'languages, dialects or styles of speech that involves differences in sound, vocabulary or syntax'. Oestreicher (1974) resembled Bloomfield's definition when he described bilinguals 'as those who demonstrate complete mastery of two different languages without interference between the two linguistic processes', and on the other side of the scale, MacNamara (1967) defines bilinguals as 'those who possess one of the language skills (listening, speaking, reading and writing) even to a minimal degree in their second language.'

Other distinctions are personal bilingualism which refers to an individual's ability to speak two or more languages, and societal bilingualism which describes the existence of two recognised language groups in society. If a society is bilingual it

does not necessarily follow that all members of that society are able to communicate in the language of the other group. For example, in Aotearoa/New Zealand, it is generally only Maori people over the age of fifty who are bilingual in Maori and English. The Pakeha (English) people invariably speak English only.

Weinreich (1953) introduced the concepts of coordinated bilingualism with two distinct and separated semantic systems, and compound bilingualism where the languages intersect and at times overlap with each other. This theory has not received much support as most bilinguals are unable to keep their languages completely separate or completely together.

Lambert(1967) introduced the notions of additive and subtractive bilingualism to refer to the way L2 is learned and the effects it has on L1. Additive bilingualism is the situation where L2 does not detract from L1; and subtractive bilingualism occurs when L1 is downgraded by the acquisition of L2. Additive bilingualism is an enriching process, and it occurs when L1 is not threatened by L2. Subtractive bilingualism occurs when L2 is dominant and replaces L1. In Aotearoa/New Zealand, the teaching through English only in schools for over one hundred years has resulted in the loss of numerous Maori people to speak Maori. Most Maori people speak English only as a result of the subtractive bilingual policies. The desire now however is to follow a policy of additive bilingualism where Maori (L2 for Maori learners) is learned without detracting from English (their L1).

It is clear, then, as Swain and Cummins (1982) state, that there is little consensus as to the exact meaning of the term 'bilingualism'. Therefore, in this research, it is important for the reader to be aware of the possible variables such as the oral, written, understanding and reading competence of the people being referred to, and the intellectual and social factors involved in bilingualism. The important points for Maori educationists to grasp however are that:

- 1 We need to be clear about what we mean when we talk about bilingualism;
- 2 We need to be clear about the present situations, needs and aspirations of the Maori people situated in so many different areas of the country. For example, the situation, needs and aspirations of Maori people in Dunedin may differ from those people in Kaitia. This may mean that the models of bilingual education in Aotearoa/New Zealand may vary in different places;
- 3 We need to distinguish between bilingualism and bilingual education. Bilingualism is probably an objective or goal, whereas bilingual education is

a process of education. Whatever they are, we need to be clear about the definitions of both. This research endeavours to discuss bilingual education quite extensively in order to provide people with a wide range of models. The research also endeavours to evaluate the relative merits of the models of bilingual education using a number of indicators such as linguistic, conceptual, numeric and literate abilities.

There are also a number of variations of bilingualism which need to be discussed now. Wallwork (1984, p65) describes a linguistic situation which is in some respects similar, in others dissimilar to that of bilingualism called *diglossia* where the status of the two languages in a particular society differ. MacNamara (1959) describes cases where two or more varieties of the same language are used by some speakers under different conditions. One obvious case in the German-speaking part of Switzerland where Swiss German is the everyday informal language for all inhabitants, and German is the accepted language for all official and formal occasions. In the inland Urewera area of Aotearoa/New Zealand, Maori is the formal language and English is the language of work and commerce.

The Arabic countries, Haiti, the West Indies and the blacks of the United States also have what MacNamara refers to as H (High) and L (Low) varieties, where H indicates the variety which enjoys greater status. Unlike bilingualism, diglossia using MacNamara's definition, means that no one group learns the H form as a mother tongue. The H form is rather learned at school where it is used. Therefore an advantage comes to the speakers of the H form with education. In Aotearoa/New Zealand, English is the language of politics, commerce and education, and Maori is confined to Maori contexts. Within the Maori language there is a classical form which includes poetry, proverbs, idioms, protocols and etiquette which could only be learned in formal Maori situations, as well as a form of everyday expressions which invariably contain numerous transliterations (from English).

Fishman (1972, p92) believes that diglossia exists not only in multilingual societies which officially recognize several 'languages', and not only in societies that utilise vernacular and classical varieties, but also in societies which employ separate dialects, registers or functionally differentiated varieties of whatever kind.

Fishman also provides a possible differentiation between bilingualism and diglossia when he states that bilingualism is essentially a characterisation of individual linguistic versatility while diglossia is a characterisation of the societal allocations of functions to different languages or varieties.

According to Fishman, in Paraguay, the bilingual speaking population regard Spanish as the High language and Guarani as the Low language. On the borders of some European countries where both languages are regarded as equal, diglossia does not exist. Fishman also surmises that an example of diglossia without bilingualism would have existed in early Europe, where the nobility would have spoken the H variety and the commoners the Low variety of the same language.

Another example of diglossia without bilingualism cited by Fishman is Hong Kong where the Cantonese-speaking and English-speaking communities have access to their own institutions operating in their own languages, thus removing the need to become bilingual. This situation also exists in many Arab countries.

It is possibly worthwhile in this discussion on the definitions of bilingualism to mention two other language varieties, namely pidgin and creole, which are quite common in various parts of the world. Pidgin is a simplified, auxiliary language which arises as a lingua franca to permit communication in multilingual areas. It is a language in itself with, for example, its own grammar rules and vocabulary. Pidgin has no native speakers. It is merely a means of communication, usually for trade between groups with different languages. The limited vocabulary is based on the dominant contributing language. The grammar of pidgin is restricted, omitting inflectional morphology; the syntax and phonology are usually based on the vernaculars of the subordinate groups.

Neo-Melanesian Pidgin (Tok Pisin), an English-based pidgin on Papua New Guinea has been adopted as that country's standard language, and has recently gained native speakers (or become creolised). Bislama has been developed as a new pidgin in Vanuatu where there are about 400 vernaculars and two formerly official languages, French and English.

A creole is a pidgin language which has gained native speakers. Creoles are no longer merely a link language between people from different language groups. Creoles have all the characteristics of standard languages. For example, creoles have an expanded vocabulary, grammar, styles and registers. Besides the English-, French- and Dutch-based creoles, a Bantu-based creole in Tanzania exist in the world.

Aotearoa/New Zealand has never developed a pidgin or creole language. A possible reason is that there is only one Maori language. Various dialects are spoken by tribal groups throughout the country. However it is relatively simple

for a Maori speaker from the South Island to converse with a speaker from the North Island despite possible variations in vocabulary and sentence structures.

Diglossia, pidgins and creoles add to the difficulty in defining bilingualism. The points to remember in this research however, are that the particular definition of bilingualism a particular group employs fits their situation at that time, and that it is possible to change their form of bilingualism if or when the circumstances require them to do so. This research sees bilingualism has having a dynamic rather than a static quality. It is evident in this research that in many cases the different forms of bilingualism and bilingual education represent transition stages to go through as people move to creating their ideal model.

### **Definitions of Bilingual Education**

It will be useful at this stage to discuss the different forms of bilingual education which exist in various parts of the world.

Fishman (1979) identifies four main types of bilingual education (transitional, monoliterate, partial and full). Fishman believes that, enrichment or maintenance of non-Anglo cultural groups are the true contributions which bilingual education will ultimately make.

Transitional bilingualism refers to the situation where the children's L1 is used in the initial stages of schooling, and as they adjust to the school and/or master subject matter, their schooling is in English, their L2. Fishman reports that in the case of Spanish speaking children in the United States, transitional programmes do not aim to maintain the status of L1. Rather, the social objective corresponds to a language shift. This resembles Lambert's (1967) subtractive bilingualism model where L1 is downgraded by the acquisition of L2.

Monoliterate bilingualism programmes indicate goals of development in both languages for aural-oral skills but do not concern themselves with literacy skills in the non-English mother tongue. Links are made between the home and school through speaking and listening only, and L1 literacy does not then become associated with reading and writing in either the school or wider society. The graduates from these programmes are orally competent in both languages and literate in one, English.

Partial bilingualism programmes seek fluency and literacy in both languages, but literacy in the mother tongue is restricted to certain subject matter, most generally

to the ethnic group and its cultural heritage. Generally, L1 is restricted to the social sciences, literature and the arts, but not in science and mathematics. Although there is some attempt to recognise the mother tongue of the children, it only goes part of the way.

One official definition of bilingual education (contained in Fishman, 1979) was presented by the U.S. Office of Education in 1971, and is:

the use of two languages, one of which is English, as mediums of instruction for the same pupil population in a well organised program which encompasses all or part of the curriculum and includes the study of the history and culture associated with the mother tongue.

Fishman's concerns about the lack of real commitment to the first language of the children is borne out in this particular (official) definition of bilingual education.

Full Bilingualism programmes promote the development of all skills in both languages in both domains. Typically, both languages are used as media of instruction for all subjects (except in teaching the languages themselves). Clearly this program is directed at language maintenance and development of the minority language. Fishman concludes that, from the viewpoint of much of the linguistically and psychologically oriented literature this is the ideal type of program, since, in the words of one specialist, it results in balanced coordinate bilinguals- children capable of thinking and feeling in either of two languages independently.

Whereas Fishman's definitions of bilingual education relate basically to the status accorded the first language of the children, Swain (1978) emphasises the time in which education through L2 begins, and the amount of instruction the children receive in L2, for her definitions of bilingual education. For example:

the Early Total Immersion programme begins on the first day of school. All the instruction is initially provided through the medium of L2, and as the years go by L1 becomes increasingly prominent until both languages are allocated equal amounts of time. Generally, the 'English and French portions of the day are taught by different teachers' (Swain, 1978, p21);

the Early Partial Immersion programmes teach through L1 and L2 in each year of schooling. Instructional time is usually divided equally between the two languages, with a different teacher teaching each portion;

Late Immersion programmes begin some years after the children begin school. In Canada, late immersion programmes can begin as early as Grade 4 (9/10 year olds), and as late as Grade 10 (15 and 16 year olds). In all cases, as Swain cites, students who enter late immersion classes have already had some instruction (usually second language instruction) in L2. Swain mentions that late immersion classes started as a result of parents and students feeling that they had 'missed out on a valuable learning experience' in the early immersion programmes.

As we scan the similarities and differences between Fishman's and Swain's definitions of bilingual education, we are able to understand Mackey's (1970) assertion that bilingual education can mean different things in different situations. Swain was careful to point out during her discussions on the definitions that the parents were the most influential in deciding the actual form of bilingual education their children were going to be involved in. Swain emphasises the influence of parents when she mentions an example where a school, in conjunction with the parents, changed their bilingual programme from an early total immersion (which began in 1969) to an early partial immersion programme (in 1975) to attract more people to the classes.

It is clear also that the particular bilingual education programme taken on by a school depends on their Government's political agendas and the amount of quality information available to staff and parents on the advantages and disadvantages of different forms of bilingual education. It seems clear that the aim of bilingual education in the United States is to assist non-English speaking children to make the transition to speak English as quickly as possible (cf. subtractive bilingualism, Lambert, 1967). The particular forms of bilingual education in the Quebec province of Canada (especially in Swain's Montreal and Toronto), where the French and English languages enjoy virtually the same status, seem to illustrate a genuine concern to develop fluency and literacy in both languages (cf. additive bilingualism, Lambert, 1967). Unlike the United States, it seems that the Canadian programmes demonstrate no wish to downgrade the importance of the mother tongue, although we need to keep in mind the relative status of the languages in the programmes of both countries. However, the question which needs to be explored in future research is the state of the indigenous languages in Canada and the United States. There is a dearth of literature in this area.

In considering the range of definitions of bilingualism, it is difficult to deny that the work which is taking place in foreign and second language learning classes is

not a form of bilingual education. After all, the primary objective is to develop competence in either one or all of the language skills (listening, speaking, reading and writing), especially if MacNamara's (1967) definition of a bilingual (as a person who possesses at least one of the language skills, even to a minimal degree in the second language) is to be accepted.

Littlewood (1986) in his efforts to introduce some of the discoveries and ideas which have emerged from recent research into foreign and second language learning, has concentrated especially on those aspects which seem likely to help us develop more effective approaches to teaching. There is no doubt that if managers, administrators and teachers were to heed the advice of writers and researchers such as Littlewood, they would indeed develop competent and well educated bilingual people. It is also possible to conclude that foreign and second language learning can produce people with improved bilingual skills.

During this research, I have become aware of the fears of principals and other educationists about the possible separatism of Maori from Pakeha people through the desires of an increasing number of Maori people to separate their education initiatives from the mainstream system. These Maori educationists cite the examples of church, boys and girls schools as examples of separate schools which have been established and supported by government for gender and ideological reasons as precedents for the establishment of Maori schools. This brings me to discussing various segregation models in Africa and Europe to possibly guide us in Aotearoa/New Zealand in our establishment of Maori only models.

Skutnabb-Kangas (1988. p23) cites a *segregation* model for a *majority* population (in this case a powerless majority) the Bantu education given at the elementary level to Namibians in Namibia. At the time, Namibia was still illegally occupied by South Africa. He also provides an example of *segregation* for a *minority* in the education of Turkish migrants in Bavaria, Germany. The Turkish children are separated from the majority German children in the classrooms, and the goals are to maintain their fluency in the Turkish language for forced repatriation back to Turkey when the labour of their parents is no longer needed or when they themselves become expensive for West Germany (for instance when resisting assimilation and racism by political or other means).

In Aotearoa/New Zealand, the so-called separatist movement is based on a determination to establish schools which teach all parts of the curriculum in Maori. Speaking to various people during this research, I became aware that many Maori people prefer an exclusive Maori medium of learning for their

children and grandchildren. Only one out of fifty non-Maori people I spoke to prefer this option. The relatively slow pace in which total immersion schools are emerging is due to the massive majority of non-Maori people who are not in favour of this form of education for Maori.

Separatism is occurring through preferences. Skutnabb-Kangas (1988, p26) identifies mother tongue (MT) maintenance programmes which uses the children's mother tongue as ME, medium of education, and the linguistic goal is to produce bilingual children, and the societal goals are equity and integration. An example of a MT *maintenance* programme for a *majority* population is in the Uzbekistan. The seven main language groups, including the dominant group, the Uzbeks, are all in the same position educationally with the same rights. The groups have the right to education through the medium of their own languages with Russian, another Uzbekistan language, as the second language. Skutnabb-Kangas also provides the Finnish migrant population in Sweden, and the Spanish-medium classes for the Chicana population in the United States as examples of mother tongue (MT) *maintenance* programmes for *minorities*. The differences however between the MT models explained by Skutnabb-Kangas and those in Aotearoa/New Zealand is that the first language of the children and parents is English in Aotearoa/New Zealand. The target language is Maori, the minority language in the country, and there is an intense determination amongst many Maori people to revitalise the Maori language.

Skutnabb-Kangas' example of *submersion* for a *majority* is education through the medium of a former colonial language in many African countries, for example Zambia (Chishimba, 1984). The linguistic goal is dominance in English for the elite, and, for the masses, dominance in their mother tongues (which the school does nothing to develop) and limited proficiency in English. Submersion is the historic model of education in Aotearoa/New Zealand where English has dominated over the Maori language.

Skutnabb-Kangas maintains that *submersion* programmes for *minorities* are still by far the most common way of educating both indigenous and immigrant minorities in most countries in the world. Even in Sweden, where they have shown initiative and creativity in the education of minorities, some 80% of the immigrant children are educated this way, through the medium of Swedish, regardless of the fact that *all immigrant organisations in every Scandivanian country demand mother tongue medium education*. Most migrants, for instance in the UK and West Germany (except Turks in Bavaria who are in segregation programmes and others in maintenance programmes), undergo submersion programmes. The goals are

dominance by the majority language at the expense of the mother tongue, and assimilation of the minority population into mainstream society.

It could also be added that transitional programmes belong to the submersion type, too; they are simply a version of submersion which is a bit more sophisticated than direct submersion. (See Skutnabb-Kangas' typology, 1984, pp124-133).

In conclusion, five possible goals of bilingual education, as stated by the Department of Modern Languages of Massey University (1984, p13), are:

- 1 a political move to assimilate groups or individuals into the mainstream culture;
- 2 to unify a multilingual country;
- 3 to enable a people to communicate with the outside world;
- 4 to gain economic advantage for various language groups;
- 5 to preserve ethnic or religious ties.

Now that we have necessarily dealt with the definitions of bilingualism and bilingual education, there needs to be a detailed discussion on the disadvantages and advantages of bilingual education from the points of view of researchers in the field. The main questions confronting the advocates of bilingual education in Aotearoa/New Zealand are:

- \* how will Maori medium education affect the abilities of the children to succeed academically in a society dominated commercially, politically, legally, scientifically and socially by English?
- \* what is the ideal model of bilingual education which will ensure success for the students?
- \* how do we build a resource support mechanism in bilingual education to ensure we have the teachers, textbooks and references, buildings, and equipment to sustain high quality education programmes for all learners in Aotearoa/New Zealand?

## Perceived Disadvantages of Bilingualism and Bilingual Education

In early comments about bilingualism, commentators surmised that the capacity of the brain to hold more than one language needed to be considered by advocates of bilingual education. For example, Jespersen claimed that the brain effort required to master two languages resulted in the inferior linguistic achievements of bilingual children compared with children who spoke only one language. He surmised that the brain had a finite capacity to hold more than one language, and although some research has found that the learning of L2 results in a deficit of L1 with some learners, research has shown that the reasons for these are to do with factors such as the relative status of L1 and L2 and the socio-economic levels of the learners, and cannot be attributed to the learner's anatomy. There are enough examples people of all ages throughout the world speaking three or more languages to place doubts on Jespersen's assertions.

Saer (1923) in his work with children in Wales found that rural bilingual children were inferior to rural monolingual children when measured against the Stanford-Binet scale. Saer concluded that the bilingual children were unable to separate the cognitive requirements of the two languages, and thereby learning became a difficult and confusing task for them. He found that the differences in achievement between the children grew as they got older. Critics of Saer's research point to the fact that the bilingual children belonged to a lower socio-economic strata than the monolingual children. They assert that the reasons for the results had more to do with sociological considerations than bilingual ones.

Macnamara (1966) in his work with bilingual children in Ireland reached the conclusion that a balance effect does indeed exist, and this not only has harmful effects on the learning of language, but also places the bilingual child at a disadvantage in learning other subjects. The critics point to the varying socio-economic circumstances of MacNamara's subjects and the relative status of the two languages (Irish and English) which were involved in the study, to discredit the results of the research. Cummins (1977b,c) criticised MacNamara's use of Irish (L2) as the medium for the test on the bilingual children, whereas the control group was tested in English, their L1.

Richard Benton (1977, pp1-5) maintains that bilingualism is an asset, and that any alleged disadvantages reflect a misuse of the word; others reflect inadequate research. Many problems experienced by bilingual children, Benton believes, stem from the unequal status of their two languages. He further contends that a second language brings with it enrichment and valuable insights into language generally.

In Aotearoa/New Zealand, colonisation became an influential force on the language and education of Maori people. Within the context of this country, discussions on Maori language was inextricably linked to Maori education. For example, Royal and Tapiata (1974, p128) maintain that:

the teaching by missionaries in the vernacular [Maori] was enthusiastically received by Maori of all ages and in the 1830s many hundreds are believed to have learned to read and write.

Sorrenson (1981, p171) in supporting Royal and Tapiata states that:

the demand for the printed word was insatiable; by 1845 about half of the adult Maori could read or write a little in their own language.

Royal and Tapiata continue by stating that:

the central place given to the Maori language in the Mission Schools can be claimed to be a key factor in their success.

It is interesting to note that the indications of the priorities the two races had during the initial contact period are illustrated by Sorrenson using the word 'insatiable' to describe the Pakeha appetite for land, and he, Royal and Tapiata using the same word to describe the Maori appetite for the written word.

Despite the success of the Maori language as a medium of instruction however, as Royal and Tapiata write:

the teaching of English [was] stipulated as a condition for a Government subsidy to Mission schools by Governor Grey's Education Ordinance of 1847. Despite, also, the introduction of secular village schools for Maori communities under Acts of 1867 and 1871, it was decreed that English be the medium of instruction.

Sorrenson (1981, p171) brings another dimension to the Ordinance citing it as Grey's attempt to deal with the inadequacy of mission-based Maori education, whose instruction was in Maori and confined to Christian tracts. Subsidies were forthcoming to mission schools so long as the instruction was in English and the curriculum included industrial training, and Sorrenson seems to contend that this

was an attempt to equip Maori to combat the colonising movement that was threatening to engulf them; they needed to learn English.

Harker (1990, pp31,32) states that in the debates on the 1867 Education Bill there were strong and unanimous arguments in favour of using education to bring about the assimilation of Maori children into European culture and society. J.C.Richmond, the opening speaker, stated the basic aim of assimilation:

for a people in the position of the Maori race it was a first condition of their progress to put them in the way of learning the language of the inhabitants and Government of the Colony.

This assimilationist attitude is the primary philosophy behind the subtractive (Lambert, 1967) and the transitional, monoliterate and partial bilingual (Fishman, 1979) programmes. One needs to keep account of the relationship between, for example, the learners of an indigenous people group's educational and linguistic achievements and the time given to the indigenous language in the classroom. The question refers to whether children in total immersion classes for example, where the indigenous language is the only medium of learning and teaching, achieve better than a similar group of children in monoliterate programmes.

### **Perceived Advantages of Bilingualism and Bilingual Education**

It is important for advocates of bilingual education to carefully examine the results coming out of the myriad of models throughout the world. It is essential however for people in Aotearoa/New Zealand to realise the different conditions, status of the languages and people, and socio-economic circumstances of the participants when reading these results. This is not to decry however the fact that similar positive and negative results can be produced by bilingual education programmes established in this country. It is fair to say that the positive results are encouraging for people advocating bilingual education, and the negative results will ensure that we are cautious to establish successful models.

According to Skutnabb-Kangas (1988, p23), segregation programmes for a majority population of black children in Namibia produce poor results. Scholastic failure for the majority of those who start school (and many do not), and low levels of cognitive/academic proficiency in both languages is the norm. This fits however with the overriding linguistic goal which is the dominance of dominant language, and the societal goal, which is the perpetuation of apartheid. He also maintains that the segregation for minority population programmes for Turk

children in Bavaria, Germany, are not successful for the Turk children. The German Government is reluctant to allocate an equitable share of resources (in comparison with the allocations to the mainstream system for German children) to the Turkish minority and the education of their children. This points to the fact that separatist bilingual education programmes in Aotearoa/New Zealand need to be adequately resourced and based on achieving at least the same quality as mainstream programmes if they are to be successful for the students in them.

On the other hand, the mother tongue (MT) maintenance programmes for majorities in Uzbekistan, where only a tiny elite was literate 70 years ago when the country was still under feudal conditions, has turned the situation around, and all children now complete at least 10 years of education. The programmes achieve high levels of success as the goals of bilingualism, equity and integration are inherent in the policies.

In summing up the mother tongue (MT) maintenance programme for minorities, especially the first three cohorts of Finnish youngsters who have gone through the whole comprehensive school (nine years) in Finnish in Botkyrka, a suburb of Stockholm, Skutnabb-Kangas writes that they continue their education in upper secondary schools in the more academic streams to a somewhat greater extent than Swedish youngsters from the same schools.

These comments about the children of Finnish workers in Sweden by Skutnabb-Kangas is at variance with his and Toukomaa's (1976) earlier report in which they characterised the children as 'semilinguals' as their skills in both Finnish and Swedish (as measured by standardised tests) were considerably below Finnish and Swedish norms. The extent to which the mother tongue had been developed prior to contact with Swedish was strongly related to how well Swedish was learned. Children who migrated at age ten maintained a level of Finnish close to Finnish students in Finland and achieved Swedish language skills comparable to those of Swedes. However, children who were seven to eight years of age when they moved to Sweden or moved before starting school were most likely to achieve low levels of literacy skills in both languages. Skutnabb-Kangas and Toukomaa argue on the basis of these results that the minority child's first language (L1) has functional significance in the developmental process and should be reinforced by the school. Swain and Cummins (1982, p24), maintain that things have changed for the better for Finnish migrants' children in Sweden over the last number of years through the realisation that the maintenance of L1 is to be promoted throughout the children's schooling.

Swain and Cummins (1982) reviewed recent studies which have investigated the relationships between bilingualism and cognitive functioning, and to outline the implications of these research findings for educational settings. They identify many examples of research from various parts of the world which point to specific incidences where bilingual children are not handicapped in relation to unilingual children.

For example, MacNamara's (1966) study of bilingualism in Irish primary education was criticised by Cummins (1977 b,c) as the Irish immersion group was given the arithmetic test through their weaker language (Irish) whereas comparison groups took the test in their stronger language (English). Thus, according to Cummins, MacNamara's study confounds the immersion children's competence in arithmetic with the ability to demonstrate this competence when tested through their weaker language.

Swain and Cummins also criticise Tsushima and Hogan's (1975) study which reported that grade 4 and 5 Japanese-English bilinguals brought up in the United States by a Japanese mother and US father performed at a significantly lower level on measures of verbal and academic skills than a unilingual group matched on non-verbal IQ as it fails to provide any information about the bilingual learning conditions under which such a deficit might occur.

They similarly criticised the Singaporean study by Torrance, Gowan, Wu and Aliotti (1970) who reported that grades 3, 4 and 5 children attending English (L2) medium schools performed at a significantly lower level than unilingual children on the fluency and flexibility scales of the Torrance Tests of Creative Thinking, a measure of divergent thinking. Although more than one thousand children were involved, there was little detail about the relative IQs nor about the level of bilingualism of the bilingual subjects.

Skutnabb-Kangas' conclusions of the models of bilingual education he investigated are that in all HDS (high degree of success) contexts the *linguistic goal* has been *bilingualism*, and the *societal goal* has been a *positive* one for the group concerned. In all LDS (low degree of success) contexts, the *linguistic goal* has been *dominance in one of the languages*, either L1 or L2, not bilingualism. The other language (non-ME, medium of education) has been neglected or taught badly. The *societal goal* has been to *keep the group* (or at least most of them) *in a powerless subordinate position*.

Skutnabb-Kangas (1988, p 24, 25) identifies organisational factors such as the children having choices, equal knowledge of the medium of education, and teachers being trained and bilingual, having a sufficient supply of bilingual resources, and the cultural content of materials being appropriate for pupils as crucial in order to attain a high degree of success in bilingual programmes. He also identifies learner-related affective factors such as providing a low level of anxiety (supportive, non-authoritarian), high internal motivation (not forced to use L2, understands and sympathetic with objectives, responsible for own learning), and high self-confidence (fair chance to succeed, high teacher expectations) as essential requirements for a high degree of success.

Skutnabb-Kangas continues by highlighting *L1-related linguistic, cognitive, pedagogical and social factors* such as adequate linguistic development in L1 by being taught well, with enough relevant, cognitively demanding subject matter provided, opportunity to develop L1 outside school in linguistically demanding formal contexts, and L2 teaching supporting L1 developments as crucial in the development of highly successful bilingual education programmes. He finally identifies *L2-related linguistic, cognitive, pedagogical and social factors* such as an adequate linguistic development in L2 by L2 being taught well, L2 input being adapted to the pupils' L2 level, opportunity to practise L2 in peer group contexts, and the exposure to native speaker L2 use in linguistically demanding formal contexts as also being essential requirements to achieve a high degree of success.

The comments by Skutnabb-Kangas (1988) correlate with conclusions presented by Swain and Cummins (1982). Swain and Cummins claim that a variety of cognitive advantages have been reported in association with bilingualism. Their assertions cover linguistic skills, general intellectual skills and divergent thinking, analytic orientation to linguistic and perceptual structures, and increased sensitivity to feedback cues. I would like to consider each of these in turn as the developments in Aotearoa/New Zealand need to take cognisance of the results emanating from the various models of bilingual education so that we can ensure that any forms we establish are well thought out.

In the area of linguistic skills, Swain and Cummins claim that, several studies conducted within the context of primary immersion programmes have reported that the immersion students performed better than children in regular programmes on measures of L1 skills despite considerably less instruction through the medium of L1. For example, in early total French immersion programmes:

- 1 Barik and Swain (1978) in their work in Ottawa with Grade 5 children whose L1 was English reported that although the children were learning entirely through French, their L2, they performed better in some aspects of English than English speaking children learning through English only. Ekstrand (1978) also found that Swedish speaking children who learned through English only, performed better in some aspects of the Swedish language than Swedish speaking children who were taught entirely through Swedish. The critics however point to the fact that English is a high status language which is prominent throughout the world, and therefore in the Ottawa situation L1 is not threatened by L2. French is also a language of status. In the Swedish situation the children were highly motivated to achieve in English as well as maintain their own first language. Swedish is the language of politics, commercialism and social contact in Sweden.
  
- 2 Swain (1975) reported that the immersion children used more complex syntactic structures in written English composition than regular programme students;
  
- 3 Tremaine (1975) compared the syntactical development of grades 1, 2 and 3 children in a total French immersion programme with children who were given 75 minutes of French instruction per day, and he found that:
  - (i) there were large differences between the two groups in French syntactical development [in favour of the immersion students];
  
  - (ii) there were significant differences in favour of the immersion group in English syntactical development when level of Piagetian operations were controlled.

Tremaine concludes that intensive exposure to French facilitated the comprehension of certain English syntactic structures.

- 4 Ekstrand (1978) reports preliminary results of an experimental project in Sweden in which elementary school children with an early start in learning English (L2) did significantly better in Swedish (L1) than control children;
  
- 5 Genesee, Tucker and Lambert (1978), in a longitudinal study, report an enhancement of linguistic skills as a function of intensity of bilingual learning experiences;

- 6 Genesee et al also report that, grade 3 and 5 children in a tri-lingual English-Hebrew-French programme in Montreal performed at the same level in English and significantly better in Hebrew when compared to children in a bilingual English-Hebrew programme. Genesee et al point out that the Hebrew curriculum in experimental and control schools was essentially the same;
- 7 Dube and Herbert (1975) report that minority francophone children in a French-English bilingual education project in Maine developed higher levels of English skills than a control group of children in an English-only programme.

In the area of orientation to linguistic and perceptual structures, the following results have been attained:

- 1 Feldman and Shen (1971) reported that five year old bilingual Head Start children were superior to unilinguals in their ability to switch labels, and in their use of common names and nonsense names in relational statements;
- 2 Ianco-Worrall (1972), in a study in South Africa, reported that bilingual children, brought up in a one-person, one language home environment, were significantly more sensitive than unilingual children, matched on IQ, to semantic relations between words and were also more advanced in realising the arbitrary assignments of names to referents. Unilingual children were more likely to interpret similarity between words in terms of an acoustic rather than a semantic dimension ( e.g. *cap-can* rather than *cap-hat*) and felt that the name of objects could not be interchanged;
- 3 Cummins (1978) in a study involving grades 3 and 6 Irish-English bilinguals matched on IQ with a unilingual group, supported Ianco-Worrall's findings that bilinguals were more aware of the arbitrary assignment of words to referents. However, a subsequent study (Cummins and Mulcahy, 1978a) involving grades 1 and 3 Ukrainian-English bilinguals found no differences between bilingual and unilingual groups on this task;
- 4 Cummins (1978b) reported that both grade 3 and grade 6 bilingual children were significantly better able than unilingual children to evaluate non empirical contradictory statements;

- 5 Cummins and Mulcahy (1978a) reported that grades 1 and 3 Ukrainian-English bilingual children were better able to analyse ambiguities in sentence structure than a control group of unilingual children matched for IQ, SES and school;
- 6 Ben-Zeev (1978a,b), in two studies involving middle class Hebrew-English bilinguals and lower class Spanish-English bilinguals, reported that in comparison to unilingual children matched on IQ, bilingual children were better able to treat sentence structure analytically and also perform better on several nonverbal tasks which required perceptual analysis. She suggested that bilingual children develop an analytic strategy of linguistic processing in order to overcome inter lingual interference. Bilingual-unilingual differences on the perceptual tasks were interpreted as evidence for the generalisation of bilinguals' analytic strategy towards language to other kinds of structures;
- 7 Ben-Zeev (1977a) also reports higher latency of paradigmatic responses by bilingual children on a word association task. Cummins and Mulcahy (1978b) in providing some balance have also reported that Ukrainian-English bilingual children took significantly longer than unilingual children to respond on a word association task. Swain and Cummins (1982) surmise that the longer latency of the word association responses may be a result of the increased semantic processing necessary to overcome inter lingual interference;
- 8 Balkan (1970) reported, superior performance by bilinguals on tasks involving an ability to restructure linguistic and perceptual schemata. In a study conducted in Switzerland, Balkan matched bilinguals and unilinguals on non-verbal intelligence and found that the bilingual group performed significantly better on two variables which he claims measure cognitive flexibility. One of these tests was similar to the Embedded Figures Test, and involved an ability to restructure a perceptual situation. The other test required a sensitivity to the different meanings of words. Bruck, Lambert and Tucker (in press) also found large differences between experimental and control groups on the Embedded Figures Test at the Grade 6 level in the St. Lambert French immersion programme, again, in favour of the bilinguals;
- 9 Starck, Genesee, Lambert & Seitz (1977) demonstrated more reliable ear asymmetry effects on a dichotic listening task among children attending a

trilingual Hebrew-French-English programme as compared to a control group of children whose instruction was totally in English;

- 10 Vygotsky (1962, p110) argued that being able to express the same thought in different languages will enable the child to see his or her language as one particular system among many, to view its phenomena under more general categories, and this leads to awareness of his or her linguistic operations. Lambert and Tucker (1972) argued that a similar process was likely to operate among children in immersion programmes. They suggested that as children develop high-level bilingual skills they are likely to practice a form of incipient contrastive linguistics by comparing the syntax and vocabulary of their two languages.

In the area of being sensitive to feedback cues, Swain and Cummins (1982) maintain that, several studies provide evidence of both greater social sensitivity and greater ability to react more flexibly to cognitive feedback among bilinguals. The following are some examples:

- 1 Ben-Zeev (1977b) suggests that increased attention to feedback cues has adaptive significance for bilingual children in that it might help them understand the communication of others, make them aware of mistakes in their own speech and provide them with information regarding the appropriate times for switching languages;
- 2 Ben-Zeev (1977a,b) reports that Spanish-English bilinguals were significantly better able to use hints as cues to successfully restructuring on classification tasks. Cummins and Mulcahy (1978a) similarly report that bilingual children make significantly better use of prompts in interpreting ambiguous sentences. However, differences between bilinguals and unilinguals on the ambiguities task remained significant even when the prompting data was eliminated;
- 3 the findings of several investigations suggest that bilinguals may be more sensitive to impersonal feedback and more adept at certain kinds of communication tasks. For example Genesee, Tucker and Lambert (1976) asked children in immersion classes to explain how to play a game to two different listeners, one blindfolded and the other not blindfolded. The immersion group was found to be more sensitive to the needs of listeners and responded most differentially, showing the largest difference between sighted and blindfolded conditions. The authors suggest that the

immersion children's school experiences may have made them more aware of possible difficulties in communicating as well as provided them with some experience in coping with such difficulties;

- 4 Bain (1975) and Bain and Yu (1978) have examined bilingual-unilingual differences in sensitivity to facial expressions. Bain (1975) found significant differences between bilingual and unilingual children at grades 1 and 6 on the Portrait Sensitivity Test in which children were required to identify the facial expressions on a series of 24 portraits painted by famous artists. The finding was replicated cross-culturally by Bain and Yu (1978).

In the area of general intellectual development, a number of studies have revealed certain findings, some of which are explained here:

- 1 Peal and Lambert (1962) reported that French-English bilingual children showed a higher level of both verbal and non-verbal intelligence than a comparison group of unilingual children matched on SES and sex. In addition, factor analysis of the cognitive measures revealed a more differentiated subtest profile in the bilingual group. Cummins and Gulustan (1974) also reported significantly higher levels of verbal and non-verbal ability among bilingual children;
- 2 Swain and Cummins (1982) report that two further studies have reported that bilingual children performed better than unilinguals on measures of concept formation. Leidk and Nelson (1968) found that bilingual grade 1 children performed significantly better on a Piagetian concept-formation task than a unilingual group matched for age, SES, sex and IQ. The authors hypothesised that the bilingual child is exposed to a wider range of experiences due to the greater amount of social interaction involved in learning two languages as compared to one. Bain (1975) reported significant differences between grade 1 bilinguals and unilinguals on a rule discovery task. Bilingual and unilingual children were matched for SES, sex, IQ and developmental level of operations. Although in the same direction, differences at the grade 6 level did not reach significance;
- 3 Using longitudinal data from the Ottawa and Toronto French immersion programmes, Barik and Swain (1976) investigated the hypothesis that cognitive advantages are associated with the attainment of high levels of bilingual skills. It was found that children who had attained high levels of French skills performed significantly better than low French achievers on

two of the three Otis-Lennon IQ subtests when scores were adjusted for initial IQ and age differences between the two groups. The IQ scores of the low French achievers remained unchanged over the three year period whereas the IQ scores of the high French achievers increased, suggesting that the attainment of high levels of L2 skills is associated with greater cognitive growth.

In the area of **divergent thinking**, a number of studies have revealed certain results, some of which are explained here:

- 1 Cummins and Gulustan (1974) reported significant differences between bilingual and unilingual grade 6 children on a verbal originality measure. When intelligence was partialled out the level of significance was reduced but the difference remaining was still significant. However no differences were found on four other measures of divergent thinking. Further analysis of the data (Cummins, 1977a) suggested that only those bilinguals who had attained a relatively high level of second language competence performed at a high level on the verbal originality task (administered in L1) while children who remained dominant in their home language were at a disadvantage in relation to unilingual children on verbal fluency and flexibility skills. Torrance et al (1970) have also reported that bilingual children in Singapore performed at a higher level than unilingual children on originality and elaboration scales of the Torrance Tests of Creative Thinking. Landry (1974) reported that grade 6 children attending schools where the FLES (foreign languages in elementary schools) programme (that is between 20 and 45 minutes of second language instruction per day) was operative, scored significantly higher than a unilingual control group on both the verbal and figural parts of the Torrance Tests of Creative Thinking. Differences between FLES and non-FLES schools at the grade 1 and grade 4 levels were non-significant;
- 2 Scott (1973) reported significant differences in divergent thinking between the experimental children in the St Lambert bilingual programme in Montreal and unilingual comparison groups. She also reports that the French speaking skills of the experimental children at the grade 6 level were significantly predicted by earlier (grade 3) divergent thinking abilities. Scott concludes that higher levels of divergent thinking may be either an effect or a causal element in the attainment of functional bilingualism;

- 3 a study conducted by Carringer (1974) reported that 24 Spanish-English bilinguals performed at a significantly higher level than 24 Spanish speaking unilinguals on several measures of divergent thinking.

Swain and Cummins (1982) maintain that although, in general, these recent studies are better controlled than the earlier studies which reported negative findings, few are without methodological limitations. A problem in many of these studies (Bain and Yu, 1978; Carringer, 1974; Cummins and Gulustan, 1974; Feldman and Shen, 1971; Landry, 1974; Peal and Lambert, 1962) is the lack of adequate controls for possible background differences between bilingual and unilingual groups. An index of SES based on parental occupation provides inadequate protection against bias. Also, matching only on overall stage of cognitive development (e.g. preoperational, concrete operational etc.) is insufficient since there can be extremely large individual differences on cognitive variables within stages. Although remaining studies have matched bilingual and unilingual groups on IQ in addition to SES, the validity of some of the dependent measures used to assess constructs such as analytic orientation to language or sensitivity to feedback cues is open to question. Also, some studies are difficult to evaluate because of inadequate descriptions of either the bilingual learning situation or of the levels of L1 and L2 competence attained by the bilingual Ss.

Future research on bilingual and immersion education in Aotearoa/New Zealand needs to examine the methodologies from overseas for their relevance and appropriateness to test bilingual education in this country. There is a lot we need to know. For example, do the separate kura kaupapa Maori being established resemble the Namibia segregation programmes Skutnabb-Kangas (1988) describes, or are they more like Swain's (1978) early immersion programmes in Canada. This is an important question as Skutnabb-Kangas reports that the segregation programmes are clearly indicating poor educational and bilingual results for the students, and Swain reports positive results for the immersion programmes. It is not enough to rely on anecdotal evidence to monitor and plan the various programmes being developed in this country.

It is essential however to take note of the limitations of the research results mentioned here and devise methods which although related to overseas methods, are specifically devised for Aotearoa/New Zealand conditions.

The different forms of bilingual education established throughout the country provides an exciting base for research. Practically every model of bilingual education throughout the world exists in some form or other in Aotearoa/New Zealand. However, the prime difference between the people involved in bilingual education research overseas and the situation in this country is that Aotearoa/New Zealand has an indigenous population who are taking the lead in establishing models of bilingual education which satisfy their needs and aspirations. The main goals of the Maori education movement from preschool to tertiary levels are to restore the indigenous Maori language, to achieve educational success, and to ensure Maori people have the essential English skills.

This research now needs to provide an historical account of bilingual education in Aotearoa/New Zealand prior to examining the case studies. This will enable the readers who are not familiar with the situation in Aotearoa/New Zealand to acquire a sound base to understand the unique challenges which face bilingual education developers in this country. Readers will also understand that the establishment of bilingual programmes cannot be separated from the political and social factors affecting both the Maori and Pakeha populations.

#### **Aotearoa/New Zealand Forms of Bilingualism and Bilingual Education**

With regard to Aotearoa/New Zealand, the Maori people are an indigenous population which have been colonised by an English speaking people mainly of British origin. As there are only few articles and research relating to indigenous groups, it may be advisable in this research to provide an historical account of the interactions between the indigenous people and colonisers in terms of their education and the evolving relationships between the languages. The history of the French and English in Canada, the Spanish immigrants in the USA, the Turks in Germany, people in Russia, the Swedish situation and even the Blacks in Namibia, differ markedly from the Maori in Aotearoa/New Zealand.

The literature on bilingual education in Aotearoa/New Zealand is able to paint a descriptive picture of bilingual educational developments from the time of the first mission school started by Thomas Kendall at Rangihoua in the Bay of Islands in 1816, to the intervening periods of increased contact between Maori and Pakeha, to Aotearoa/New Zealand endeavouring to cope with the influx of immigrant populations from the Pacific Islands, Europe and Asia in the main, and finally to current developments with te kohanga reo and kura kaupapa Maori (autonomous Maori run total immersion pre-schools and schools). My assertion that bilingual education started with the first mission school and has continued through to the

present day is based on the claim that bilingualism is a continuum from Bloomfield's description of native-like control of two languages to Halliday's partial or imperfect use of the second language.

Bilingualism, in its variations along the continuum, has played an influential role in the education of both the Maori people and what has come to be known as 'other ethnic groups', in Aotearoa/New Zealand. Except for various passing remarks of clarification, I will not cover the education of immigrant groups in this thesis except to say that generally the models of education in which immigrant non-English speaking children are involved are in the form of Littlewood's (1986) foreign and second language learning programmes dominated by acquiring English. The students L1 is not taken into account, which puts the programmes also into Lambert's (1967) subtractive bilingualism camp. It is an important study on its own, and any attempt in this thesis to traverse the attempts in Aotearoa/New Zealand to cope with the education of immigrant populations will be too tokenistic. Maori people have claimed that Pakeha have treated Maori issues with token or marginal treatment in the past, and I don't want to be accused of that when considering the issues facing immigrant groups.

My intention in this part of the thesis is to deal with the education of Maori people. I will begin with an historical account and build progressively to the current situation.

Royal and Tapiata (1974) state that from the first establishment of schools for Maori people by Christian missionaries until the middle of the nineteenth century, the Maori language was used as the sole medium of instruction. In addition, the Maori language was converted into written form by mainly missionary endeavour. In order for this teaching to take place, the missionaries would have had to be bilingual, somewhere along the continuum, and the learners would have experienced various forms of bilingualism in both their informal and formal learning processes with the missionaries and school teachers speaking English to each other.

Owens (1981, p37) makes the point that knowledge of the language by the missionaries had grown; and from 1827 onwards, translations of the Bible, Prayer Book, and hymns had been made. The realisation that their language could be conveyed in printed form created much excitement amongst Maori. Those who had learnt to read and write passed on the skills to others. They returned to their people from time to time to convey what they had learned from the missionaries. Owens( p39) maintains that putting the Maori language into printed form was

undoubtedly one of the missionaries' greatest achievements, and, in so far as it helped to preserve the language, it was a triumph.

Therefore, during the initial thirty years of mission schools, the model resembled Swain's (1978) immersion programmes where Maori was the only language spoken and written in the learning process. They only had access to translated religious material. Like Swain's immersion programmes, the reports indicate that the mission schools were extremely successful in that less than thirty years after the establishment of the first school in 1816, over 50% of the Maori population were literate in Maori.

Owens makes a pertinent observation when he states that, formidable as the changes were, they took place within a Maori framework of values representing continuity with pre-European Maori ways. The ability of Maori tribes to withstand powerful cultural pressures from outside lay partly in the nature of their social structures and controls. Maori kinship groupings were equipped to survive stress, and even disasters such as wars and famine, at the local level. All kin groups interlocked: the whanau, or extended family of three or four generations, led out into the hapu which could number several hundred members and so into the iwi, or tribe, even to the waka, or groups of tribes. These social groups, though based on descent, were capable of constant change and regrouping. King (1981, p280) however comments that over the first half of the twentieth century these social institutions weakened, as a result of an earlier population decline and the continuing loss of land. Migration in search of seasonal work also dispersed some tribes.

It is an interesting point to note here that advocates of bilingual and immersion education in this country emphasise the need to incorporate Maori kinship patterns into the modern learning situations. They decry the adding on of Maori language programmes to an essentially Pakeha system of education. They see that the incorporation of whanau systems is important for the success of bilingual and immersion programmes.

Owens also emphasises that external pressures were also limited because they were uneven. Economic contacts were essentially local and there was a distinction between areas of direct and indirect contact with the Bay of Islands receiving much direct contact while the interior of the North Island enjoyed gentle stimulus. These differences would probably have also resembled the variances on the language developments happening at the time. The language of Maori people in direct contact with the Pakeha would have been directly influenced whereas those

not in direct contact would have remained relatively unchanged. One of the areas which enjoyed this gentle stimulus was Ruatoki, which over a hundred years later was to figure prominently in the language renaissance.

Owens further states that early relationships between Maori and European were usually of mutual convenience and economic benefit and violent conflict between the races were rare and the spirit of tolerance and respect generally prevailed. However this was later to be challenged as Sorrenson (1981, p169) maintains that there was a difference between the few Perches who had earlier come to trade, and the many who now came to settle, to claim, occupy, and cultivate the land. They displayed an insatiable appetite, gave the land itself a commercial value, and used it as a means of speculation. Colonisation became a tide which flowed but never ebbed.

Harker (1990, pp31) in providing an overview of the legislative provisions for Maori children states that the debates were kept quite separate from the debates on the education of the European settlers' children. Harker explains that the period between 1860 and 1880 covers the heights of the Land Wars (or the wars between Maori and the colonisers over land), the formation of the national education system and the creation of the four Maori electorates to elect Maori Members of Parliament. Harker also notes that there was a growing Maori nationalism, and combined with the Land Wars, led to a decline in the number of Maori children receiving schooling. Harker concludes that by 1865 it was estimated that only 22 Maori pupils were attending any form of school in the Colony.

Harker continues by stating that the 1867 Maori Schools Bill which replaced the mission schools with a national system of secular village schools required that:

schools would be built only on the condition that the Maori should write to the Colonial Secretary requesting a school, and should declare their willingness to provide one half of the costs of construction, one quarter of the teacher's salary and an area of not less than one acre of their land for a school site.

The Maori commitment to education was demonstrated by the fact that native schools were established throughout Maori districts. Most Maori children attended the native schools and Pakeha children the public schools.

Royal and Tapiata bring another perspective to the developments when they maintain that James Pope, appointed organising-inspector of these schools formulated in 1880 a realistic Native School Code with a curriculum adapted to Maori needs, and though in the formal work of the schools he stressed the prime importance of English he recommended the use of the Maori language in junior classes as an aid to comprehension of English. Teachers who taught in the native schools were required to have a knowledge of William's *First Lessons in Maori*, to be able to translate a passage from the Maori Bible, and to have some knowledge of Maori traditions and customs. Pope's concessions to bilingualism was in the interests of fostering the learning of English, but a generation after his appointment difficulties were continuing in teaching English to Maori children, of whom it was estimated that 98 per cent used Maori as their only language in the home. This model resembles Fishman's transitional bilingual programme where L1 (Maori) is used only as a vehicle to strengthen L2 (English), and Fishman's monoliterate programme where the written L1 form is not promoted; only English literacy is promoted in the formal learning process.

There was consequent hardening against the use of Maori language in the schools as the conviction developed that its use impeded, rather than assisted, the learning of English - a belief unfortunately too common. Barrington (1966, pp2-6) maintains that William Bird, Pope's successor, expressed the view that not only were teachers who ceased to use Maori in their classes to be commended, but also that Maori children should be encouraged to speak English only in the playground. Saer's (1923) assertion that bilingualism adversely affects the learning of the target language, despite being wrong, gained credence throughout the English speaking world.

The belief that Maori language impeded the learning of English also gained credence amongst various Maori people who lived alongside Pakeha. Royal and Tapiata (1974, pp129, 130) emphasise that the need to learn English was supported by many influential Maori. They cite, for example, Takamoana (1871), one of the four Maori members of parliament at the time, requesting the Government to legislate for Maori children to be taught only in English. Also, a petition by Wi Te Hariko and 336 others in 1877 asking for legislation that the teacher in a Native school and his wife and children be ignorant of Maori language and that no word of Maori should be allowed to be spoken in any school. These submissions were quite successful in ensuring that completely monolingual English speaking teachers were appointed to native schools. James Pope's requirements that teachers in those schools have some facility in Maori were put aside in favour of policies promoted by William Bird.

Royal and Tapiata give a reason for this attitude by stating that Maori children were then able to learn their own language at home whereas English was seen as opening up advancement in the world of the Pakeha. Therefore they contend that it is understandable that there should have been concern to acquire knowledge of English at a time when there was no threat to the use of their own language. Although this may be so, it is apparent that a subtractive bilingual policy (Lambert, 1967) was well established at this time, with the goal being the development of the English language at the expense of Maori.

This attitude to assimilationist trends extended to Pomare (a Maori minister of health) when he stated baldly in 1906: "There is no alternative but to become a Pakeha." Fitzgerald stated that the Young Maori Party, a group of young professional men who, (excluding Frederick Bennett) were educated at Te Aute College, with the exception of Apirana Ngata, was characterised by its wholesale adoption of Pakeha culture and its readiness to scrap the surviving elements of its own. (Martin, 1956) To them Maori society was degraded, demoralised, irreligious, beset with antiquated, depressing, and pernicious customs. Their task was to reconstruct this society to make their race clean, industrious, sober and virtuous. This appealed to liberal Pakeha opinion as it did not present the threatening prospect of having to deal with the Maori as Maori. (King, 1981, p289). Maori politicians were merely echoing the assertions of their Pakeha colleagues.

For example Harker (1981, p31) emphasises the attitudes of government officials when he notes some comments during the debates on the 1867 Bill. For example:

Mr Hall noted that the Government's great aim was the civilisation of the remnant of a noble race;

Major Heaphy raised the social issue and stated that as the more natives were educated the less would be the future expenditure on police and goals;

Mr Carlton declared that the traditional Maori lifestyle could not be tolerated to continue, and that the Maori language was "imperfect as a medium of thought."

However, there was an alternative Maori opinion recorded in the early twentieth century. Williams (1977, p9) provides a summation of significant Maori reaction

to the proceedings since initial contact between the Maori and Pakeha in the form of a script developed by a collection of Arawa chiefs in 1907:

You brought us your civilisation, and you decimated our ranks with strange diseases and modern armaments. You supplied us with firearms, and when in the lust of war we had slain almost half of the flower of our race (and a few of yours), you punished us as rebels and confiscated our lands. You gave us the Bible and you broke its precepts. You taught us ethics and you had no scruples in your dealings with us. You gave us alcohol and then punished us and gave us an evil name for using it. Our fathers desired to be civilised, but because of your inconsistencies they abandoned your teaching and opposed it with their hearts' blood. We retrograded, and the gap between us widened. You have had to make up the ground lost by the bad example of your fathers: we have had to overcome the distrust and suspicion engendered in the hearts of ours and transmitted to us, ere we could once more take up the broken thread of progress.

Whereas in the initial period of contact the Maori borrowed specific goods and customs, fitting them into the context of their own culture, by 1890 a massive and complicated body of legislation existed concerning Maori land, the result of a half-century search for an easy and effective way of alienating Maori land to European settlers. To some Maori such as Rewi Maniapoto, chief of the Maniapoto tribe, the greatest obstacle to effective Maori political action was lack of unity, a problem stemming from the divisions of Maori society in pre-European times. The waka (or canoe) consisted of related iwi, and only on rare occasions, such as when a tribe was under threat or, as in the case of the Arawa confederation of tribes (as demonstrated by the united submission), for political reasons. Whereas Owens (1981) cited the traditional structures as enabling Maori people to withstand powerful cultural pressures from outside, Williams (1977) thought that it was the basis of Maori disunity.

The progressive displacement of the indigenous people of Aotearoa/New Zealand by the European settlers, which was manifested in the loss of their land and independence in the nineteenth century, brought about a new resolve by Maori around the turn of the century. By this time the Maori were becoming aware of the significance of European political power and they became more articulate, better organised, and more effective in their use of political techniques. New organisations combined with traditional leadership, and new economic enterprise combined with traditional social values, to form a pattern of Maori development.

This has been the pattern of Maori educational developments, and throughout the twentieth century the Maori people have through trial and error, rejected some notions of European education and have progressively moved towards retaining traditional elements to better equip Maori people for the twenty first century. It is apparent that complete facility in both the Maori and English languages are the essential goals for Maori education enterprises. Learning the English language at the expense of the Maori language however, has been rejected outright throughout Maori society.

Royal and Tapiata (1974, p129) explain that, with many years of neglect and discouragement of the Maori language in the State schools, with increased momentum of urbanisation of Maori since World War II, and decreased use of Maori in the home, the fate of Maori as a living language has been brought into question. This has been met with an increasingly widespread demand that active measures be taken for the language to be made available as an important subject in New Zealand schools. The change in attitude since World War II by educationists, by Government, and by the Maori people themselves has been influenced by modern language research and increased information on bilingualism, by fuller understanding of the connection between language and culture, and by greater awareness of the value of a language to the people to whom it belongs.

King (1981, pp296, 297) maintains that in the 1960s and 1970s, a group of young and largely urban Maori dissidents, many of whom had tertiary education spoke out for Maori interests more emphatically and more abrasively. The young educated Maori of the 1960s and 1970s had realised that despite the best efforts of the Maori people in the past to negotiate diplomatically for the recognition of Maori in the political processes of Aotearoa/New Zealand, Maori people remained marginalised. They came to occupy the fringes of decision making. The young people grouped together and chose to protest with strong verbal attacks on parliament and the establishment.

Smith (1979, p17), in explaining the build-up towards the establishment of the first official bilingual school in Aotearoa/New Zealand in 1978, writes that, from the time when the state became responsible for Maori education, in 1867 the English language has been the medium of instruction in schools. Although Maori was used as a bridge to English for a brief period, by the turn of the century the classrooms of Maori schools had become completely monolingual. The use of Maori as the medium of instruction in Ruatoki school is, then, a radical change from policies which have held for more than a hundred years.

Smith implies that the notion of bilingual education and its eventual implementation was a result of teamwork between the Ruatoki community and the Department of Education when he states (p18) that:

the idea of establishing a bilingual programme at Ruatoki School was presented by officers of the Department of Education at a full community meeting held on the Rewarewa Marae in November, 1976. The community gave the project approval in principle, although some searching questions were asked. Why was the Department now advocating the use of Maori, when for so long it had been discouraged? Would the development of Maori make the acquisition of the English language skills by Maori children more difficult? Since the meeting, however, parents of the community have given their full support for the bilingual programme. Experience elsewhere in the world has shown this to be the essential ingredient for success.

Smith emphasises that the incentive to establish bilingual education in Ruatoki came from a socio-linguistic survey carried out by the New Zealand Council of Educational Research which showed that a majority of Maori families now use English at home, and that most Maori under the age of thirty are unable to speak Maori fluently. Ruatoki is one of the few communities where children come to school with Maori as their first language, and even there things are changing rapidly. Surveys taken since bilingual teaching began there have shown that children's fluency in Maori can no longer be taken for granted. Smith attributes the changes to the influence of radio and television, improved transportation, and wider opportunities in education and employment.

According to the Department of Education, Maori Education Statistics (1989), since the first bilingual school in Ruatoki, the number in Aotearoa/New Zealand had grown to 20 in 1989. In addition, the number of schools with bilingual classes grew to 131.

The establishment of the bilingual schools changed the perceptions at a local level of Maori language as a medium of instruction, but the programme which has been attributed with changing the face of Maori education throughout the country from preschool to tertiary is the kohanga reo movement. It is appropriate at this time to discuss this programme at length as it is a prototype of the model of education that many Maori people would like to see implemented for all Maori learners. Fleras (1983, p 19) explains:

for the past 150 years, Maori society in general, and Maori language in particular have been under assault by Pakeha political, economic and social institutions. The Pakeha have taken it upon themselves to foreclose that which is distinctive about the Maori and to replace it with Pakeha virtues of materialism, progress and Christianity. In the face of this barrage of destructive influences, significant elements of Maori culture have undergone a steady, cumulative deterioration.

The eventual assimilation of the Maori, has traditionally marked the cornerstone of Government policy. In 1867 the government passed the Native Schools Act and the Education Act which in effect imposed a monocultural system of education upon Maori pupils. In 1870, the Education Amendment Act repealed the bilingual policy, hitherto espoused by the Missions, in favour of one which relied on English as the sole language of instruction.

Fleras concedes that English was needed to ensure success in the Pakeha world, a point noted by one of the greatest Maori leaders of them all, Sir Apirana Ngata, who exhorted Maori children to learn English first, English second and English third. It is clear from Sir Apirana's later comments however that he believed that the acquisition of English must not be at the cost of being able to speak Maori.

Te Kohanga Reo movement, which was initiated in April, 1982, after a series of meetings by Maori elders and the Department of Maori Affairs, produced a formula for Maori language survival which brought together Maori elders who had been brought up in the language, and the preschool children. This movement differed from the bilingual education developments which was epitomised by Ruatoki School, in that it took place outside of the traditional school system, and it was formulated by the Maori people themselves. The interaction between the elders and the children was to be based on a set of beliefs such as those recorded by Dr Augie Fleras of the University of Waterloo, Canada, who was commissioned by the Department of Maori Affairs in 1983 to produce a report on the organisation, objectives and implications of Maori language nests or kohanga reo.

Some of the inherent beliefs by Maori people which were articulated during the rise of the kohanga reo movement were recorded by Fleras as follows:

You don't teach a language to kids. They just learn it naturally from listening to it. (Official, Maori Education Foundation).

The kids aren't taught how to speak Maori. They just sit around and listen to it and their little minds stretch and take it all in. (Maori parent).

No formal teaching at this place, but an open community where children learn through seeing and hearing. (Community Officer, Department of Maori Affairs).

Expanding on this, Fleras (1983, p41) explains that learning in kohanga reo centres

goes on naturally. Supervisors are no longer expected to act as teachers whose role is intrinsically more important than that of parents or grandparents. The language model proponents are not against the use of gadgets or theory in order to convince the children to speak Maori. In fact toys, blocks and brushes are permissible if they are integrated into the whanau centre and if they serve to enhance the learning of the language. What they are against is the use of toys and equipment as a form of escape or as a diversion which distracts children from the real purpose of the kohanga.

The beliefs emerging from Maori debates on the education of their people and the retention of the language can again be attributed to the historical context and, kohanga reo was, and still is, an expression which challenged traditional thinking on education in this country. The theories of education, teaching and learning practices, types of resources and equipment, the designs of education buildings and classrooms, and the management of education, especially as they affected Maori children and their education, were being placed under the spotlight. The education norms and mores of New Zealand were under close scrutiny.

Fleras (p39) explains that the apparent dilemma between the preservation of the Maori language and ensuring education success for Maori learners is epitomised in an apparent conflict experienced by the kohanga reo movement early in their development:

criticisms directed at kohanga reo range in intent from persons who question the very validity of the kohanga, to those who are sceptical of its goals, to those who are disgruntled with some facet of its program. The negative responses make sense in terms of a basic conflict over two fundamental models of the kohanga which are espoused by different sectors of the Maori community. The **Developmental Model** (Te Kohanga Reo as preparation-for-school) and the **Language Model** (Te Kohanga Reo

as preparation-for-life) differ from each other in premises, objectives and methods for achievement of goals. (My emphasis).

Fleras continues:

there is abundant support for the developmental model especially amongst Maori parents and government officials both of whom tend to regard the kohanga as a preparation for formal schooling. As a preschool, its purpose is to prepare Maori children - mentally, socially and physically - to take their rightful position at school on a equitable footing and without the intellectual handicaps which have undermined efforts in the past.

Against this goal of developmentalism, the language is perceived as a means to a greater goal based on the assumption that practical success is secured by those children that are aware of who they are, where they belong, and where they come from.

The language model, subscribes to the official kaupapa or philosophy of the kohanga as a Maori language nest whose fundamental objective is to instil a working knowledge of Maori into preschool children. Here, unlike the developmental model, the focus is on preparing children for life and is accomplished by totally surrounding the children in the language, culture and spiritual aspects of Maoritanga, the essence of being Maori.

The developmental model imparts marketable skill pertinent to the Pakeha world, and focuses on teaching by extracting maximum effort from teachers. The language model encourages children to learn through supportive interaction with adults and other children. Several community officers involved in the kohanga program have stated:

We aren't in the business of teaching. No.

We are in the business of providing an environment where learning can take place.

It is a learning thing - it is not a teaching thing.

The lead which was provided by kohanga reo supervisors, parents and administrators has affected other Maori educational initiatives in schools and tertiary institutions. Kura kaupapa Maori, which are primary schools that cater directly for kohanga reo children, whare kura, which are the secondary equivalents, and wananga, which are Maori tertiary institutions, have adopted the

kohanga reo kaupapa. They collectively challenge the education fraternity by their assertions that language is caught by students, not taught to them, and that learning for Maori children will take place in an environment which was supportive of them as Maori. Their questioning of the styles, designs, languages, structures, educational aids, and pedagogical models of schooling put pressure on schools. Despite the emergence of these Maori educational models, more than 95% of Maori learners are in the mainstream Pakeha system.

The responses by the schools to kohanga reo have resulted in the formation of a number of models, which in some ways resemble the French-English models in Canada, as explained by Swain (1978). For example, the Early Total Immersion Model occurs in all the bilingual schools and in specific classes in some state schools, such as Waiwhetu School in Lower Hutt, Wellington. In these classes, all the instruction is in the Maori language. No English language is used in the classes at these early stages by the teachers, although children who have not had a lengthy time in kohanga may use English.

The Aotearoa/New Zealand models may differ from the Canadian examples however in that the children may in actual fact have a greater facility in the language of instruction than their Canadian counterparts do in French at the beginning of their schooling, especially if they enter directly from kohanga reo. In addition, L2 in the Canadian examples may be clearly French, it may be more difficult to define Maori as the L2 in the Aotearoa/New Zealand examples as some children would have spent at least four years in kohanga, and therefore have become quite fluent in Maori. In fact they could be more fluent in some aspects of Maori than they are in English.

The distinction may also be marked in that whereas the parents in Canada have little or no facility in the French language, the parents or guardians of the children in this country, although being fluent in English, may choose to speak only Maori to their children as a means of actively supporting the acquisition of fluency in the Maori language. Kohanga reo and other educational enterprises have developed language learning programmes for the parents. The difference may be attributed to the fact that there is no threat to the French language being lost or in the status of French. It is, like English, an international language. Maori, on the other hand, is in danger of being lost and, in relation to English, it has a low profile internationally. Also, English is everywhere in Aotearoa/New Zealand; in the media, the neighbourhoods and all places where people congregate, including the marae (traditional Maori places for getting together). There is no escaping that Wallwork's (1984) diglossia exists in Aotearoa/New Zealand, as English is the

dominant language with status, and Maori is the lower status language within the context of the nation. It is important however to note that a significant proportion of Maori people regard Maori as the language with the higher status. Within either contexts, diglossia is present.

Swain's (1978) Early Partial Immersion model in Canada, where both languages are used as languages of instruction, and time is usually divided equally between them, is the model in Aotearoa/New Zealand which is referred to as bilingual programmes or as bilingual education (as distinct from immersion programmes). These programmes are present in classes where kaiarahi reo, or fluent Maori speakers who are not trained teachers, work alongside trained teachers, mainly in new entrant classrooms, to provide the Maori language input. Generally, the teacher would bring the lessons of the day to the class and the kaiarahi reo would translate the lessons for those children who have come to the class from kohanga reo. The children from kohanga are in the same class as those from the mainstream. Preliminary surveys indicate that the capacity of kohanga reo children to maintain their competency in the Maori language depends on the assertiveness and skill of the kaiarahi reo and the support of the teachers and pupils within the classrooms. There needs to be research in this area to ascertain what in actual fact is happening.

Early partial immersion also happens in some classrooms where the teachers are able to speak both Maori and English. It is more prevalent however that the teacher would be stronger in English, and Maori would be the second language. This would probably be reflected in the outcomes of the learning, where the children would be more confident in English rather than in Maori. No research has been done on this aspect however.

Swain's (1978) Late Immersion model is occurring in some secondary schools. In one model the English speaking children of 13 or 14 years of age are taught by the teacher in Maori only. The teacher permits the children to speak English in the first year (3rd form) only. From the second year, Maori is the only language allowed in the classroom. Similar to the Canadian model, the students would have had Maori lessons in their previous intermediate and primary schools. However, the children who have entered the programme to date have not been able to hold a conversation in Maori on entry.

The initial indications emerging from this Late Immersion model is that the students have achieved very high standards in oral and written Maori. Students from the late immersion programme sat the 1991 and 1992 School Certificate

Maori examinations as fourth formers, a year earlier than the usual time, and collectively scored much higher than the national average. For example:

**TABLE 1**

The percentage distribution of students achieving the different levels in the 1992 School Certificate Maori Language Oral and Written examinations nationally and in the Late Immersion programme.

Level	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
National Written	7.4	9.51	6.1	21.3	20.0	1.1	2.5
National Oral	23.5	21.7	21.9	13.7	6.2	1.3	0.1
Late Imm Written (n = 20)	84.0	8.0	8.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Late Imm Oral (n = 24)	88.0	12.0	0.0	8.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

There is no doubting the success of the Late Immersion model for achieving competency in Maori language oracy and literacy skills. These results are outstanding.

The emerging model of bilingual education at the high school (or secondary) level in Aotearoa/New Zealand differs from the Canadian Late Immersion model in that some of the teachers in various subjects may not be fluent in the Maori language, and therefore some lessons may be in English only or partly in English. There is a dearth of Maori speaking teachers in mathematics, science and accounting, and therefore it is more likely that teachers in these fields who have an empathy with Maori children and bilingual education would be involved in the programmes. These programmes are more inclined towards the Swain's Partial Immersion model.

The Late Immersion programme compares with another secondary school unit I would like to mention here. The bilingual unit at Tauranga Boys' College in the mid 1980s was staffed by three Maori teachers fluent in both Maori and English. In addition, the teacher who had responsibility for mathematics in 1988 had some command over Maori as did the carving tutor. At least one of the teachers of physical education could use simple Maori phrases.

The students enrolled in the unit, compared with the national average, come from the lower end of the Elley and Irving (1985) socio economic index. According to Wagemaker (1988, p6), classification of occupations for the Elley and Irving Index is based on an equal weighting of the median educational and income levels for each specific occupational group. Classification corresponds to:

Level 1	Higher Professional, Administrative
Level 2	Lower Professional-Technical
Level 3	Clerical Highly Skilled
Level 4	Skilled
Level 5	Semi Skilled
Level 6	Unskilled

In 1987, none of the students in the bilingual unit came from level 1, 2% from level 2, 12% from level 3, 40% from level 4, 36% from level 5, and 10% from level 6. Students in the unit were from the lower socio-economic echelons of society.

In describing the composition of the unit, the number of enrolments in the third form were:

34 in 1985    25 in 1986    25 in 1987    39 in 1988

In 1988, the classes were organised in whanau (family) groups with the intention of having pupils at four levels (vertical grouping).

**TABLE 2**

The number of students in the four vertical groups in the 1988 Tauranga Boys' College Bilingual Unit.

	Form 3	Form 4	Form 5	Form 6
Kapo	9	6	4	4
Kimi	10	8	5	4
Rapu	10	5	6	4
Whai	9	7	3	4

This formation is an attempt to establish the learning and teaching procedures on Maori kinship patterns in the belief that whanau groupings provide a more compatible learning environment to Maori learners. This supports the emphasis kohanga reo places on whanau structures in their learning environments. As with kohanga reo, Tauranga Boys' College gives priority to the involvement of parents in the learning and teaching processes in the unit.

The Test of Scholastic Abilities (TOSCA) is a standardised test designed to provide a broadly based assessment of New Zealand school children at primary, intermediate and secondary school, and they are used to ensure that during recruitment the unit does not become a catch all. The unit is anxious to ensure that the most appropriate academic placements in either broad ability bands or the special classes are in the unit. It is worth noting however that Maori people such as Professor Timoti Karetu (1983) criticise TOSCA for its bias towards Pakeha language and culture.

It is important to note that at Tauranga Boys' College:

- 1 the principal agreed to the establishment of the unit as the education system was patently not meeting the needs of a significant proportion of the Maori student population;

the objectives from the principal's point of view were to raise Maori pupils' self esteem, reduce the number of behavioural problems and as a consequence, improve the academic performances of those pupils.

- 2 In contrast to the principal:

the main aim of the Bilingual Unit from the point of view of the bilingual unit teachers is the survival of the Maori language and culture. It is seen by these teachers as the vehicle whereby the deficiencies in Maori achievement and retention may be addressed.

- 3 In the achievement of the original 3b1 students in the School Certificate Examination, some aspects stood out:

- (i) unlike the results for any of the other colleges in the district, all subject enrolments at Tauranga Boys' College by Maori students increased from 1986 to 1987. This was achieved despite a decline in the overall Maori roll. English increased from 17 to 25, mathematics

from 15 to 26, science from 10 to 22 and Maori from 5 to 15. All of the original 3b1 students who were still at college in 1987, sat five subjects but performance in the non-unit subjects, the subjects which were chosen by the students but not able to be offered by the unit's staff (eg. mathematics), was generally lower than for those subjects taught by the unit staff. It may also be noted that, unlike the subjects that were taken as part of the whanau, no student achieved a mark of 50% or greater for any of the optional subjects. It was clear however that the overall performances of the original 3b1 students in the School Certificate subjects was better than the overall performances of previous students of the school and much higher than the national average for Maori students. The results in subjects offered by the unit also compared favourably with the national average. The achievement of results for Maori students to be at least equal to the national average is the primary educational goal for units such as that at Tauranga Boys' College.

The following table shows the percentages for Maori, English, science and mathematics in the 1987 School Certificate Examination.

TABLE 3

The 1987 School Certificate results in four subjects of students in the Tauranga Boys' College Bilingual Unit (TBCBU) compared to the national averages.

Group & Subject	A1	A2	B1	B2	C1	C2	D
Nat.Average (Maori)	3.3	10.2	20.1	23.2	21.3	18.2	3.7
TBCBU (Maori) (n = 15)	20.1	46.9	20.1	13.4	0.0	0.0	0.0
Nat.Average (English)	2.6	8.1	17.6	23.7	28.2	16.9	2.9
TBCBU (English) (n = 25)	4.0	4.0	16.0	20.0	20.0	36.0	0.0
Nat.Average (Science)	5.6	12.7	25.0	26.5	19.0	9.9	1.2
TBCBU (Science) (n = 22)	13.5	4.5	27.0	42.5	13.5	0.0	0.0
Nat.Average (Maths)	6.7	12.8	23.2	24.6	21.0	10.6	1.2
TBCBU (Maths) (n = 26)	0.0	0.0	11.4	38.0	45.6	3.8	0.0

Maori, science and English were taught within the unit in 1987. Mathematics was taught in the mainstream. Note also, that some of the original 3b1 cohorts would not have sat the School Certificate Examination in 1987 as they would have normally been placed in a slow learners' class alongside others with low TOSCA percentile scores. Examination of the 1988 sixth form students ranged from 16-70, a distribution which indicates that none of the students were of above average ability (ie. there were no students who scored in the upper quartile who were assigned stanines of between 7-9 (Wagemaker, 1988, p23).

- (ii) When comparing the reported Maori language use between the students in the bilingual unit and from a group of Maori students who were not in the unit, the magnitude of the reported differences is significant. Wagemaker (1988) writes that "bilingual unit pupils reported greater language use in the home and in the playground with the differences being most apparent for students who reported that they use Maori 'most of the time' or 'never'. Wagemaker concludes: "It is unlikely, that these differences could be explained solely in terms of initial group differences, and when these data are combined with statements by parents about the children's use of Maori, the result is compelling evidence of the unit's impact."
- (iii) With reference to the retention rates, Wagemaker maintains that:

an examination of the 1985 cohort which entered 3b1 revealed that 32.3% of those students were in form 6 at the beginning of 1988. This represents 24% of the 1984 Maori roll and because it does not take into account students who may have moved to other schools or those who returned to the mainstream, may well underestimate the total retention rate for that cohort. This figure also represents the third highest retention rate in the last 12 years and reverses the three year trend that was apparent from 1982 to 1984.

In comparison, the overall Maori retention rate into the 6th form in 1988 was 10.6%. Tauranga Boys' College more than doubled this, and, according to the staff and principal, due primarily to the bilingual unit.

Despite the positive trends being experienced in bilingual units such as these, Smith (1990, p192) asserts that:

a growing number of kohanga reo parents are expressing dissatisfaction with schooling options presently available to them in regard to the inability of many schools to sustain the impetus of Maori language development begun in the kohanga reo. It has been the reluctance of the mainstream schooling system to respond meaningfully to these needs that has led to the development of kura kaupapa Maori outside of the system as an alternate schooling option.

Sharples (1989) complies with this when he states that:

Kura Kaupapa Maori does not equate with any of the school types outlined in Tomorrow's Schools [the Government's school reforms policy] and accordingly it is not catered for in the proposed transition of schools in the current reform of education administration.

Smith brings in the dimension of control and autonomy when he states that:

Maori parents have moved outside of the schooling structures not merely to resist existing schooling trends, they have also moved in a proactive way to assume greater control and autonomy over meaningful decision-making related to the education of their children. For example, what should be taught, how it should be taught and whose interests should knowledge serve?

## CHAPTER 2     **The Rationales for Bilingual Education in Aotearoa/New Zealand**

According to Spolsky (1987) the four rationales Maori people have for bilingual education are:

- 1     revitalisation of the language;
- 2     educational;
- 3     religio-cultural;
- 4     political.

I would like to consider each of these rationales in the light of what other writers are saying. These rationales both conform and not conform with the bilingual education goals identified by the Massey University's Department of Modern Languages (1984). For example, Spolsky's religio-cultural and revitalisation of the language rationales comply with the objective of preserving ethnic and religious ties identified by the Department. The educational rationale is also in line with the objectives of gaining economic advantage for language groups and communicating with the outside world.

The political rationale however, is antagonistic to any further attempts by the dominant Pakeha group to achieve the assimilation objective, and the revitalisation of the language and the religio-cultural rationales emphasise Maori attempts to be seen as a unique people alongside other ethnic groups in Aotearoa/New Zealand.

### **Revitalisation of the Maori Language**

The Maori language is threatened with extinction, and if bilingual and immersion programmes work, then this could be the answer for Maori people, as the joint goals of the programmes are improved performances in education as well as the maintenance and promotion of the Maori language.

According to Benton (1990), 60,000 native speakers of Maori in 1976 reduced to 46,000 in 1987. Only 15% of the total Maori population in 1987 spoke Maori fluently.

According to the Education Ministry's statistic report (1989), from 1983 to 1988, the number of Maori learners from 2.5 years in kohanga reo increased from 4132 to 11127.

At the same time the numbers of Maori learners in play centres reduced from 2069 to 1314, and in kindergartens from 5757 to 5541.

Presently in New Zealand, there are 28 Kura Kaupapa Maori (with nearly 400 children in total). These schools are funded by the government. Note however that there is some debates at the definition of a Kura Kaupapa Maori. Sharples contends that any mainstream school which becomes a Kura Kaupapa Maori does not have the right origins to be a Kura Kaupapa Maori. His contention is that the Kura Kaupapa Maori which originated from Maori sources and philosophy are the only genuine Kura Kaupapa Maori, and those which have changed have a Pakeha genesis.

I am more interested in whether these schools will achieve the goals of Maori and English language fluency and literacy, high educational accomplishments, and caring students with leadership skills rather than their definitions.

The issue for Maori people is whether these programmes are going to help fill the vacuum of fluent speakers of the Maori language mentioned by Benton.

The other question relates to the debate in kohanga reo concerning developmentalism and the language model exposed by Fleras (1983). Is the prime objective of bilingual education to develop learners for the market place or to ensure that the Maori language is not lost?

As Fleras (p21) states:

I would suggest that it is against this background of language decline and language renaissance that one can begin to explain the origin and popularity of Te Kohanga Reo. The Te Kohanga Reo struck a responsive chord in the hearts of the Maori people for the very simple reason that the Maori were ready to face up to the facts. The choice was alarmingly simple, either the Maori community take the initiative to do something about

preserving their language or they could sit back and do nothing at the risk of losing their language and jeopardising the future of their children. It has taken the emergence of Te Kohanga Reo to alert the Maori population to the necessity for teaching Maori to preschool children as a strategy of language survival.

Fleras continues and reports two key statements which were coined at the inception of Te Kohanga Reo:

the language inside Te Kohanga Reo will be Maori.  
There will be rules applied to all visitors and certainly the supervisors that at all times only the Maori language is to be spoken and heard by the growing child.

the key thing for bilingualism is that for part of the day the child hears English - morning and night if the parents so wish - and for the other part of the day Maori. Over a period of five years in such an environment a child should develop a good command of both languages.

The uncompromising stance of Te Kohanga Reo on the place of the Maori language in its centres, and its belief that the development of Maori language fluency will not result in a deficiency of English language fluency in the children, has in part nullified the arguments between the developmental and language models. Children are demonstrating abilities in both languages as was predicted, although as expected, debates concerning the relative strengths children acquire in both languages are still taking place. Additive bilingualism is promoted within the kohanga reo philosophy as the goal is complete facility and strength in both languages, Maori and English. The point to remember is that in comparison to Maori, English is dominant in every sphere that kohanga reo children meet outside of the kohanga themselves. From the time the children step outside, they become immersed in English, and it is a challenge to teach and maintain Maori. It requires grit, determination, and at times belligerence, to keep the Maori language on the lips and in the minds of such young and impressionable people. The peer pressure will grow and be a challenge continuously.

It is a common belief now that children from kohanga reo who enter primary schools that do not cater for their Maori language lose their Maori language

quickly. My nephew for example, who had spent more than three years in a kohanga reo, lost his Maori language in three months. He still had much of the language in him, but he would not speak it either in the home or in contexts where Maori was spoken. When I probed into the situation, it seems that the turning point was when the nephew's school friends ridiculed him for the funny way he spoke.

It is apparent from the increasing numbers of kohanga reo and kura kaupapa Maori being established that the trends in total immersion learning situations are indicating very positive outcomes including bilingualism.

### The Educational Rationale: Closing the Gap

Wagemaker (1987) wrote that:

large gaps exist between the two groups, Maori and non-Maori, for all levels of qualifications.

According to the Ministry of Education, Maori Education Statistics (1989), from 1969 to 1989, the relative retention rates of Maori and non-Maori students in secondary schools from form 3 to form 7 increased as follows.

YEAR	MAORI	NON-MAORI
1969	1.5%	11.5%
1979	3.9%	16.0%
1989	12.4%	36.9%

Whereas the increase in Maori retention rates from 1969 to 1979 was 2.4%, and 8.5% from 1979 to 1989, the corresponding increases for non-Maori students were 4.5% and 20.1% respectively.

The overall increases in the twenty years from 1969 were:

10.9% for Maori and 24.6% for non-Maori.

Another way of interpreting these figures however is that the rate of increase for Maori students is 8.3 times from 1969 to 1989, whereas the rate of increase for

non-Maori students is 3.2 times over the same period. That is the rate of change for Maori students is 3 times the rate for non-Maori students.

According to the Ministry of Education, Wellington, Maori Education Statistics (1989), in comparison with non-Maori, a disproportionate number of Maori people are not achieving or being retained in education institutions beyond the compulsory age of 15 years. Only 12.4% Maori compared with 31.6 % non-Maori were in the 7th form.

The then Minister of Maori Affairs, Winston Peters (Ao Kawe Tikanga, NZQA., 1991) stated:

Sadly too many Maori people are unskilled and unqualified and urgent solutions are needed to break the cycle of under-achievement by Maori people.

In supporting Peters' call for urgent solutions, Graham Smith (1990) states that:

a radical approach is necessary to act on the present Maori education crisis. Fundamental structural change is required to overturn this situation.

The quest to identify what these changes are continues. The structural changes Smith refers to could include either administrative, communication or classroom structures. Concerned people agree that changes must occur. However very few people are actually stating what those changes are. Research may uncover new knowledge which could assist us identify specific strategies to persevere with. It is clear however that kohanga reo provides a good starting point to the search for urgent solutions and structural changes.

### **The Religio-Cultural Rationale**

Te Tino Rangatiratanga Waananga (1989, p11) states that:

whanau learning within every kohanga reo must be intensified and resourced to ensure that whanau mana, family prestige and solidity, remain the basis of mauri tangata, the uniqueness of each person.

During the research I observed that all bilingual programmes begin and end each day with a karakia or prayer. In addition, Maori protocol is an integral part of the programmes. Visitors are accorded traditional welcomes which entail calls from

women, rhythmic chants, speeches, songs, chants, war dances, and ending with the shaking of hands and the pressing of noses.

Representatives or the entire bilingual classes may be required to attend tangi or gatherings which are set up to mourn for people who pass away, and Maori people accept such attendances as obligatory if the students are to acquire a true appreciation of the essence of Maori people.

In line with Skutnabb-Kangas' call for appropriate cultural content, aspects of the local Maori history are incorporated into the curriculum. Local Maori institutions are studied.

Maori values require that the staff, students and parents nurture each other. They are required to see each as useful contributors to the well being of the units. As Skutnabb-Kangas (1988) states, highly successful bilingual programmes remove any factors causing anxiety and any authoritarian practices, and these values are in line with contemporary Maori thought.

The research also notes that the reluctance of teachers to extend themselves from the New Zealand traditional single form classes to have students from two, three or more forms in the room for lessons as constraining aspects to the incorporation of whanau systems into secondary school bilingual classrooms.

The research has also found that the schools who have this whanau class organisation report improved achievement and behaviour of students.

In support of this view, Fleras (1983, pp7,8) states that:

a kaupapa of the kohanga is the commitment to **whanau** principles as the bedrock of the kohanga operation. The term whanau is employed in the sense of a traditional extended family arrangement wherein children were socialised in an environment surrounded by the presence of grandparents, relatives and other children. Second, the concept of whanau may be extended to include a cluster of images or values such as those naturally associated with a family setting and embodying the virtues of aroha, and manaaki (caring, sharing and empathy). When both meanings are combined, the image of a kohanga as a whanau centre is a powerful one which acknowledges the supportive nature of the extended family.

The Department of Maori Affairs (1982) indicated the high priority assigned to the extended family model in the overall operation of the kohanga when it stated:

the key to Te Kohanga Reo is the whanau. The Te Kohanga Reo programme is designed to stimulate the growth of Maori whanau centres which can in turn offer the best environment possible for their children. It is a place where the Maori language will prevail and where love and care spring from the whanau. These centres can be in many places such as homes, maraes, churches, factories, offices, kokiri centres and the like. It is simply any place where the whanau Maori can operate with its natural and effective style.

Fleras (p9) concludes:

to sum up: the philosophy of the kohanga revolves about the desire of the Maori people to stand tall and to overcome adversity by producing a generation of bilingual and bicultural children who are capable of interacting in the Maori and Pakeha world. Within this framework, the primary kaupapa is the promotion of the Maori language and Maori whanau values in a caring environment where children are lovingly ensconced by Maori speaking persons. For the child the ability to speak Maori is seen as stimulating a pride of race, a growth of personality, character and morals as well as an awareness of a positive self image. Alongside the development of language, the kohanga is expected to develop the practical skills of the child at the social and cognitive level in order to facilitate entry into school on an equal basis. Taken together, the ultimate objective of the kohanga is nothing less than the renaissance of the Maori as an equal but separate component in the mosaic of New Zealand society. This verse from A T Ngata echoes the sentiments of the kohanga -

E tipu e rea mo nga ra o to ao  
 Ko to ringa ki nga rakau a te Pakeha  
 Hei ara mo to tinana  
 Ko to ngakau ki nga taonga a o tipuna Maori  
 Hei tikitiki mo to mahuna  
 A, ko to wairua ki te Atua  
 Nana nei nga mea katoa.

Grow up o tender child in the days of your world  
 Your hand to Western tradition for your well being

Your heart to the treasures of your Maori forebears  
 As a plume for your head  
 Your spirit given unto God  
 The source of all things.'

### The Political Rationale

Smith (1990, p193) explains reasons behind the political rationale when he writes that:

Kura Kaupapa Maori represents a conscious resistance initiative to the inhibiting structural impediments embedded within state schooling and reflected in the poor general performance of that system. They also represent a positive and radical initiative seeking to bring about fundamental structural change within schooling by altering the power relations (Maori is the *norm* in Kura Kaupapa Maori), and by changing the ideological dimensions (Maori language and culture are valid and legitimate as of right).

Smith (p195) sums up by stating that Kura Kaupapa Maori addresses the fundamental structural change which previous Pakeha reforms have been unable or unwilling to achieve in state schooling. For example:

- 1 by controlling knowledge; Kura Kaupapa Maori has given Maori parents increased control over the curriculum and schooling environment: what should be taught? how should it be taught? whose interests are served?
- 2 by asserting the validity and legitimacy of Maori knowledge, language, culture and pedagogy as common sense and taken for granted (conversely overthrowing ideologies projecting the inferiority of Maori knowledge which are implicit in state schooling ideology and structures);
- 3 by assuming power and control over key educational decision making; Maori parents make decisions for their children unimpeded by Pakeha gate-keeping devices. In this way parents have been more successfully able to negotiate the societal context of unequal power relations which controls state schooling;
- 4 by the restoration of mana (status and power) to the Maori learner in a meaningful way; to be Maori in a Kura Kaupapa Maori is the norm; the

school and classroom environment connects with the Maori home; cultural and language values are central;

- 5 by the total commitment and support of parents which is fundamental to Kura Kaupapa Maori. The whanau assumes responsibility for the education of their children along with the school. The absolute commitment by Kura Kaupapa Maori parents to being involved in the education of their children is a major change from state schooling.

Smith (p195) concludes by stating that:

Kura Kaupapa Maori is a manifestation of renewed interest in schooling and education. The opportunity to capitalise on the potential of Kura Kaupapa Maori should not be lost in dealing with the current schooling crisis, in terms of meeting Maori needs and aspirations related to language and cultural survival, and in terms of building a fair and just New Zealand society in the future.

Sharples (1989) states that:

Kura Kaupapa Maori is a new concept in schooling developed entirely by the Maori people from a basis of Maori custom and tradition, to meet the desires and expectations of the Maori people for their children in education at this time in our history.

Ohia (1990, pp119, 120), when writing about secondary schools bilingual units states that:

in the programmes visited, all involve the entire whanau in the decision-making which affects the administration of the programmes. All report an amicable arrangement which is successfully working through all the issues facing the bilingual programmes. As with the whanau structure in the classrooms, the entire bilingual family work co-operatively in the decision-making process. The contentious issue, however, is that any of their decisions may be vetoed by the school authority.

Ohia, Maloney and Knight (1990, p10) take this a step further when they state:

the staff, parents and students of all the bilingual units speak about their desire to take control of the administration, curricula, budget and priorities

of the unit. They want to be able to arrange their classes, timetables, resources and learning programmes in ways which best meets the needs of their students and the aims and objectives set collectively by the unit.

They want to organise the placement of staff, the allocation of rooms and the distribution of funds, and to make decisions affecting teaching, learning and discipline.

Without exception the bilingual units realise that they need to clarify their relationships to the Board of Trustees, the principal and other staff, parents and students of the school in a way which does not disrupt the learning and activities of the school as a whole.

The Maori people have found a political forum to air their grievances and their desires for autonomy in a raft of areas including the management and administration of their education, health, land, resources, justice and social areas. Jane Kelsey in her article 'Legal Imperialism and the Colonisation of Aotearoa' (p39) writes:

the *Treaty of Waitangi Act 1975* was passed. Its purpose as stated in the preamble is:

An Act to provide for the observance, and confirmation, of the principles of the Treaty of Waitangi by establishing a Tribunal to make recommendations on claims relating to the practical application of the Treaty and to determine whether certain matters are inconsistent with the principles of the Treaty.

The Waitangi Tribunal has become an important symbol to Maori (and others). It has become an important platform for Maori to speak about and share their concerns about their individual perceptions of tino rangatiratanga, as well as the tino rangatiratanga of the Maori nation as a whole. If someone was to ask me where is this all going, my reply would be to peace, to less stress, and eventually to justice for Maori. There is no other single organisation which will achieve those goals for Maori. I doubt that the Government will, as their focus is on all inhabitants, and Maori are in the minority.

Andrew Sharp, in his article 'Justice and the Maori' (p273) emphasises that the Court of Appeal in the *New Zealand Maori Council v the Attorney General* faced with legal questions that required an answer:

gave legally authoritative views as to some of the relations between state sovereignty and Maori sovereignty. In deciding the case, the judges seem to have seen that the Maori jurisprudence of the wairua pointed in two different directions, negotiation between two people in a co-operative partnership and the claim that perhaps only the Maori, in Maori institutions, could decide what the wairua was. Only the Maori - it could be argued - could say what constituted the rangatiratanga they retained by Article 2 of the Treaty of Waitangi; to suggest otherwise would derogate from a mana that had never been relinquished.

Ranginui Walker in his book 'Ka Whawhai Tonu Matou - Struggle Without End' (p266) states that:

the Maori Affairs Bill recognised the Treaty of Waitangi as the symbol of the special relationship between the Maori people and the Crown. It affirmed the exchange of sovereignty for the guarantee of protection of rangatiratanga. Rangatiratanga meant custody over matters significant to cultural identity.

Walker points the arguments back to the Maori language when he writes (p268):

in the Maori language claim brought before the Waitangi Tribunal in June 1985, by Huirangi Waikerepuru and Nga Kaiwhakapumau i te Reo, the tribunal had to determine whether language came under the definition of taonga which the Crown was obliged to protect under the Treaty. In this case the tribunal laid down the principle that the word taonga covered both tangible and intangible matters. Language was essential to culture and was defined as a treasured possession. Having decided that the language was a taonga, the tribunal then laid down a principle concerning the meaning of the word guarantee in the Treaty. The tribunal decided that guarantee meant more than merely leaving Maori people unhindered in their enjoyment of their language and culture; it also required active steps to be taken by the guarantor to ensure that the Maori people have and retain the full exclusive and undisturbed possession of their language and culture.

Dr Tamati Reedy, while head of the Maori Affairs Department, in 'Te Tino Rangatiratanga Waananga' prepared for Te Kohanga Reo in 1989, provides an apt summary of the political rationale when he says that:

Maori opinion is emphatic that the Treaty of Waitangi remains central to the history of New Zealand as a modern nation and that the Treaty and its principles must influence all legislation, policy and administrative decision.

The initial Treaty of Waitangi Act 1974 and its subsequent amendment 1985 has made the Treaty a focal point for many Maori groups seeking change. The tribunal offers an environment where Maori grievances can be realistically appraised by Maori minds and the findings of the Tribunal offer a starting point for negotiations to resolve the grievances.

Whereas the Waitangi Tribunal is providing a useful political platform to air grievances, bilingual education, in all its myriad of variables, provides a platform for Maori people to seek change in the education of Maori children right in the schools and classrooms.

Penetito (1988, pp 14, 15), with his heading:

#### EDUCATION 'IN' MAORI, 'ABOUT' MAORI, AND 'FOR' MAORI

encapsulates the arguments for proactive Maori educational initiatives. He makes some pertinent points when he states that:

the current situation is critical because of:

growing dissatisfaction of Maoridom about the shortcomings of the system in terms of Maori achievement;

the demands on primary schools created by the kohanga reo movement;

the growing interest in the notion of kura kaupapa Maori schools and bilingual initiatives; and

the heightened profile accorded the Treaty of Waitangi as a consequence of the work of the Waitangi Tribunal.

kura kaupapa Maori, bilingual schools, and schools with immersion-in-Maori classes or units educate children in Maori. They share a similar philosophy, which is to foster, maintain and promote the Maori language and culture as a priority for Maori students.

They set out to:

reinforce cultural identity and self-esteem;

develop communicative competence in Maori and so enhance its status as an official language;

improve the prospects of upward social mobility for Maori people through success in their system initially; and

provide the means whereby Maori can receive total recognition as a language of status in the New Zealand scene.

Where we have an education in Maori, the language (te reo) is central; the content of the curriculum is heavily biased in favour of tribal knowledge; the context, organisation and process of transmitting that knowledge derive from tribal standards (tikanga Maori).

In conclusion, this fairly detailed historic account of bilingual educational developments in Aotearoa/New Zealand from 1816 to the present day, and the rationales for their establishment provides the readers with a background on which they may understand the directions in which the Maori people are wishing to proceed. One is unable to divorce the political aspirations of Maori people from their educational initiatives. The Treaty of Waitangi plays an extremely important part in the lives and thought processes of Maori people, and their search for justice is enshrined in the treaty. As we look at the case studies, the same issues raised here will emerge again as the two schools grapple with satisfying the Maori educational and political aspirations as well as endeavouring to remain within the political and educational parameters of the country as a whole.

It has become clear during the research that the staff, parents and students concur on the aims and objectives of bilingual programmes. These are:

- 1 to enable students to speak Maori and English fluently and behave appropriately in Maori and Pakeha contexts;

This bilingual objective complies with one of Skutnabb-Kangas' (1988) reasons for highly successful bilingual programmes. He also emphasises, as mentioned previously, that unsuccessful programmes subordinate one language.

- 2 to enable students to read and write Maori and English competently;

Fishman (1979) emphasises that the full bilingualism model, where both languages are given the same status in terms of both the oral and written resources, result in the success of the units in achieving their educational and linguistic objectives (for L1 and L2).

- 3 to enable Maori students to achieve and be retained in education institutions in the same proportion as Pakeha students;

Skutnabb-Kangas (1988) emphasises the need for learner related programmes and processes, understanding of and sympathetic to the objectives, high teacher expectations and a fair chance of success as being essential requirements for the higher retention and achievement of students.

- 4 to enable schools to develop a culturally appropriate environment and structures for Maori students and those from other racial groups;

Skutnabb-Kangas (1988) again emphasises the need for appropriate cultural content and adequate bilingual resources to ensure high success in these programmes.

- 5 to enable Pakeha students and teachers to develop positive attitudes to Maori language and culture, and to other languages and cultures;

Support by the wider community will be achieved as the positive results emanating from the different models of bilingual education are conveyed through well organised public relations exercises. Maori immersion and bilingual programmes need to remain open to scrutiny by supporters and critics alike. Provided the programmes remain aligned to successful formulae, there will be nothing to hide and a lot to gain through keeping the doors open.

- 6 to enable the parents of bilingual students to participate fully in the education of their children.

Swain (1978) emphasises that parent participation as partners with teachers and students in the decision making processes is essential for highly successful programmes. She cites the role of the parents in changing from an immersion to a partial immersion programme in Canada in order to better cater for the

aspirations of the parents as a significant contributor to the extremely successful results emanating from the programme.

Smith (1990, p192) would be anxious about 4 and 5 as, the Pakeha dominant population hold the power of veto over Maori decisions and the rationale has been deliberately couched in terms that appeal to Pakeha.

The reality however is that most Maori children (an estimated 98.4%) are in schools alongside Pakeha children, and if objectives 1, 2, 3 and 6 are met, then the programmes are successful. It bears repeating however that more research is required to assess and evaluate the outcomes of bilingual units and kura kaupapa Maori. This thesis is not enough to enable any conclusive results to be attained. The best we can hope for are indications and trends.

During the research, it became clear that the model of bilingual education established in a particular secondary school fits within the parameters formulated by the school. Kohanga reo and kura kaupapa Maori do not face the same hindrances. That is not to say that kohanga reo and kura kaupapa Maori do not have challenges. There are a number of limitations and challenges facing bilingual units in secondary schools as follows:

the lack of subject options is due to the desire to confine the subjects of senior students to those covered by the bilingual staff. As the Tauranga Boys' College situation indicates, the students of the units do not perform as well in studies outside of the unit (compared with the performances in the subjects within the units);

the extent to which a school is able and willing to accommodate the needs of Maori students to be bilingual;

attempts to foster cooperation between the unit and the rest of the school may be rejected by the other staff, board members and students;

the rooms allocated may not be appropriate to achieve the linguistic, cultural and educational objectives of the bilingual unit.

## **CHAPTER 3     The Case Studies**

### **Introduction**

I selected a primary school immersion unit and a secondary bilingual unit in Wellington city to test the various general assertions made in the literature review. Besides conducting interviews and studying records, I designed questionnaires for the Boards of Trustees, parents, staff who were not directly involved in the units, and students. For the younger primary students, the teachers assisted them to answer the questionnaires.

### **The Research Intentions**

My intentions were to investigate the following:

- 1 the types of bilingualism aimed for in the units. Is the goal to achieve Bloomfield's (1933) native-like control of two languages or Halliday's definition of using the second language (Maori) however imperfectly? My assertion is that the definitive bilingual goal a unit has may illustrate their commitment to bilingual education, and as Skutnabb-Kangas (1988) declares determine their success or otherwise;
- 2 the attitudes of the Board, the staff not involved in the unit, parents, students and the principal to bilingualism and bilingual education. My assertion is that the support of the unit can be demonstrated by the attitudes of the school authorities, parents, students and staff. I also wanted to ascertain the ethnic composition of the parents/guardians, their age group, and the abilities of the parents to speak Maori;
- 3 how committed is the unit to the Maori language? In the light of Skutnabb-Kangas' ((1988) assertion that the linguistic goal of successful bilingual education initiatives is bilingualism, I wanted to find out the commitment of the units to the Maori language. I needed to explore whether the unit practised either Lambert's (1967) subtractive or additive bilingualism. That is, whether the Maori language was being subverted in the unit or the school in relation to English, despite their best intentions towards the Maori language. A related issue which needed to be addressed was whether Wallwork's (1984) diglossia exists in the schools, and if so, how is this shown?
- 4 what definitions of bilingual education exist in the units? How different is the type of learning in the units to Littlewood's (1986) foreign or second language learning? Do they resemble Fishman's (1979), Swain's (1978) or Skutnabb-Kangas' (1988) definitions? Or have they developed definitions

which respond to their own local circumstances? The question is related to the commitment of staff to use the Maori language as the medium of teaching and learning;

- 5 have the units identified the advantages and disadvantages of the types of bilingual education they have established? Are they fulfilling their linguistic, educational, social and political aspirations? If so, why? If not, why not? My view is that one needs to be careful about claiming outright successes without the controls and the monitoring of the methodologies utilised, as Swain and Cummins (1982) emphasise about the modern research on this topic. However, it is possible in this research to identify positive and negative trends within the units. In many cases, the controls are the relative results being achieved by Maori students in the neighbouring classrooms;
- 6 it has been emphasised by Fleras (1983), Graham Smith (1990), Sharples (1989) and Penetito (1988) that acquisition of the Maori language, the instilling of Maori values and whanau structures, the involvement of the parents in the decision making processes and a commitment to close the achievement and retention gaps between Maori and non-Maori need to be the priorities of Maori educational initiatives. The units need to be probed to ascertain their response to these priorities, and the ways they are showing their commitments in their administration and the communication and classroom structures;
- 7 the responses of the units to the assertions by kohanga reo to follow the language rather than the developmental model described by Fleras (1983). My assertion is that the development model, which sees kohanga reo as preparation for school, and the language model, which sees kohanga reo as preparation for life, will not clash with an immersion programme which views the acquisition of quality educational outcomes as readily being achieved through the medium of the Maori language;
- 8 the amount of resources allocated to the units will indicate their priority within the totality of the school. Skutnabb-Kangas (1988) emphasises that successful bilingual education programmes have adequate resources such as buildings, equipment, texts in the target language, and access to technology;
- 9 so much of the success of bilingual programmes rests on the shoulders of the staff and administrators. In this research, one needed to ascertain the qualifications and experiences of the bilingual staff, and their opportunities

to participate in relevant inservice courses and to meet with colleagues from other schools with similar units;

- 10 the performances of the students of the units in national external examinations in relation to the national average for Maori students. In the end, people want to know whether the units enable the learners to achieve higher levels than if they remained in the mainstream.

### **The Design of the Questionnaires**

I resisted employing other people's questionnaire designs in their totality, and opted instead to questions and styles of language which I thought would achieve a reasonable amount of feedback from the people I was working with. The questionnaires are included as Appendix 1. As a result of my conversations with the principal, staff and students of both schools, I decided on four questionnaires as follows:

#### **The Board of Trustees**

- 1 I wanted to ascertain whether the members of the Board of Trustees, the governing body of the school, supported the unit. In the questionnaire, I decided to separate the members who were very supportive from those who were supportive or not supportive. My hunches were that there was a core of very supportive members who were at the forefront of initiatives such as these, and who provided the political muscle to support and sustain the unit. My perception was that this core would counter the unsupportive members and ensure that the unit continued to receive their share of the resources. The respondents were required to tick in the box opposite either:

"very supportive"

"supportive"

"not supportive".

- 2 I also wanted to find out what their individual expectations were of the unit. I focused on four areas; acquisition of the Maori language, educational achievement, retention and participation. Again, the respondents were required to tick in one of the boxes which were situated alongside each of the words "Increase", "Remain the same", and "Decline". I chose the word "Decline" instead of "Decrease" as I was concerned at the

possible integration of the words "Increase" and "Decrease" while filling the questionnaire.

The sentences which preceded each of these rows of words and boxes were:

"My **expectations** are that in the bilingual/immersion unit:

- a The abilities of the students in the **Maori language** would
- b The Maori **achievement** rate would
- c The Maori **retention** rate would
- d The **participation** rate of Maori parents in school activities would

The staff and parents and staff I spoke with prior to designing the questionnaire assured me that all the Board members and staff would understand what the words "achievement", "retention" and "participation" rates for Maori people if they were in the questionnaire. There would be no need for an explanation attached to the questionnaire. The parents had become aware of these words through their involvement with the unit, and the Board and staff members had been amongst the group who enabled the parents to become familiar with these concepts.

- 3 My next wish was to ascertain the attitudes of Board members, prior to and following the establishment of the unit, to the establishment of a unit within the school which focused on the education of Maori children. In the light of the increased publicity within Aotearoa/New Zealand on the Treaty of Waitangi, and the move by Maori people towards tino rangatiratanga, I wanted to know what effect all this had on Board members. I debated primarily with myself about the wording; whether I should include words such as "tino rangatiratanga", "self determination", "control". I decided that with the possibility of some words conjuring up possible emotional reactions, it was more appropriate in this research to enquire about their attitudes:

to the establishment of specific **Maori education units**.

They were required to tick in the box alongside the options which were:

Improved

Remained the same

Declined

The next portion of this question enquired about whether their **understanding of the Treaty of Waitangi** and their **appreciation of equity issues** had either increased, remained the same or declined through the presence of the unit. With this question, I wanted to ascertain whether the presence of the unit increases the awareness of Board members to issues affecting Maori people.

- 4 I had some trouble selecting a design and words to enquire about the Board members' impressions of the budget and resources of the unit. As mentioned previously Skutnabb-Kangas (1988) and Graham Smith (1990) emphasised the need for adequate resources to ensure the success of the unit to achieve its linguistic and educational goals. The question needed to be addressed to the Board as they are the distributors of the budget to various areas of the school. I basically wanted two answers in this section as follows:

whether they knew about the funds and resources; and

whether they had visited, or spoke with, the unit.

I finally opted to make the statement on each occasion and then require the respondents to tick in one of the boxes alongside the answer which best fitted their perceptions. The statements were as follows:

the budget is

the amount of written material in the Maori language is

the equipment is

the premises are.

The words alongside the boxes were:

Excessive    Sufficient    Not sufficient    Don't Know

Each of these sections had lines ruled underneath inviting any comments the respondents wanted to make.

- 5 The final section was a set of lines with invitations to write about either their contact or lack of contact with the unit, and to comment further.

The complete questionnaire for the members of the Board of Trustees took up three pages. Feedback from the respondents I spoke to afterwards was very positive about the design of the questionnaire and appreciative of the space available for comments. I initially thought that three pages was too excessive. However, feedback again, and the tendency to cramp the information as attempts were made to become more precise and to take up less space, convinced me that the questionnaire as designed originally should be retained and sent out.

In both schools, the Board members received their questionnaires with a letter from the principal. The principal was responsible for giving the questionnaire to the Board members. I thought that this was more acceptable than me fronting up to them at a meeting to hand the material out.

#### The Staff

The questionnaire was designed for staff who are not directly involved in the unit. My personal interviews with the members of the unit staff extended over a number of months, in generally informal ways, and the questionnaire was focused on their colleagues.

The first four sections were the same as the questionnaire for the Board of Trustees. That is, they were required to indicate:

- 1 whether their attitude to the unit was either very supportive, supportive or not supportive;
- 2 what their expectations were with regards to the Maori language acquisition, achievement, retention and participation rates;
- 3 whether their attitudes to the establishment of specific Maori education units had either improved, remained the same or declined, and whether their understanding of the Treaty of Waitangi and appreciation of equity issues had either increased, remained the same or declined through the presence of the unit;

- 4 their perceptions of the budget, written Maori language material, equipment and premises were either excessive, sufficient, or not sufficient, or they didn't know.
- 5 in the next question, I was curious to find out about the contacts of the staff with the unit, and although much time was spent endeavouring to design a suitable set of questions, I finally decided to invite the staff to write comments about their contact with the unit in the same way as the Board of Trustees. The problem was to desist from confining the staff to making comments only in certain fields. Although I anticipated probable difficulty in adequately reporting the comments, I nevertheless chose to proceed in this way.

basically, the invitation was open, and the staff were not required to indicate their identities. The possibility of procuring straightforward comments was quite exciting to me.

In the final analysis, the questionnaires for the Board and staff were so similar that they ended up having the same questionnaire.

#### Parents/Guardians

In designing the questionnaire for the parents, there were a number of questions I wanted to explore as follows:

- 1 I wanted to get an indication as to the ethnic composition of the parents who permitted their children to enter these units. The respondents were required to tick in the box opposite the name of the ethnic group which I had written on the form. Those named were Maori, Pakeha, and Other Ethnic Group. The line beside Other Ethnic Group invited the person to name the group if he/she wished. There was also a line under this for any comments the respondent wanted to make.
- 2 I was also curious about the age group of the parents, and a section was incorporated for parents to tick in the box opposite the following age groups:

25-34

35-44

45-54

55 and over

My impression was that the parents would come from a group which had not had access to the Maori language, and therefore felt inadequate in this area and didn't want the same for their own children. My perceptions, in the light of historical accounts, is that the 1960s and 1970s represented a period when Maori people were experiencing the production of a unique group of people; born and bred in the city and towns. Their parents were born in the rural areas and had experiences with the Maori language and culture first hand. However, their children's experiences with Maori language and culture were going to be through occasional visits home and via Maori activities in the city only; not in the schools.

The first group of children born and bred in the cities would be in the 25 to 40 age group. Based on this hunch, I thought that it would be interesting to ascertain whether the parents of the children in the units were from that group.

- 3 To back up this hunch, I also wanted to ascertain the Maori language ability of the parents, and there was a box to tick alongside the following words:

- Fluent
- Competent
- Not Fluent
- Little
- None

Although there could be some confusion between the words "Competent" and "Not Fluent", I became aware that some parents had definite ideas about the differences. A competent speaker is a person who has learned Maori through receiving lessons in one form or another and has become quite fluent. They distinguish this person from a native speaker of the Maori language.

The "Not Fluent" speaker does not speak the language with native fluency, but has had no formal lessons either. They have achieved their Maori language ability in the same way as native speakers have, but have not been privy to the intensity of the language or been exposed to it for long periods of time. It did not matter in the reporting of the results, but I thought it would be a sign of good faith to include this

suggestion in the questionnaire. The option was better than including words such as 'excellent', 'very good', 'good' or 'poor' in the questionnaire as these comments resemble a school report, which I tried hard to avoid given the unhappy experiences many Maori parents have had with their own schooling.

- 3 My next task was to find out how often the parents were involved in Maori language and cultural activities. I wanted to explore Skutnabb-Kangas' (1988) assertion that social factors, such as being exposed to linguistically formal contexts (Maori welcomes, activities and ceremonies), increases the capacity to acquire the language, and gives the unit a greater opportunity to succeed. Skutnabb-Kangas emphasised the need for units to venture outside of the classrooms to gain a wider view and extra incentives.

On the questionnaire, the parents/guardians were required to tick in either the box, Very Often, Often, Seldom or Nil in response to the question of their "involvement with Maori cultural activities".

- 4 The next question was to explore the reasons the parents allowed their children to enter the unit. It seemed, from my conversations with parents throughout the country, that the reasons were quite uniform. However, the more important question related to the set of priorities; was it so that the children could become fluent in Maori (and English), to achieve higher education, or some other reason? The challenge was to create a design which did the following:

- a cover all the reasons;
- b achieve a priority list;
- c be unambiguous.

After speaking with a core of parents and staff, I decided to ask them to write the numbers 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5 in each box alongside the reasons in order of priority. The reasons provided (in order of their placement in the questionnaire) were:

- a to become fluent in the Maori language

- b to become fluent in English
- c to achieve in education
- d to get a good job
- e to be with his/her friends

The respondents were invited to add any comments they wished to make on the lines provided.

- 5 I was then interested in whether the fact of having a child in the unit had affected the parents in terms of interests in education in general, and Maori education in particular. I was faced with the challenge of designing a section which covered as many areas as possible without appearing overwhelmingly verbose and crowded. My decision was to have this section on its own on one page.

The question required the respondents to write either yes or no in the box opposite 10 statements. The stem statement was:

Since my child has been in the bilingual/immersion unit, I have...

The inclusion of 'bilingual/immersion' in the question was made after I realised that the same questionnaire could go to either groups of parents, the Newtown School immersion unit and the Wellington High School bilingual unit.

The statements, in order of how they appeared in the questionnaire were:

- a become more interested in education
- b become more aware of Maori education issues
- c gained more awareness of the Treaty of Waitangi
- d visited the school more often
- e become involved with the Board of Trustees

- f become more involved in classroom activities
- g involved myself in the parents' group of the unit
- h contacted the staff more often
- i assisted more often with homework
- j taken more interest in my child's activities

Again, more comments were invited on the lines provided.

### Students

Through the questionnaires for students, I wanted to find out the reasons the children ended up in the unit, again in order of priority. The statements (in the order they appeared in the questionnaire) were as follows:

My parents/guardians encouraged me

My friend/friends were going into the unit

To become a fluent speaker of Maori

To get a better education

Because past pupils told me about the unit

Lines were provided below these statements for respondents to add any further reasons.

- 2 I then wanted to know how long the children had been in the unit. A line was provided for the children to place the length of time on the line.

My assertion was that there could be different perceptions of the unit from those students who had recently entered the unit in comparison to those students who had been in the unit for an extensive period of time.

- 3 I then wanted to know how good the children were at speaking Maori before entering the unit. The children were not provided with any standards from which to gauge their fluency. The question was:

How good were you at speaking Maori?

The respondents were required to tick in the box opposite the words:

Fluent              Competent              Little              None

- 4 My next question related to the perceptions of the students as to how they thought they were at speaking the Maori language after their time in the unit. The same words (as in question 3) were included in this section, and again the students were required to tick in the appropriate box. The question was:

How good are you at speaking Maori now?

Again the students were required to tick in the box opposite the words:

Fluent              Competent              Little              None

My primary intentions in questions 3 and 4 were:

- a to ascertain whether the students thought their Maori language had improved since being involved in the unit;
  - b to gauge whether there was an overall improvement in the class (as an entire unit) in their ability to speak Maori after their time in the unit. My thought was, although individuals may not perceive an improvement, especially the 3rd form students at WHS as they would have had just over 7 months in the bilingual unit, there could have been an overall improvement.
- 5 I then inquired about the frequency of contacts the children had with Maori people prior to their entry into the unit. The question was:

How frequent were your contacts with Maori people (through hui etc.) before you entered the unit?

The students were required to place a tick in the box opposite each of the following:

Very frequent    Frequent    Seldom    None

- 6 My next intention was to inquire about the frequency of contacts with Maori people since being in the unit. The actual question was:

How frequent are your contacts with Maori people (through hui etc.) since being in the unit?

Very frequent    Frequent    Seldom    None

- 7 The next question related to work and behaviour in the classroom, doing homework, wanting to achieve good results, and the students' relationships with the students and staff in the unit, and the other students and staff (that is, the staff and students in the mainstream).

This question was generally related to concerns expressed to me by some staff and parents that the unit was drawing the children away from the other staff and children. They expressed a view that although the children in the unit seemed to be working and behaving well in the unit, they tended to be less tolerant of some of the other students and staff.

The final design of the question was as follows:

Do you think you have improved in the following areas since entering the unit?

Either write yes or no, or a tick (for yes) or a cross (for no) in the box:

Work in class

Behaviour in class

Doing homework

Wanting to do well

Relationship with bilingual/immersion students

Relationship with other students

Relationship with bilingual/immersion unit staff

Relationship with other teachers.

I used the word 'staff' for the bilingual unit as the staff consists of the teachers, and parents who frequently visited the unit to produce resources, or accompanied the unit during visits to other places. All the students were expected to address and speak to the parents in the same manner they interacted with the teachers.

- 8 Finally, I intended to gauge whether in the students' minds, the unit had fulfilled their expectations. I resisted my instincts to include a list of possible expectations, and opted in the end for a simple answer, with lines below the question for comments if they wished. The question and words (opposite which they were required to place a tick in the box) were:

Has the unit fulfilled your expectations?

Yes

No

Not sure

There were lines below each of the questions on which the students could comment if they wished.

### **The Interviews, Files and Papers**

I was given files, papers and access to any person I wanted to interview. I was grateful to receive the entire bilingual file from Pat McKelvey, principal of WHS, and a vast collection of papers and a lot of time from Laures Park, principal of Newtown School. The busy work loads of the principal, staff and parents required that the interviews be for a short time and on specific questions. I spoke to some people more than once.

The interviews with Maori people generally required quite an extensive time of greeting and getting to know each other before getting down to the business of the interview. I was anxious to conduct this research in a way which suited Maori people and the others involved, and at times this required that the proper

protocols and etiquette be completed before specific questions about the unit entered the discourse.

Many of the interviews were held at school, and the pressures evident in the lives of the bilingual/immersion staff was most evident at these times. They answered staff queries about historical incidents, the Treaty, various landmarks and methods of teaching or reprimanding students over lunch. Every single minute of the day seemed to be used up. If it wasn't the staff it was the students who required their time. When I inquired about the possibility of burn-out, each of the staff spoke not in terms of its possibility, but of its inevitability. The general consensus was that the maximum length of time a teacher could remain in the unit was 4 years.

Although everyone seemed to demand the attention of the bilingual/immersion staff, they thought that the main reason burn-out was inevitable was the unceasing demand on producing resources to keep up with the students. Producing original (or translating) story books, mathematics and science texts, and posters, is a laborious task which requires a lot of concentration, and this, in the opinions of the bilingual/immersion staff is the main cause of stress. The books produced commercially are too few in number to keep classes motivated for the duration they are at school.

Commercial book publishers are not enthusiastic about producing material in the Maori language as the market, in their opinion, is too small in comparison to the English material. The material written in English also has a possible world market, whereas the Maori language is confined to the Maori people of Aotearoa/New Zealand. The Maori language is related to other languages in the Pacific, such as the Cook Islands and Tahiti. However some differentiations are too marked. For example, those languages include the letters "v" and "s" in their alphabet, and the glottal stop, and the Maori language does not.

At both schools, I was able to enquire of the staff of the immersion/bilingual units as follows:

- \* the goals of the unit;
- \* their expectations of the students;
- \* their commitment to the Maori language;

- \* their ideal model of bilingual education, and the actual model implemented in the school;
- \* the advantages and disadvantages of the type of bilingual education implemented in the school;
- \* the installation of Maori values, whanau structures, parents as partners in the decision-making processes, appropriate administration and communication procedures, and compatible classroom structures into the unit;
- \* whether they favoured Fleras' (1983) developmental or language model; and,
- \* their qualifications and experience for immersion/bilingual education.

I also looked through the WHS unit's external examination records, and the Newtown School unit's reading ages to gauge the success or otherwise of the units in relation to the accepted measures of academic achievements. I compared the WHS results with the national average for Maori students.

All the parents I spoke with were people who were balancing efforts to ensure their families' survival with being concerned about their children's education. It is apparent that with the economic downturn in the country, both parents endeavour need to work. The primary objective for the parents is to survive in the city where they believe the best opportunities for their families are. It became evident that many of the families are under pressure to provide the necessities of life, and the children, for much of the time, are left to their own devices. Some parents have part-time jobs during the day and night, and in between they endeavour to interact with their children.

## **The Schools**

### **A Newtown Primary School**

Newtown Primary School is in the city of Wellington. There are 365 children on the roll and 20 staff. The children belong to 28 different ethnic groups.

The principal, Laures Park, and 5 staff members are Maori. Laures identifies strongly with her Maori identity and she has been active in the New Zealand

Educational Institute (the primary school teachers' union), especially in relation to Maori educational issues for thirteen years.

The Maori teachers are also committed to developing an education environment which enables children and parents to have genuine opportunities to be completely educated through the Maori language.

### **Establishment of the Immersion Unit**

Three years after the establishment of the first kohanga reo in 1982 in Wainuiomata, just on the outskirts of Wellington, there were five kohanga reo in Wellington. All the kohanga were feeling anxious about where their children were going to go when they reached school age (5 years old). Mrs Topsy Ratahi, who was a community officer for the Department of Maori Affairs scouted around for suitable schools, and her attention was drawn to Newtown School.

The first reason Newtown School attracted her was that it was at the centre of the five kohanga reo (which were in Island Bay, Taputeranga, Miramar, Ngaio and Pipitea Marae). The second reason the school caught Mrs Ratahi's attention was that the principal at the time was a Maori person, Arapeta Gibson. Mr Gibson and Mrs Ratahi came from the same tribe, and they knew each other well.

The young parents of the children attending kohanga reo joined with Mrs Ratahi to investigate the prospects of Newtown School developing a programme which would cater for their needs and aspirations. What followed was a clash between the traditional modus operandi of a New Zealand school and the emerging philosophy (kaupapa) of kohanga reo. The primary education system, as the Treasury (1987, p138) intimates, was characterised by little consumer choice and sharing of information, minimal provider flexibility and responsiveness to the demands of consumers, and incoherent management, accountability and incentive structures devoid of performance oriented objectives. For Maori people, coming to the school to discuss the establishment of a learning structure which was based on immersing children in the Maori language only, was a challenge indeed.

In addition to immersion in the language (and the exclusion of English), the management and staff of Newtown School had to wrestle with the kohanga reo children and parents bringing the whanau concept into the school. This concept, which entailed putting into action 'caring and empathy' as Fleras (1983) describes, required that all the parents and helpers like Mrs Ratahi support each other and share all the information. The school authorities found themselves dealing with

the entire group of parents and their supporters. The kohanga reo parents were bringing to the school a new way of dealing with issues. The collaborative and cooperative mode of decision making was tugging at the hierarchical mentality which had been ingrained into the structures which the Board was used to.

In 1986, Newtown School responded by starting what was termed a 'bilingual class', whose teacher was a well-meaning and competent Pakeha teacher who had some experience with bilingual education in Hawkes Bay. After a while however, the parents quietly protested at the lack of Maori language in the classroom. The use of greetings and some commands only in Maori was not the environment that the parents had in mind. The parents preferred total immersion in Maori, similar to Swain's (1978) early immersion model. The teacher agreed with their sentiments and actively joined the parents and supporters in their attempts to better address the needs of children entering Newtown School from kohanga reo.

The parents of the kohanga reo children had been part of the vast and concentrated campaign by the emerging kohanga reo advocates, including Mrs Iritana Tawhiwhirangi, to insist on Maori language only, whanau, aroha and manaaki (sharing and caring) in all kohanga reo throughout Aotearoa/New Zealand. The Newtown School parents of kohanga reo children were insistent that the same kaupapa be transferred into any educational institution where their children were to attend.

In 1987, the principal produced a 5-year plan which proposed that a total immersion education programme be introduced into the school gradually over five years. The kohanga reo parents reacted strongly against that proposal, and they sought an appropriate teacher themselves. In 1988, with the help of the Wellington Education Board inspectors of schools, a young teacher of Maori descent was identified and then appointed to the position of kaiako (teacher) in the Ngati Kotahitanga (The United Group) Total Immersion Unit at Newtown School. That same year, a kaiarahi reo was appointed to assist the teacher in the total immersion class.

The choice of the name Ngati Kotahitanga was an attempt by the parents, staff, elders and other supporters of the immersion unit to unite the children from all tribal and ethnic groups under the same kaupapa. There is only one Maori language with a number of dialects which are unique to the different regions throughout Aotearoa/New Zealand. The coining of the name for the immersion class signalled that all children were to be catered for by acknowledging and promoting their own dialects and tribal affiliations, where and when appropriate,

within the single Maori language and the one Maori people. From the start, parents were established as partners with the teachers in the decision making processes affecting the unit.

From 10 children in 1988, the unit has quickly grown to two immersion and two bilingual classes in 1992. There are 36 children in the immersion unit. All their lessons are in the Maori language. The two teachers and the kaiarahi reo, besides instructing the children, produce the bulk of the resources. The bilingual classes, with 45 children, use variant amounts of Maori and English, similar to the Swain's (1978) early partial immersion model. The ability of the teacher to speak Maori generally decides the amount and quality of the Maori language being heard and/or used in the bilingual classrooms, and at Newtown School, the teachers of the bilingual classes speak Maori and English, and they endeavour to use each language for half of the time.

Four children and their parents/guardians have applied to enter the immersion classes. The whanau of the immersion unit, which includes the parents, staff and supporters have been involved in recruiting the children into the immersion unit over the last four years. They have formulated criteria for entry into the immersion classes, and these include:

- \* parental commitment to the kaupapa of the immersion classes. This is in line with Swain's (1978) and Smith's (1990) assertions that parental support and involvement in bilingual education assures the unit of success;
- \* the children having spent sufficient time in kohanga reo to feel comfortable in a total immersion teaching and learning situation. This is in line with Skutnabb-Kangas' (1988) assertion that the children of the unit be at similar levels in the medium of education (in this case Maori);
- \* maintaining a suitable pupil-to-teacher ratio to ensure quality time is available to each student. Again this is in line with Skutnabb-Kangas' (1988) and Swain's (1978) assertions that teachers in these units need to be able to spend time with children in a system where the medium of education is in the language that the children are least familiar with.

The reasons 8 children have been refused entry into the unit have ranged from a lack of 'real commitment' to the kaupapa of total immersion, the inability of the children to cope with the basic linguistic communications and interactions in the classroom (due primarily to spending only a short time in kohanga reo), and

because there were too many children in the class. The whanau have decided that 20 children in an immersion classroom, especially at this stage (while resources are being made in-house), is the maximum number.

In 1987 and 1988, the children from the kohanga reo were served by fluent speaking kaiarahi reo, who were untrained Maori language support for teachers of new entrants. The teachers have not always been as fluent in Maori as kaiarahi reo. The kohanga reo parents have supported the kaiarahi reo because of their valuable input into the development of greater Maori language fluency among the children. At times the parents have argued that from their perspective the kaiarahi reo is equal in status to the teacher (in that the skills and knowledge of one compensates for the weaknesses of the other).

As the fluency of the teacher grew, and more resources in the Maori language were developed, the classes developed to the stage where Maori was the only language spoken, both as the language of cognition and of management. Newtown School pioneered a total immersion classroom in an inner-city Wellington school, and as Laures Park states:

there is no turning back. Total immersion education, like kura kaupapa Maori, is a growing educational industry as it is satisfying the aspirations of Maori to preserve and promote Te Reo [Maori language], to operate as a whanau, and to achieve their educational objectives.

We are able to ascertain from this historical account of the development of the unit at Newtown School that the bilingualism the parents and staff aimed for was complete oral and literate fluency in Maori and English. Their concentration on Maori was an attempt to compensate for the fact that the children's skills in Maori were far inferior to those in English. The staff were familiar with Swain and Cummins (1982) summaries of the research emanating from the immersion programmes in Canada, especially those related to the assertion that education in the second language does not handicap the students' acquisition of skills in the first language. Therefore, transferring that finding to Aotearoa/New Zealand, total immersion education in the Maori language would not hinder developments by the children of the skills in English. Although there has been no quantitative evidence that Swain and Cummins results can be transferred to Aotearoa/New Zealand, the qualitative avowal by teachers and parents indicate that the English language skills are being developed in concert with Maori language skills in total immersion situations.

With regards to qualifications and experience, the teachers are fully qualified primary teachers, one with 35 years experience in mainstream classes and 3 years experience in the unit. The other teacher has 3 years experience in the unit and 1 year attendance at a bilingual training programme at the School of Education at Waikato University. The teachers meet once each month with teachers from other schools with bilingual and immersion units. The teachers and kaiarahi reo are integral components of the local Maori communities, as well as their own tribal groups. The kaiarahi reo has developed teaching skills through her interaction with the teachers.

For some children and parents, the bilingual unit is a transition stage to entry into the immersion classes, and for others it is an end in itself, their ideal education environment. The beauty of the situation at Newtown School is that the children have a choice between mainstream, bilingual and immersion education. The element of choice would please Skutnabb-Kangas (1988), as he regards children and parents being able to choose the type of education they prefer as essential for successful educational initiatives. Smith (1990) on the other hand would prefer that Maori children be in kura kaupapa Maori as there is total immersion education and shared decision making there with no fear of the Pakeha veto; or school authorities actively deciding against decisions made by the unit.

If the proposals for a kura kaupapa Maori in the neighbourhood of Newtown School progress to become a reality, the children and parents would have another choice. The principal, staff and parents of the immersion unit have forwarded a submission to the Ministry of Education to establish the proposed kura kaupapa Maori in Newtown as a secondary kura kaupapa Maori. This would give the children coming out of their immersion unit a place to continue their education in an environment where the Maori language of the children will be fully retained. It is clear however that the Ministry intends proceeding with the establishment of the primary level kura kaupapa Maori in Newtown. This will not jeopardise the immersion unit at Newtown School as it has gained a very good reputation for achieving high quality linguistic and educational outcomes for their children.

The Newtown School parents and staff do not have confidence in the intermediate school, or the secondary schools (including Wellington High School) to provide an education environment which is non-threatening for their children and able to improve on the language that they possess now. The parents and staff of the Newtown School immersion unit are pleased that negotiations are taking place in Auckland, between Dr Pita Sharples and the Minister of Education, Hon. Dr Lockwood Smith, to establish the first secondary kura kaupapa Maori, alongside

the primary kura kaupapa Maori at Hoani Waititi Marae, within the near future. The parents of the immersion unit would prefer that total immersion education continues for their children after their time at Newtown School. They see in fact that their initial hopes lay in the recapitulation option where their students could spend their 1st and 2nd form years in Newtown School instead of going to the local Intermediate School. They envisage that this strategy will give them time to negotiate for a better secondary school option for their children.

It is clear that the choices the parents have to acquire education for their children in the Newtown area are greater than similar places in Aotearoa/New Zealand. However, it is also clear that the parents will continue to make their choices on the type of education their children receive. Their involvement in establishing and maintaining the immersion unit have made them very articulate and strong advocates for immersion education. For the parents of kohanga reo children who are entering schools, their perception of quality education includes their children achieving fluency in the Maori language and high educational goals, and the parents themselves having complete access to the decision-making and information affecting the unit.

### **The Mission Statement**

There have been calls from some people of both the Island and Pakeha communities to instigate classes, similar to those which have been initiated for Maori, for children who originate from Samoa (a Polynesian country in the Pacific Ocean). The principal and Maori members of the Board of Trustees have resorted to the Mission Statement to argue for consolidating the Maori programmes before expanding into meeting the needs and aspirations of the other ethnic groups.

Part of the Mission Statement states that Newtown School:

acknowledges the tangata whenua [the original people of the land, the Maori people], the Treaty of Waitangi, Te Reo Maori me nga tikanga [the Maori language and its culture];

will acknowledge and respect the many and varied cultural and spiritual beliefs within the school community.'

The principal and the Maori Board members, as well as the whanau, are adamant that Maori children deserve to be the priority at this time in order to seriously address the poor delivery by the education system of Aotearoa/New Zealand

over more than a hundred years. The lack of resources in the Maori language, the shortage of fluent speaking teachers and the lack of a genuine response from at least 90% of the schools throughout the country (primary and secondary) signifies that there is a long way to go. In the Wellington city area (where there are 42 primary and 12 secondary schools), Newtown School has the only immersion unit. There is no other. One other primary school has a bilingual unit, another is starting in the new year, and other schools have plans to start units.

Besides the immersion and bilingual programmes, according to the 1992 School Guidelines, all the classes at Newtown School develop Maori programmes for all children. This is part of the schools policy to promote cultural understanding between Maori and all other groups, and to develop and implement programmes that positively affirm the tangata whenua status of Maori.

The school is divided into four whanau of which the immersion unit, Ngati Kotahitanga, is one. Ngati Arohanui has the two bilingual classes and two language enrichment classes, which although teaching predominantly in English, include Maori language and cultural input, the amount and specific format of which depends on the Maori language ability and experience of the teachers. These teachers call on the Maori resource people both within the school and community to assist with the Maori input. It is apparent that the fluent teachers are in the immersion unit and the lesser able, in terms of the Maori language, are in the bilingual and language enrichment classes. The other two whanau, one with three classes and one with two classes have been given Samoan names Aiga Malosi and Aiga Fesoni respectively. From these descriptions, the bilingual goals vary in each of the classes, and undoubtedly, the linguistic outcomes will range from Halliday's partial or imperfect use of the second language to Bloomfield's (1933) native like control of two languages. It is clear from the policy that no pupil will leave Newtown School these days without any knowledge of Maori language and culture. One outstanding fact about this combination, is that the children have a variety of quality programmes to choose from.

### **The Results of the Questionnaires**

In reporting on the questionnaires, I will present the results from each group separately.

#### **(i) The Board of Trustees**

Despite the fact that the majority of children at Newtown School were Maori, all the five members elected on the first Board of Trustees in 1988 were Pakeha. One Maori, and then two, were co-opted later. When two Pakeha members resigned, two Maori people (which included one of the co-opted members) were elected to the Board in their place.

From the points of view of the Maori members and staff, the Board of Trustees (at the beginning of their term of office), like the previous School Committee, were against the kaupapa being proposed by the parents of the kohanga reo children. As they became more enlightened, the attitudes of the majority of Board members gradually changed. Most of them became supportive of the goals and objectives of the immersion unit.

The new Board of Trustees, which was elected in 1992, includes 3 Maori members who were voted in by the parents. The Maori members, present and past, are proud that 3 of the 5 elected members are Maori. This is attributed to an active campaign spearheaded by one of the Maori members of the previous Board. Profiles of the 5 Maori candidates were circulated amongst parents, and they also went door knocking to elicit support.

This style of campaigning was challenged by other candidates and their supporters, and for a period of time as the elections drew closer, the criticisms became more intense and personal. The Maori candidates were at times accused of collusion as they met together, in the style of cooperation and collaboration, much in the whanau mould, and shared ideas, possible policies for the school, and strategies to ensure good performances at public meetings. This is a good example of Maori people playing the Pakeha voting game to achieve an effective power base for themselves. However, it will be interesting to gauge how much the majority-Maori Board of Trustees responds to possible accusations of bias and favouritism towards Maori issues. Will they be so sensitive about this that the Maori unit will revert rather than make progress in the next 3 years.

All the 6 Board of Trustees (5 elected and 1 co-opted) members responded to the questionnaire. The results were as follows.

On the question of their attitudes to the immersion unit, all the respondents are very supportive. Interviews have confirmed this support. This is not to say they do not have concerns about the unit.

On the question of their **expectations** of the unit, all respondents believe that the Maori achievement, retention and participation rates, and Maori language acquisition by the students would increase. One member, however questioned what I meant by 'retention'. Obviously it is important to note that one should not make assumptions on the meanings of words which are used quite frequently by educationists. Other people may not have the same meanings as you do. The challenge then is to include a possible appendix to the questionnaire (or brief definitions somewhere on the questionnaire) to allow for misunderstandings. The meaning of retention in the context of the immersion unit is the students and their parents choosing to remain in the unit.

The majority of Board members agreed that **their attitude to the establishment of specific Maori education units** had improved through the presence of the immersion unit. The majority also agreed that their **understanding of the Treaty of Waitangi** and their **appreciation of equity issues** had increased as a result of the unit.

On the question of their impressions of the funds and resources of the immersion unit, there was a mixed response. 50% of the respondents thought the **budget, written material in the Maori language, equipment and premises** were not sufficient. The others thought the premises and written material are sufficient and did not know about the budget and equipment.

The comments of the Board of Trustees members covered a number of issues. Reporting in no special order of priority or preference, the issues raised were:

- \* the perception is that the immersion unit is isolated from the rest of the school. Some of the Board of Trustees respondents are anxious that the unit remains a part of the school, and the children mix with each other in the playground, and in sport and cultural activities. Underlying these concerns is the fear that the unit will separate itself from the rest of the school. This concern affirms one of the bilingual education goals, identified by the Department of Modern Languages of Massey University (1984), of unifying a multilingual country as important even in a school situation;
- \* the entire school (pupils, staff, parents and supporters) needs to be aware of the unit. Pakeha Board members were anxious to point out that this would not be because they wanted to 'pick holes in it', but to gain a greater understanding and to enable the Board to provide assistance and support when and if necessary. Swain (1978) and Smith (1990) caution against

Boards vetoing decisions made jointly by the parents and staff, especially if the Board is not familiar with all the issues and background. One has to balance this however with the need for units to be monitored and reviewed, and this cannot be readily achieved by keeping the doors closed to people who may criticise aspects of the unit. Debates have invariably helped groups identify areas which could be improved;

- \* there is complete understanding of the role of the unit to preserve a language which is being lost if something innovative and effective is not done. The Board of Trustees accept their responsibility to ensure that one of their roles is to support the retention of the Maori language and culture. Support in this area by the school authorities will assist the unit to achieve its primary linguistic goal of Maori oral and written fluency;
- \* Some Board members also thought it is unfair to expect so much from the parents, who are busy coping with the pressures of bringing up children, ensuring their economic well-being (by both parents taking regular jobs), as well as showing interest in their children's schooling. They are adamant that it is the Government's responsibility to ensure that the immersion unit is provided with sufficient resources to ensure the linguistic and educational quality in their classrooms and not rely on the voluntary inputs by the parents. Some Board members are concerned about the pressures on the parents of children in the immersion unit when other classes do not have those unreasonable expectations.

## (ii) The Staff

12 (or 67%) of the staff who do not have direct contact with the immersion unit responded to the questionnaire.

On the question of **attitude to the immersion unit**, the following table indicates the results.

**TABLE 5**

**The attitudes of the Newtown School staff to the immersion unit.**

Very supportive	91.5%
Supportive	8.5%
Not supportive	0

Number of respondents, n =12

On the question of the staff respondents' expectations of the effects of the immersion unit on the achievement, retention and participation rates, and the acquisition of the Maori language, the following table shows the results which were indicated.

	<b>Increase</b>	<b>Remain Same</b>	<b>Decline</b>
Achievement	91.5%	8.5%	0
Retention	91.5%	8.5%	0
Participation	91.5%	8.5%	0
Maori language	100%	0	0

n = 12 respondents

The predominant comment centred on the need for support of the staff and students of the immersion unit from the parents and other staff to ensure the unit fulfils its expectations. This compares with the Board of Trustees placing more responsibility on the government, rather than the parents, especially for the production of resources in the Maori language which is sadly lacking.

On the question of the effects of the immersion unit on their attitudes to particular developments amongst the Maori people, the staff respondents indicated that there was either an improvement/increase or no change as indicated in Table 7.

	<b>Improve</b>	<b>Same</b>	<b>Decline</b>
(a) Establishment of specific Maori education units	64%	36%	0
(b) Understanding of the Treaty of Waitangi	70%	30%	0
(c) Appreciation of equity issues	30%	70%	0

n = 11 respondents

On the question of the funds and resources related to the immersion unit, the staff respondents indicated in Table 8.

TABLE 8

The perceptions of the staff of Newtown School to the amounts of funds and resources received by the immersion unit.

	Excessive	Sufficient	Not Sufficient	Don't Know
Budget n = 11 respondents	0	30%	40%	30%
Written Materials n = 12 respondents	0	8.5%	92.5%	0
Equipment n = 10 respondents	0	30%	60%	10%
Premises n = 12 respondents	0	50%	25%	25%

The general comment by the staff respondents was that there is a need to ensure that the immersion unit is adequately resourced to enable the unit to function smoothly and effectively and without stress. This confirms assertions made by Skutnabb-Kangas (1988) and Swain (1978). The staff see that the fact that the immersion staff have to make the bulk of the resources they require in the unit themselves as not assisting the unit achieve its educational and linguistic objectives. Staff remarked that the immersion staff work longer hours than those in the mainstream to ensure a smooth running unit with sufficient resources to cater for the different levels.

The staff respondents also mentioned that from their own perceptions, the unit is achieving very good results in that the children are speaking Maori in the buildings and playground, they are able to switch easily from Maori to English when appropriate, and the children are self assured and confident. 3 respondents especially mentioned the sensitivity of the immersion children to staff and students who could not understand them when speaking Maori, and their ability to gauge the appropriate time to switch languages by the puzzled looks of the listeners. This supports Ben-Zeev's (1977b) assertions that immersion children are able to ascertain the appropriate times to switch languages, and Bain's (1975) and Bain and Yu's (1978) affirmations that immersion children are more sensitive to facial expressions than unilingual children. One staff member was also able to remark that the students are able to read and write both English and Maori, although the student had never been formerly taught English in the immersion classroom.

There was also concern expressed about the attitudes of the children outside of the immersion class to the children in it. Some staff respondents thought that an information sharing project in the school about the immersion unit could be a useful idea. A teacher mentioned that if students perceive that a group is being

given special attention, clashes may occur. Maori commentators such as Sharples (1989), Penetito (1988), Reedy (1989) and Smith (1990) would see this point as confirmation to establish kura kaupapa Maori where Maori is the norm, and no conflicts, which require Maori to justify their stance, occur. However, the concern expressed by some staff relates directly to that expressed by the Board of Trustees for a public relations exercise by the unit to share their work with the rest of the school.

### (iii) The Parents/Guardians

12 parents/guardians (48%) of the children in the immersion unit responded to the questionnaire. However, 23 (or 92%) of the 25 homes were represented in the parent responses.

On the question of **ethnic group**, 83% of the respondents ( $n = 12$ ) identify themselves as Maori. The other ethnic groups mentioned were Samoan and Pakeha.

On the question of **age groups** represented in the survey, the parent respondents are indicated by Table 9.

<b>TABLE 9</b>			
<b>The percentage distribution of the age groups of parents of children in the Newtown School immersion unit.</b>			
25-34	35-44	45-54	Over 55
17%	75%	8%	0
$n = 12$ respondents			

On the question of their **ability in the Maori language**, Table 10 indicates the distribution.

<b>TABLE 10</b>				
<b>The abilities of the parents of the immersion students at Newtown School in the Maori language.</b>				
Fluent	Competent	Not Fluent	Little	None
18%	46%	18%	9%	9%
$n = 11$ respondents				

On the question of their involvement in Maori cultural activities, the parent responses are indicated in Table 11.

The involvement of the parents of the immersion students in Maori cultural activities.			
Very Often	Often	Seldom	Nil
40%	30%	30%	0
n = 10 respondents			

On the question of the reasons (in order of priority) for allowing their children to enter the immersion unit, some parents had difficulty deciding the priorities as they decided that all the reasons given in the questionnaire were valid. 75% of the 12 parent respondents gave their priorities, and the following are their indications (in order of priority):

- 1 to become fluent in the Maori language
- 2 to achieve in education
- 3 to get a good job
- 4 to become fluent in English
- 5 to be with his/her friends.

Parents commented on the culturally safe environment that the immersion unit would provide for their children, and that they would grow up knowing the intrinsic values which are inherent in a fully immersed Maori language and cultural education programme.

Parents also mentioned the high quality of the immersion staff as a determinant in deciding that the Newtown School immersion unit was the place that they wanted their child to be educated. Five parents particularly mentioned the quality of the principal and staff as important considerations in their choices to be involved in the immersion unit.

Two sets of parents also mentioned that their children had to travel enormous distances each day to attend the unit (two and a half hours each day on the bus for one group of children, and in excess of 60 kilometres from the school to home for another group).

In the section which required the parents to indicate the effect of the immersion unit on themselves in the specific areas mentioned, the following results are indicated Table 12.

	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>
Become more interested in education	100%	0
Become more aware of Maori education issues	100%	0
Gained more awareness of the Treaty of Waitangi	92%	8%
Visited the school more often	58%	42%
Become involved with the Board of Trustees	42%	58%
Become more involved in classroom activities	25%	75%
Involved in the parents' group of the unit	58%	42%
Contacted the staff more often	42%	58%
Assisted more often with homework	100%	0
Taken more interest in the child's activities	100%	0

n = 12 respondents

Two sets of parents specifically mentioned that they have always been involved in the activities identified in this section, and that they were unable to state whether they could attribute this to the immersion unit. As far as they were concerned, they would have been the same no matter where their children were being educated.

Three sets of parents specifically referred to their desire to assist the unit more. However, work commitments, learning Maori, and participation in Maori organisations such as kohanga reo have precluded them from more involvement.

Mention was also made of the need for more funds for the immersion unit to properly resource the text book library with material written in the Maori language, computers and other equipment appropriate for immersion classrooms. 3 parents mentioned the lack of Maori texts as an indictment on the Ministry as they have verbally supported immersion units but have not backed this up with the resources to provide even the minimal support for the written Maori word. The commitment made by Learning Media, an independent organisation producing education resources (including resources in the Maori language), may indicate more positive responses in the future. Swain and Cummins (1982) emphasise the need for written resources in L2 to ensure proper acquisition by the students in that language. Fishman (1979) bases his definitions of bilingual education on the status accorded the written form of the subservient language.

**(iv) The Children**

All the children present on the day the questionnaires discussed the questions prior to furnishing their responses. The older children were able to answer the questionnaires on their own. However the younger children were assisted by the teachers and kaiarahi reo to furnish their replies.

On the question of age, the **numbers of children in each age group** on the day of the survey (August) are indicated in Table 13.

**TABLE 13**

The numbers of immersion students in the different age groups.

10 years	2
9 years	8
8 years	6
7 years	3
6 years	2
5 years	4

n = 25 respondents

On the question of their **length of time in the unit**, the times along with the number of children are shown in Table 14.

**TABLE 14**

The number of students and the amount of time spent in either the bilingual or immersion units of Newtown School.

Over 6 years	1
Between 5 and 6 years	1
Between 4 and 5 years	8
Between 3 and 4 years	3
Between 2 and 3 years	4
Under 2 years	8

n = 25 respondents

On the question of their **reasons for choosing to be in the immersion unit**, Table 15 indicates the results.

TABLE 15

The students' reasons for being in the immersion unit at Newtown School.

Reasons Stated on the Questionnaire	1st	2nd	3rd	4th	5th
My parents/guardians encouraged me	76%	0	16%	8%	0
My friend/friends were going into the unit	0	0	8%	40%	52%
To become a fluent speaker of Maori	24%	36%	40%	0	0
To get a better education	0	52%	32%	0	0
Because past pupils told me about the unit	0	12%	4%	52%	48%

n = 25 respondents

On the question of how good the students were at speaking the Maori language prior to and after being in the unit, the results are indicated in Table 16.

TABLE 16

The perceived abilities of the immersion students at speaking Maori at entry into the unit and after their time in the unit.

	On Entering the Unit	After Their Time in the Unit
Fluent	0	0
Competent	20%	92%
Little	72%	8%
None	8%	0

n = 25 respondents

The question was generally answered in terms of the children being able to respond to the teacher-pupil and pupil interactions in the Maori language both within the classroom and outside of it, such as in the playground, on the street or wherever the immersion unit makes contact with each other.

On the question of how frequent their contacts were with Maori people prior to and after their involvement with the unit, the results are indicated in Table 17.

TABLE 17

The frequency of contacts by the students with Maori people prior to entering the unit and after their time in the unit.

Before Entering Unit

Since Being In Unit

Very frequent	64%	84%
Frequent	20%	12%
Seldom	16%	4%
None	0	0
n = 25 respondents.		

On the question of whether the children had improved in the areas specified in the questionnaire, the results are indicated in Table 18.

**TABLE 18**

The percentage distribution of students who had perceived their own improvement (or otherwise) in the areas indicated.

	Affirmative	Negative
Work in class	100%	0
Behaviour in class	88%	12%
Doing homework	96%	4%
Wanting to do well	92%	8%
Relationships with bilingual students	96%	4%
Relationships with other students	80%	20%
Relationships with immersion staff	100%	0
Relationships with other staff	88%	12%
n= 25 respondents		

On the question of whether the immersion unit has fulfilled their expectations, the results of the immersion children are indicated in Table 19.

**TABLE 19**

The percentage distribution of students whose expectations have been fulfilled in the immersion unit.

80% indicated 'Yes'  
8% indicated 'No'  
12% indicated 'Not Sure'.

n = 25 respondents.

The general comment which came through was that the children enjoy being in a place where they speak Maori all the time. The vast majority of the children obviously enjoy working with and in the Maori language. The immersion staff supervised the children during the filling in of the questionnaires which accounts for the consistency in the number of respondents replying to each question. We were careful to avoid the staff leading the children in producing their answers by adhering to the questions and accurately recording the children's answers.

On careful inspection of the reading ages of the students in Maori and English, it is clear that the trends are positive in that the children are reading in English at least at the level of their chronological ages. The school has also devised methods of testing reading ages in Maori adapting the same criteria used by Clay (1979) and Warren-Roberts (1991). For example, the children's attitudes to reading, their skills with words and the way they attack the words, and their comprehension are criteria utilised in these exercises. I will leave it for more technical research however to clarify these points further.

## **B Wellington High School**

Wellington High School is an inner-city secondary school of over 800 pupils. There are in excess of 70 staff members, 4 of whom are Maori. The roll has remained fairly constant over the last 10 years. There are 27 different ethnic groups represented in the school's roll.

Presently, 18% of the pupils are Maori, and of these students, the vast majority originate from outside of the Wellington area. In 1980, as far as I can ascertain from the roll, approximately 9% of the students were Maori. The increase could be attributed to a number of factors including the presence of the bilingual unit and the increased Maori population in Wellington.

According to a report by staff in 1984, up until the establishment of the bilingual unit, the performance of the Maori children in the high school were invariably below the average for Maori students nationally, and well-down also on the achievements of non-Maori students, both in the school and nationally. Turoa Royal, the principal of the school, in a letter to Kawerau College in March, 1985, stated that:

Our first bilingual class sat School Certificate last year. The average pass rate in Maori has moved from below 50% to 84%. I believe that the magnificent change has been due to the bilingual programme.

Examination of the Wellington High School Maori students' results in the School Certificate examination are shown in Table 20.

**TABLE 20**

**The achievements of Wellington High School Maori students in the School Certificate Examination.**

<b>YEAR</b>	<b>A</b>	<b>B</b>	<b>C</b>	<b>D</b>	<b>E</b>	<b>n</b>
1983	0.0	5.1	16.5	45.6	32.9	79
1984	1.7	3.4	6.8	39.0	49.2	59
1986	4.4	12.1	29.7	28.6	25.3	91
1988	4.9	10.6	20.3	40.7	23.6	123

**NOTE**

<b>Grade</b>	<b>Score Range</b>
A	80 - 100
B	65 - 79
C	50 - 64
D	30 - 49
E	0 - 29

The results show clear improvements amongst Maori students at Wellington High School from 1983 to 1988. However it is difficult at this stage to allocate the reasons for these improvements entirely to the bilingual unit. The presence of a Maori principal, increased Maori staff, and a significant presence of Maori people on the Board of Governors could have been additional factors to the improved performances. During this period, there were also changing pass rates being allocated to various School Certificate subjects. This was mainly due to protests by Maori and other educationists and communities. For example the pass rate in School Certificate Maori language in 1983 was 32%, and in 1986 was 38%.

With the change of School Certificate Maori language examination from a norm referenced system (with set percentage distributions of students' marks) to a standards-based form of assessment (where students' performances in oral and written Maori language were assessed against set standards) in 1992, the WHS results compared with the national average are indicated in Table 21.

TABLE 21

The percentage distribution of students in the 1992 School Certificate Oral and Written Maori Language Examinations showing the performances of WHS students in relation to the national averages. Level 1 is the highest performance and 7 the lowest.

Examination	Levels						
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
National Written	7.4	9.5	16.1	21.3	20.0	11.1	2.5
National Oral	23.5	21.7	21.9	13.7	6.2	1.3	0.1
WHS Written (n = 21)	14.3	19.0	23.8	23.8	14.3	4.8	0.0
WHS Oral (n = 24)	29.2	33.3	25.0	12.5	0.0	0.0	0.0

The table clearly indicates the results in Maori language at the School Certificate level for WHS students were better than those for the national average. The staff expected better results however.

### Establishment of the Bilingual Unit

Records show that initial discussions in 1979 specifically focused on the establishment of a bilingual unit at Wellington High School (WHS), and this was one year following the establishment of the first primary bilingual school at Ruatoki. The incoming principal to WHS, Mr Turoa Royal, was a colleague of Mr Alan Smith in the Maori and Islands Education Division of the Department of Education, during the negotiations and implementation of the first bilingual school. It was natural that Mr Royal take his experience with him and initiate discussions on a similar enterprise at WHS.

In early 1980, the Chairman of the WHS Board of Governors, Professor Whatarangi Winiata, and the principal, Mr Royal, met with Mr Smith, who was Director of Maori and Islands Education, and Tamati Reedy, Education Officer of Maori and Islands Education, to gain some support for the development of bilingual programmes at WHS. Professor Winiata and Mr Royal were informed

that it was the intention of the Department of Education to consolidate the bilingual developments in the primary area before launching similar developments into the secondary schools. It seemed that in the eyes of the department, there was time enough to set the primary system in place before the impact would be felt in the secondary schools. WHS was pointed in the direction of the District Senior Inspector (Secondary), where they received 'polite support in theory' but no resources.

This did not discourage the Board as they continued discussions with the New Zealand Council of Education Research (NZCER). They were at one time told, during these preliminary discussions, that a bilingual secondary school education programme had begun in Trident High School in Whakatane. However, on investigation, it was found that their programme was an optional Maori language programme (or Maori As A Second Language (MSL) programme, similar to those described by Littlewood, 1986), not a bilingual programme. These MSL and FSL (French as a second language) programmes differ from bilingual or immersion programmes in that their language of instruction is English (or L1), although the target is L2. The bilingual and immersion programmes use L2 (Maori in Aotearoa/New Zealand and French in Canada) as the language of instruction.

The Board was committed to improving the educational and linguisto-cultural opportunities for the Maori students attending WHS, and in term two of 1980, they set up a Planning Committee, under the chair of Pam Cubey, the Deputy Chair of the Board. The members of the committee were interested teachers, members of the Board, and a representative from NZCER, Mr R. Montgomery. The task of the committee was to formulate a strategy to start a bilingual programme at WHS as soon as possible. They had to examine the logistics of a unit in the school according to a number of possible scenarios, surveying possible interests from prospective students and their parents/guardians in a bilingual unit from both within the school and in the contributing schools, and predict the possible cash flows required, and possible financial sources, to enable the unit to operate.

It is interesting to note that the initiatives for bilingual education came from within the school and its Board, when in Montreal, as Swain (1978) states:

The first French immersion class in the public sector began in 1965 in St. Lambert, prompted by a group of English-speaking parents whose primary concern was that the level of French attained by their children in a traditional French as a second language programme would not be sufficient

to meet their needs in a community and country that was increasingly emphasising the importance of French as a *langue de travail* as Lambert and Tucker (1972) assert. They were convinced that if French was used as a medium of communication in school - as a means to an end rather than as an end in itself - second language (L2) learning would be enhanced.

These statements from overseas were being read by advocates in this country, including the principal and some staff at the high school. Naturally, people were drawn to relevant information, especially research. Following the first meeting of the Planning Committee, a smaller working party of teachers was formed to explore the possibilities and put into action a number of activities. The working party called many meetings, including a two-day planning course. John Moorfield, a lecturer at Waikato University who had just returned from visiting the bilingual programmes in Wales, provided useful information and advice. Various pamphlets and papers received by the Maori and Island Division (MIE) of the Department of Education were also passed on by Wiremu Kaa to the school. WHS was the pioneer of bilingual education in the secondary schools of Aotearoa/New Zealand, and they regarded this position with cautious optimism.

A meeting of the staff at the end of 1980 recommended that planning for the WHS bilingual programmes continue in 1981 rather than start the actual course. There was a commitment to laying the proper foundation before launching the programme. In the second term of 1981 a brochure was designed to inform parents of the possibility of a bilingual unit starting in 1982. In the meantime, the working party continued with the fine-tuning of the plan. The details were worked out.

The bilingual programme was introduced to WHS in the beginning of 1982. It started with one 3rd form class (new secondary school entrants to WHS). The 28 pupils, all of whom, in conjunction with their parents, chose to be a part of the bilingual class, were assumed to be beginners in the Maori language, as there were no well-developed programmes in the contributing schools at the time. The assumption proved to be correct.

Swain and Cummins (1982), in their definitions of immersion programmes state that although the language of the school may differ from the language of the home (such as English at home and Maori at school in the WHS bilingual unit's case), the switch is supported by the parents, and all the children are at the same understanding of French [or Maori in the case of WHS] at the start of the programme. A staff meeting at WHS in 1982 reports that:

Teachers of social studies, mathematics, physical education, health, science and music were willing to assist in the bilingual programme, although some were not speakers of the Maori language. The teachers were prepared to learn alongside the students. However, all the teachers made a commitment to be sensitive to the needs of their Maori learners who were in the bilingual class and to be innovative in their delivery of the knowledge and skills to them.

As Maori was not the only language of instruction in all subjects, the WHS programme could not be called an immersion programme, either late or early as Swain (1978) describes. In the arrangements for the bilingual programme which eventually emerged, it was decided that students would be required to choose Maori in the option (MSL) system. In addition the bilingual method would develop both their English and Maori by using both languages in the core subjects when they were together as a form. All other subjects would be taught in English.

In the bilingual programme, it was decided that there were two ways to introduce Maori and to use it regularly. These were:

- \* to teach the content of the subject in Maori where and when possible;
- \* for social interaction in the classroom among students and teachers, and classroom management language.

In the view of unit staff this model provided the teachers with sufficient flexibility as:

- \* the scope of the bilingual programme could be matched with the abilities of the teachers in the unit. It was thought that even one bilingual teacher could spearhead the programme, and other teachers were able to support to the extent of their knowledge and skills in Maori. It was however felt that proper bilingual development of the children depends primarily on the fluency of the teachers, and on planning the syllabuses of the subjects to fit into the overall goals of the unit to produce bilingual students who were successful in achieving their educational objectives;
- \* if a teacher in the bilingual unit was absent from class, or left, the programme could remain intact through parents, students, unit staff and other staff having a commitment to the unit.

The abilities of both the pupils and the majority of teachers to speak Maori meant that the Maori language, in the initial stages, was to be confined to classroom management language. As the teachers and students became more familiar with Maori vocabulary and phrases the amount of Maori language in the classroom increased. After a while, Maori was being used to teach more of the content of mathematics, science, physical education and other subjects. The teachers found that, without sufficient resources, the task of teaching content in Maori, even for the fluent speaking teachers, was difficult. The teachers were grateful for various unpublished pamphlets, papers and books on primary school mathematics and science, which contained Maori vocabulary, phrases and ideas about teaching Maori children. These were being produced at various courses organised by the Advisers on the Education of Maori and Pacific Islanders (AEMPI) and Resource Teachers of Maori (RTM), who were employed by the Department of Education.

Since the classroom management language is virtually the same in all classrooms, the teachers were able to work collaboratively in planning for this part of their programme. The teachers were developing their Maori language knowledge and skills together, and the coordination this brought to the programmes was good for the children and for the school. The cooperative spirit was extended to other parts of the school, and there was much communication between teachers on all matters affecting the school. The pattern in the bilingual unit was to allow the Maori language teachers to introduce any new vocabulary and complex structures first, and the remaining teachers would reinforce them in their own classes. Maori vocabulary which were specific to different subjects were much more difficult to acquire. These were being produced mainly by the Maori Language Commission which was set up by legislation in 1987.

The general trends of the developments in WHS indicate that there were bits and pieces of Fishman's (1979) definitions of bilingual education programmes for Spanish speaking children in the United States. There was transitional bilingualism (although in the opposite direction) in that Maori (L2) was being used increasingly to eventually phase out English (L1) in the classroom. This research indicates however that 10 years after beginning, English is still predominant in the lessons of the unit. There were also traces of monoliterate bilingualism in that the lack of written resources in Maori negated any serious attempt to develop literacy in the Maori language. In addition, there was partial bilingualism in that Maori literacy was being promoted through the Maori language and culture, and access to scientific and mathematical literature in Maori was non-existent. There was also full bilingualism as an honest intention

(although not practically implemented), where the Maori and English resources cover all subjects. Again, the research continues to show a lack of Maori written resources. The WHS bilingual programme intends to promote the development of all skills in the two languages in all subjects. It is however worth mentioning that WHS, in comparison to material in the Maori language has always had an enormous collection of English language materials across all subjects. The challenge is to increase the Maori language resources.

Operations in the 5th and 6th forms brought their own administrative problems because of external examinations, optional classes and the need for greater specialisation. Except for Maori lessons, the 5th and 6th form pupils were taught in the mainstream classes. In supporting this structure, Skutnabb-Kangas (1988, p25) identifies the opportunity to practise L2 in peer group contexts as an essential requirement for a successful bilingual programme.

The staff and parents of WHS have been involved in the planning and monitoring of the bilingual unit from the initial stages. At the meetings, the parents have continuously emphasised that their main priority was to see the children become fluent in the Maori language. The parents have been adamant that the acquisition of fluency in the language would not reduce their children's chances of passing external examinations. The parents have had no doubts that educational success and fluency in the Maori language in the Aotearoa/New Zealand situation are intertwined, interlocked and completely compatible. This intense belief and commitment by the parents demonstrates the prime reason for enrolling their children in the WHS bilingual classes. Swain (1978) singles out the fact that in the St. Lambert immersion developments, the parents were the most influential in deciding the specific type of bilingual education a school finally crafts for its children. It is interesting to note that the incentive to establish total immersion education, rather than bilingual education, was a priority for the parents. Interviews with 5 of these parents indicated clearly that the initiatives of the kohanga reo movement were influential in crafting their opinions about what should be established at WHS. This research again indicates that the present senior students are not fluent in Maori.

The parents at WHS have also been involved in overall evaluations of the unit, and in individual assessments with the principal and staff. Queries and problems have been dealt with readily under the direction and behest of the parents and students. The school has enabled the unit to develop Maori ways of dealing with issues if and when appropriate. For example, the parents met with the staff and Board on marae when important issues were to be dealt with.

The parents have been involved in many marae courses with the pupils and staff. As a result of one of these meetings, the parents formed a Parents Support Group to:

- a meet regularly to speak Maori. This would ensure that the parents, who were unable to speak Maori, would be able to show some support for their children and the programme through the language. It was envisaged that the fluent parents would assist those parents who were less confident. This actually took place for 6 years from 1983;
- b assist with various parts of the teaching programme in the bilingual unit. WHS has been blessed with Maori parents who, as well as being fluent in Maori, have interesting occupations such as professors at university, teachers/lecturers, business people, arts- and crafts-people, bus drivers, wharfies, housewives and sports people, and all are capable of bringing interesting dimensions to the classrooms. The WHS bilingual unit is supportive of these parents and other people who come into contact with the students and staff in the unit with their language fluency, skills and knowledge as valuable contributions to the educational, social and spiritual components of the unit's work.

(In relation to these strategies, Skutnabb-Kangas (1988, p25) states that the development of successful bilingual students comes as a result of exposure to native speaker L2 use in linguistically demanding formal contexts.

However, despite the high profile and positions of some parents, it should be noted that on examination of the occupations of the entire parents/guardians of the bilingual students, the pupils in these classes come from the lower end of the Elley and Irving (1985) socio-economic index in terms of home background, and their TOSCA scores cover the entire range.)

- c support extra-curricular activities such as class tours, the Polynesian cultural group, and performances at concerts and speech contests. Throughout its ten year history, the WHS bilingual unit has attracted well known speakers such as politicians, kaumatua and kuia (Maori elders), and prominent Maori scholars to their gatherings either as guest speakers or as supporters;

- d lobbying politicians and community leaders to get their support for the bilingual programme;

(This is obviously an important component for the establishment of educational initiatives which differed from the norm. Politicians and other decision makers of the establishment are important in terms of procuring the required resources and finance to achieve the goals.)

- e establishing family support services for those who need extra support from time to time.

The parents continue to be involved in fund raising projects to support tours and the acquisition of suitable resources for the programme. From 1982, parents have been involved in raising finance and support for a whare hui for the school. The parents have been continuously part of the planning and implementation committees for the whare hui, which the bilingual staff and parents see as an essential part of Maori ceremonial, hosting and learning activities. Turoa Royal (1985) states that:

parents of the bilingual students have been very supportive of the school, and our frequent meetings with them, as well as our visits to the marae (which are now a normal part of the school) indicate that they are behind the bilingual programme, as well as supportive of the education of their children.

Royal adds that:

last year the parents of bilingual students mooted the idea of developing a marae on campus. This was approved by the Board of Governors and a Marae Association has been set up. A constitution has been accepted for a Whare Hui Association. It has been decided that we should not use the name 'marae' but the words 'whare hui' so that we can vary procedures of a traditional marae to suit the educational objectives set out by the school for the bilingual programme. Because of the demolition work at the school, a permanent whare hui has to wait for further ground development, but the Department of Education is encouraging the building of a whare hui by bringing on to the site relocatables for a temporary period. We aim to have a rather stylish permanent whare hui within the next 3 years. Because our buildings are new, we need the marae to be a permanent structure which fits in with the architecture of these buildings, and furthermore we need to

ensure that it is not simply a couple of prefabricated buildings down the back of the school site.

This was an attempt, as Skutnabb-Kangas (1988) would appreciate, to establish appropriate cultural premises to support the acquisition of the Maori language. In 1992, there is still no marae at WHS.

The bilingual unit has found that assessing its success or failure is a complex matter. The criteria for success could be the achievement of explicit objectives such as:

an increase in the number of Maori students reaching the 6th and 7th forms;

improved behaviour; or

comparing similar individuals in the mainstream and bilingual classes.

There have been a number of debates about the success of the unit as each of the groups involved, the staff, parents and students may make their judgements from different stand-points.

Besides, bilingual education programmes are only part of the children's existence; other factors including economic circumstances, the family situation (such as whether there are either one or two parents in the home), and support of the educational aspirations of the student play their part in determining either success or failure.

The evaluations at WHS have generally involved measurements of the objectives against what was achieved, and when variations have occurred between them, lengthy investigations of the reasons have followed. For example, a lengthy debate followed the non-appearance of the whare hui in 1986 and a delegation was sent to the Department of Education to investigate. It was not unusual for new objectives to be set and old ones discarded following deliberations.

The evaluations of students' performances at WHS has been based on a personal appraisal of each individual's progress, with general comments on the class as a whole. It is possible for readers to gain an appreciation of the progress of the bilingual programmes and students by a collection of direct statements by teachers. The following are a collection of quotes which appeared on evaluation

reports (and selected at random) and sent to the parents of first and second sets of bilingual students in 1982 and 1983 respectively:

In the beginning the high expectations placed on these students by teachers and by visitors were not matched by the performances of the pupils, and this tended to engender a negative image of themselves. We need to assist those pupils to develop a positive image of themselves in 1983.

Their listening skills have improved vastly over the year. Their understanding of the Maori language improved as the year progressed, but their oral skills have not developed to the same extent.

There has been a decrease in disruptions in the class. Overall their attendance has been well above the average.

The teachers of most subjects reported that the performances of the students in the bilingual class was 'average' to 'above average'. As a general conclusion, the teachers collectively agreed that these students performed slightly better than a comparable mixed-ability 3rd form at WHS. Except for the perceived use of Maori in the playground, I am not aware of what criteria were used to come to this conclusion.

They understand Maori at a greater level than the 3rd form option class; their use of Maori in the playground has increased over the year. It is noted that they greet each other and the teachers in Maori. In comparison with the 3rd form option class, they are streets ahead.

They tended to sling off at each other, but after the marae visit in April they have showed a strong sense of loyalty. While they tended to keep to themselves in the beginning, at the end of the year it is noticeable that they are prepared to mix with each of the other 3rd form groups. There is a feeling by the bright students that everybody puts them down and that the expectations of the staff are too high. We need to develop a positive image for them in 1983.

The range of ability in this class is too wide.

They seem to like working together. They are very group oriented.

This class took some time to settle down.

They appear confident in their Maori. It is expressed in greetings around the school, and there is some evidence that they are enjoying their work.

In terms of benefits to the school of the bilingual unit, the staff believe that Maori has become one of the many languages heard around the school. Students feel comfortable using it, and other Maori students who are not in the bilingual unit are exposed to spoken Maori. Prior to the establishment of the bilingual unit, the staff were sure that Maori was not one of the languages heard in the playground. Turoa Royal, in a letter to Kawerau College in 1985, states that:

Over the years I have noted an increase in the use of oral Maori in and around the school by all students in the bilingual and option classes. The encouragement of its use has been due to a more accepting climate within the school. In addition, of course, many visitors are welcomed in Maori by the bilingual students.

An additional indicator of the influence the bilingual unit has had on the school is that members of the Board and staff have enrolled in night school Maori language programmes at WHS. The research indicates that the present Board and staff also pursue Maori language and cultural skills.

A Maori resource teacher was employed in 1985, and much of the work produced at that time laid a firm foundation for the development of resources in WHS over the years.

1985 was Turoa Royal's final year at WHS. He was to return to his own tribal area to become principal of the newly established Parumoana Polytechnic (now Whitireia Polytechnic). During that year he and other colleagues on the staff were busy advising other secondary schools, including Northland College, on how to establish bilingual units in secondary schools. Royal had visited Singapore, Wales, Scotland, Ireland and Germany in 1984, and he made a major announcement as a result:

We must experiment with an alternative stream in a State school to cater for the different needs of our children. (Journal of the Maori Language Resource Centre, Number 5, July 1984. p6).

Royal was advocating for a bilingual school within a school. He maintained during discussions that he was not entirely happy with the ability of the bilingual

unit within an essentially Pakeha school to really address the achievements by Maori students in subjects in addition to Maori.

Royal was obviously moved by his visit to Wales, and he stated that:

the Welsh fought their 'Post Office Battle' twenty years ago. Now they have Welsh as an official language, bilingual schools and Welsh T.V. and radio stations.

By the 'Post Office Battle', Royal was referring to the sacking of a Maori woman Nadia Povey, a Post Office employee, for saying Kia Ora (or hello in Maori) on the telephone. The incident sparked a controversial debate throughout the country, and pushed the place of the Maori language in the life of Aotearoa/New Zealand to the fore.

The following years consolidated the firm foundations which were set by the pioneers of the WHS bilingual unit. They were also important years in the further development and consolidation of the unit. The Department of Education granted \$400 to the bilingual programme in January 1986.

During the years between Royal's departure and the appointment of the new principal, the demeanour in the bilingual unit changed. For example, in July 1986 John Clarke, the new principal, sent a letter to the parents/guardians of 3JTM expressing concern at:

the general behaviour and performance of several students...related...to coming late to class, arriving without proper books and/or equipment, and...disruptive classroom behaviour.

In order to regain control and order, Clarke's formula was to :

advise that the behaviour of each pupil be monitored very closely in an effort to improve overall classroom standards. This will involve students being assessed on their behaviour, and in the case of a student being poorly graded, he/she will be detained after school for a period of time. Parents who are on the telephone will be rung by their child if he/she is to be detained.'

In November 1987, WHS called a conference of secondary school bilingual staff from the Wellington region. 5 from WHS, 3 from Makoura College, 4 from Otaki

College and 1 from Kapiti College attended. The conference detailed the present situations in each school and charted possible courses towards the future. In general, the proposals from the conference highlighted the need for more autonomy for the bilingual units in each school and the need for more resources which all could share. The establishment of a computer link between the four schools came as a direct result of the conference.

In 1988, there were 88 pupils in the unit, and 4 staff. The subjects covered were Maori, English, social studies, mathematics, science, physical education and health. The Head of the bilingual department (HOD), in a letter to the Department of Education in April 1988, specifically mentions:

a very active parental group and activities based around the interests of the parents and supporters including social evenings.

The HOD also refers to the staff of the unit having very close links with other teachers of Maori and their students and the Maori language being used in a functional situation.

In summing up, the HOD states that:

this year we have four seventh formers, thirty three fifth and sixth formers. For many of our sixths a school certificate pass in Maori has earned them the right to sixth form status.

In the senior school the retention rate has been most positive. The fourth form however has been reduced by about a third of the original roll from the third form class. Causes for reduction have varied from parents moving to other towns to complete incompatibility with the school system.

Right up to, and including 1992, the bilingual unit at WHS has continued to show resilience. In a large inner city environment, the unit has continued to exist. Although the *whare hui*, which was first raised by parents in 1984, has not been built, the bilingual programme is still there, albeit with new and old challenges. The unit has moved into the main buildings of the school. The present principal Pat McKelvey is a Pakeha woman who is relying on Maori people to give her the lead in finding ways to develop the unit further. She wants the Maori children to match the non-Maori students in the school, and also on a national basis, and she is anxious that strategies be found to achieve this within the near future.

Pat McKelvey acknowledges the hard work which has gone into the bilingual unit since its inception, especially through the efforts and guidance of her predecessors, Turoa Royal and John Clarke, both Maori principals. The unit has gone a long way to improving the achievement and retention of Maori students, and the parental participation, at WHS. However, Pat McKelvey believes that there is still some distance to go before the results for the Maori students completely match those of the non-Maori students.

### **The Present Situation**

In 1992 there are 2 full-time and 2 part-time staff and 90 students in the WHS bilingual unit. The original PR2 (two grades of positions of responsibility in Aotearoa/New Zealand secondary schools) which was allocated to the unit in 1986, has been divided into two PR1 positions:

- HOD (Head of Department) 1 Maori Studies
- HOD 2 Bilingual Department.

The HOD Maori teaches the 5th, 6th and 7th forms Maori language classes, and the 4th form bilingual English class, for 4 periods each. A period is equal to 1 hour. He is a trained teacher with a university degree. He is a fluent speaker of Maori with 9 years of experience.

The HOD Bilingual teaches the optional 3rd form Maori language 2 periods, the fourth form 3 periods, optional waiata Maori 3rd form 2 periods, bilingual social studies 4th form 4 periods, 5th form history (mainstream) 4 periods, Taikaka alternative SC subject for composite 5th, 6th and 7th forms for 4 periods. She is also a trained teacher with a university degree. She is not a fluent speaker of Maori. She has 6 years experience.

One part-time person teaches the bilingual 3rd form for 4 periods and the 4th form for 5 periods. She is a Maori speaker, an elder who is well respected by the Maori community.

The other part-time person teaches the 5th form bilingual English class for 4 periods, the 4th form bilingual mathematics class for 4 periods, and an integrated English and Social Studies 3rd form class for 5 periods. She is also a trained teacher with a university degree. She is competent in the Maori language and has over 20 years experience.

The HOD Maori provides support and guidance to all staff who are involved in teaching and using the Maori language. The personal short term objective of the HOD Maori is to teach the 5th, 6th and 7th form Maori language classes totally in Maori. The long term objective is to ensure that all Maori language and other curriculum classes in the bilingual unit are taught in Maori only. Neither of these objectives have been achieved to date. In the lessons I observed, the HOD spoke Maori during the whole time with the 5th and 6th form students. Although the students obviously understood the Maori language being spoken, their replies to questions were invariably in English.

The HOD Bilingual provides support and direction to all staff who have contact with bilingual classes. According to the mission statement, the HOD Bilingual will ensure that all the bilingual programmes affirm and promote Mana Maori - to this end there are 10 thematic modules that are in the process of being developed, initially integrating English and social studies which will be trailed in 1992 with regular reviews to make appropriate modifications. In the MSL lesson I observed, English was the only language of instruction and interaction between the HOD Bilingual and the students.

Both HODs have commitment to the support and guidance of the bilingual students, and being receptive to the directives and decisions of the whanau (which include the staff, students, parents and supporters). There is a proviso that the decisions do not conflict with the school's charter. If the whanau's decisions and directives conflict with senior management, then discussions will be held to resolve any decisions.

The 90 bilingual students are divided into junior and senior levels. The juniors, who are the 3rd and 4th formers are together at form times and during lessons on the core subjects (English, mathematics, science and physical education). The 3rd form (for 9 periods) and the 4th form (for 8 periods), are integrated into different classes in the mainstream for their option courses, where they choose the subjects they wish to pursue.

Maori language is an option course with one extra period allocated to it. In addition, one period per week has been allocated to health.

The senior bilingual students are together at form class periods. This contrasts with the whanau organisation at Tauranga Boys' College.

Policies are being introduced to make the study of te reo Maori a mandatory prerequisite for student enrolment in the bilingual unit.

In discussing the aims and objectives of the unit, the primary points raised are:

- \* raising the standards and expectations;
- \* attracting more enrolments by targeting Maori students in the mainstream and form 2 pupils in the contributing schools;
- \* developing and implementing a bilingual scheme of work;
- \* developing inter-departmental programmes;
- \* appointing well qualified bilingual staff in a range of subject areas;
- \* teaching totally in Maori;
- \* actioning the Kaupapa Tino Rangatiratanga in Education.

When probed about the meaning of this, the bilingual staff spoke about establishing a Maori decision making body to manage and administer the unit within the confines of the school. It was apparent that they were speaking in the same way as Royal (1985) discussed prior to leaving the school; establishing a bilingual school within a school.

### **The Results of the Questionnaires**

The results from the Board of Trustees, staff of the school, the parents and students will be presented separately.

#### **(i) The Board of Trustees**

All 6 members of the Board replied to the questionnaire.

On the question of their **attitudes to the bilingual unit**, it is clear that the Board of Trustees of WHS is very supportive. One member wrote that:

there is a need (still) to positively support all Maori students. i.e. over compensate in financial/pupil ratio etc.

It is clear from this response that the present Board, like the Board at the time of planning and initiating the bilingual programme, continues the tradition of totally supporting the bilingual unit at WHS.

On the question of expectations of the bilingual unit by the Board members, they were unanimous that the Maori achievement, retention and participation rates, and the Maori language acquisition by the students would increase. There was no doubt expressed at all.

This indicates that the Board has high expectations of the bilingual programmes.

The majority of the Board indicated that their attitudes to the establishment of specific Maori education units had improved through the presence of the bilingual unit. The remainder indicated no change in their attitudes. 5 also indicated that their understanding of the Treaty of Waitangi and their appreciation of equity issues have increased through the presence of the unit. 1 member recorded no change as he had much involvement before his involvement in the unit. A member wrote that since their involvement with the bilingual unit began, he/she has learned about consensus decision making, seen consultation in action, and gained an appreciation of what the Treaty of Waitangi means to Maori people.

On the question of the funds and resources of the bilingual unit, Table 22 lists the results.

The perceptions of the WHS Board of Trustees of the funds and resources of the bilingual unit.			
	Sufficient	Not Sufficient	Don't Know
Budget	20%	60%	20%
Written Maori material	0	60%	40%
Equipment	20%	60%	20%
Premises	40%	60%	0
n = 5 respondents			

The comments by Board members on the questionnaire generally centred on the need for a whare hui and the fact that if the bilingual unit was to be successful then it must have an appropriate curriculum base, and adequate resources, funds

and staff, supporting again Skutnabb-Kangas (1988) assertion that successful bilingual education occurs in culturally appropriate environments.

Although the Maori representatives are supportive of the school and their attempts to successfully maintain the bilingual unit, there is still the perception that the total management of WHS (Ministry of Education, Board of Trustees and Management) have difficulties in coming to terms with honouring the Treaty of Waitangi and understanding tino rangatiratanga. The issue raised in the comments, relate to questioning who the Treaty partners of the Ministry of Education, the Board of Trustees and the school's management are. The comments raised the point that a kura kaupapa Maori structure which was contracted by the Board of Trustees and the school, would deliver education for Maori more effectively and quickly than a bilingual unit endeavouring to work within a monocultural structure.

#### (ii) The Staff

50 (or 67%) of the staff replied to the questionnaire.

On the question of **attitude to the bilingual unit**, 44% were very supportive and 56% were supportive. None of the 50 respondents indicated their non support of the unit.

On the question of **expectations**, 96% indicated that their belief was the **Maori achievement, retention and participation rates**, and the **acquisition of the Maori language by the students** would increase, and none of the staff respondents thought that there would be a decline. Various staff mentioned the increase in the numbers of Maori parents in the school at through the efforts of the bilingual unit. There was some discussion by staff about the measurements used to determine whether the bilingual unit would be successful, referring to the assessment procedures employed in the external School Certificate, Sixth Form Certificate and Bursary examinations for example as contentious measuring tools for all students. The staff was referring to the fact that different mediums are established for different subjects for external examinations. For example, subjects were accorded various amounts of A, B, C and D grades for the 1980 School Certificate Examination. This resulted in different pass rates. The following table of the 1980 School Certificate statistics for all New Zealand students illustrates this point.

TABLE 23
----------

**A list of some 1980 School Certificate subjects, the numbers of candidates who entered, the numbers achieving the different grades, and the variant pass rates.**

SUBJECT	No entered	A	B	C	D	No	%
English	59000	2061	10593	17428	28918	30082	50.99
French	1103	78	311	418	296	807	73.16
German (AL)	1194	113	378	403	300	894	74.87
Latin	629	70	249	223	87	542	86.17
Maori	1975	37	250	536	1152	823	41.67
Mathematics	47986	2984	7719	14246	23037	24949	51.99
Science	33291	1304	7035	8720	16232	17059	51.24
Technical Drawing	13167	444	2063	3828	6832	6335	48.11
Typewriting	14590	166	1511	4616	8297	6293	43.13
Woodwork	5055	12	440	1553	3050	2005	39.66

It becomes clear from Table 23, that the subjects Maori students have either chosen or have been encouraged to take for School Certificate (English, Maori, Mathematics, Science, Typewriting, and Woodwork) are those which have pass rates from 51.99% (for mathematics) to 39.66% (for woodwork). Therefore the chances of Maori students gaining a pass mark reduces in comparison to students who enter for the foreign languages, whose pass rates range from 86.17% (for Latin) to 73.16% (for French).

Maori people protested each year about the variances in pass rates between Maori and the other languages as Maori is the indigenous language of this country. It was not until 1986, when Maori moved to withdraw from the norm referenced system to a stand-alone standards-based system of assessment that the results in School Certificate Maori became better for students of Maori language in School Certificate. There were also some welcome changes in the pass rates of subjects Maori students were choosing. For example, in 1992, the percentage grade distribution of the same subjects recorded for 1980 is shown in Table 24.

TABLE 24

A list of some 1992 School Certificate subjects, the numbers of students who entered the subject, the percentage distribution of grades, and the percentage pass rates for each subject.

Note that the Maori language examination was a standards-based system in 1992.

SUBJECT	Total	A	B	C	D	E	% Pass
English	36549	3.1	16.0	34.9	37.0	9.0	53.0
English (1A)	15965	4.3	17.6	30.4	35.6	12.1	52.2
French	3611	20.2	27.8	28.2	19.2	4.6	68.2
German	1372	15.1	28.9	29.9	21.5	4.6	73.9
Latin	351	15.7	37.0	30.2	14.2	2.8	82.9
Mathematics	39498	16.2	17.5	18.5	27.2	20.6	52.2
Science	27002	9.9	24.5	30.6	28.3	6.7	65.0
Technical Drawing	8336	2.6	22.3	32.5	31.5	11.2	57.4
Typing	10056	1.9	20.9	35.8	33.2	8.1	58.6
Workshop Technology	8336	6.5	15.3	27.7	29.2	21.3	59.5
Maori	3149						
Level	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Written(Percentage)	7.4	9.5	16.1	21.3	20.0	11.1	2.5
Oral(Percentage)	23.5	21.7	21.9	13.7	6.2	1.3	0.1

Compared to the results under the norm referenced system of 1980, the results for Maori have improved markedly, although the Maori language advocates reject a pass-fail concept, opting instead for a system which states that the levels under standards-based assessment indicates the level the students have achieved. Under this philosophy, even levels 6 and 7 are levels of achievement.

If one compares the graph for Maori in 1980 with the separate graphs for the written and oral components for 1992, one is able to discern that the so-called graphs of normal distribution are no longer relevant for Maori in the School Certificate Examination. The Bursary results have not changed significantly however, as Maori still remains within the norm referenced system.

One is also able to discern from the last two tables that Technical Drawing, Typing and Woodwork have improved pass rates in 1992. However, these subjects still remain within similar arrangements to those of 1980. Maori is the only subject which has withdrawn from the norm referenced system with its continued adherence to means analysis and standard deviations. Maori at School Certificate

level assesses students of Maori in written and oral language against standards which have been established by teachers of Maori. Assessors are trained to recognise each student's performance against the standards. The standards are set by teachers of Maori and are defined by criteria and explained by exemplars of students' performances.

With regard to the effect of the bilingual unit on the attitudes of the staff to the establishment of specific Maori education units, understanding of the Treaty of Waitangi, and appreciating equity issues, the results are indicated in Table 25.

**TABLE 25**

**The attitudes of WHS staff to specific Maori developments as a result of the presence of the bilingual unit in the school.**

	Improve	Remain Same	Decline
Maori education units	87%	13%	0
Understanding treaty	81%	19%	0
Appreciating equity	74%	26%	0

n = 46 respondents

46% of the respondents expressed the desire to learn more about the Treaty of Waitangi and what it means for education in general and WHS in particular.

On the question of the funds and resources of the bilingual unit, the respondents indicated the results in Table 26.

**TABLE 26**

**WHS staff perceptions of the funds and resources of the bilingual unit.**

	Excessive	Sufficient	Not sufficient	Don't Know
Budget	0	33%	4%	63%
Written Materials	0	4%	33%	63%
Equipment	0	23%	27%	50%
Premises	0	8%	50%	42%

n = 48 respondents

Generally, the staff believe that the written materials in Maori and the equipment at WHS for bilingual education are not sufficient. The fact that the headquarters of the bilingual unit is a prefabricated building at the back of the school probably accounts for the perceptions about the premises.

On the question of contact or lack of contact with the bilingual unit, the staff respondents provided a variety of insights into their views of what has, and what is taking place. The staff who have been at WHS for some time are concerned at the staff turn-over in the bilingual unit. They generally perceive that the pressures exerted by Maori people, politicians, the school, Board, mainstream and students, are at times too much for the bilingual staff to take. Despite the support networks developed by the unit's staff, parents and students, the expectations according to some respondents are at times too high to achieve, and as a result, the bilingual unit is invariably under stress.

The staff respondents supported the bilingual staff concerning the need for highly qualified and competent staff, as, in their collective opinion, the bilingual unit requires managerial as well as teaching skills to successfully operate.

### (iii) The Parents/Guardians

22 (or 40%) of the parents/guardians of the bilingual unit replied to the questionnaire.

On the question of ethnic groups, 91% of the respondents were Maori and 9% indicated that they were Pakeha. All the parents/guardians respondents belong to the 35-44 age group.

Indications of their ability in the Maori language was recorded in Table 27.

TABLE 27

The parents' perceptions of their own abilities in the Maori language.

Fluent	Competent	Not Fluent	Little	None
0%	30%	5%	50%	15%

n = 20 respondents

Indications of their involvement with Maori cultural activities are shown in Table 28.

TABLE 28

The frequency of the parents' involvement with Maori cultural activities.

Very Often	Often	Seldom	Nil
50%	23%	13.5%	13.5%

n = 22 respondents

On the question of their **reasons for allowing their children to enter the bilingual unit**, the **priorities** are shown (in order of preference) in Table 29.

**TABLE 29**

**The order of the parents'/guardians' priorities for allowing their children to enter the bilingual unit.**

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| 1 | to achieve in education                |
| 2 | to become fluent in the Maori language |
| 3 | to get a good job                      |
| 4 | to become fluent in English            |
| 5 | to be with his/her friends.            |

The dominant comment which was highlighted by some parents in this section was that the bilingual unit would provide a safe environment for the children within a Maori whanau.

In the section which required the parents to indicate **the effect of having a child in the bilingual unit on themselves**, the results are shown in Table 30.

TABLE 30

The WHS parents' perceptions of the effects on themselves of having a child in the bilingual unit.

EFFECTS	Yes	No
Become more interested in education	100%	0
Become more aware of Maori education issues	100%	0
Gained more awareness of the Treaty of Waitangi	85%	15%
Visited the school more often	100%	0
Become involved with the Board of Trustees	10%	90%
Become more involved in classroom activities	25%	75%
Involved in the parents' group of the unit	35%	65%
Contacted the staff more often	90%	10%
Assisted more often with homework	90%	10%
Taken more interest in the child's activities	100%	0

n = 20 respondents

It became apparent while reading the results of this section that the word 'involved' in the question on the Board of Trustees was interpreted by the parents as either seeking a nomination or being elected to the Board. My intention in the question was to determine whether the parents/guardians felt more confident in approaching the Board through their involvement with the bilingual unit. Besides, I was curious to find out whether their involvement in the unit gave them enough confidence to consider that they could become involved in the Board.

The question relating to becoming 'involved in classroom activities' was to ascertain whether the parents were involved in either making resources for the unit or delivering lessons/talks on subjects that they were familiar with. The wording I chose for the question did not provide adequate information to make any informative conclusions from these two questions.

#### (iv) The Students

I have decided to present the results of the 27 junior (forms 3 and 4) and the 22 senior (forms 5, 6 and 7) students separately as the answers appear quite different. 55% of the juniors and 40% of the seniors responded to the questionnaire.

## The Junior Students

On the question of ages, the junior students at the time (August, 1992) were 13, 14 and 15 years.

On the question of providing the reasons for the junior students choosing to be in the bilingual unit, the results are shown (in order of priority) in Table 31.

**TABLE 31**

**The percentage distribution of WHS junior students' reasons (in order of priority) for choosing to be in the bilingual unit.**

Reasons Stated on the Questionnaire	1st	2nd	3rd	4th	5th
To become a fluent speaker of Maori	92	8	0	0	0
To get a better education	0	72	28	0	0
My parents/guardians encouraged me	8	8	44	20	20
My friend(s) were going into the unit	0	4	24	52	20
Because past pupils told me about the unit	0	4	4	28	64

n = 25 respondents

On the question of how long they had been in the unit, the 3rd formers indicated 7 months and the 4th formers one and a half years.

On the questions of the students' perceptions of how good they were at speaking Maori on entering the unit, and their abilities after being in the unit, the results are indicated in Table 32.

**TABLE 32**

**The abilities of the WHS junior students at speaking Maori on entering the bilingual unit and after their time in the unit.**

	On Entering the Unit	After Their Time in the Unit
Fluent	0	0
Competent	36%	64%
Little	54%	36%
None	0	0

n = 22 respondents

On the question of how frequent their contacts with Maori people were prior to and following their involvement in the bilingual unit, the results are indicated in Table 33.

TABLE 33

The frequency of WHS junior students' contacts with Maori people prior to their entrance into the bilingual unit and since being in the unit.

	Before Entering Unit	Since Being In Unit
Very frequent	8%	40%
Frequent	52%	40%
Seldom	40%	20%
None	0	0

n = 25 respondents

On the question of junior students giving their perceptions of whether they had improved in the areas indicated to them, the following results were indicated.

TABLE 34

The improvements of the WHS junior students in specific areas since being in the bilingual unit.

	Affirmative	Negative
Work in class	92%	8%
Behaviour in class	92%	8%
Doing homework	72%	28%
Wanting to do well	100%	0
Relationships with bilingual students	100%	0
Relationships with other students	100%	0
Relationships with bilingual staff	92%	8%
Relationships with other staff	72%	28%

n = 25 respondents

On the question of whether the bilingual unit had fulfilled their expectations, the results from the junior students are indicated in Table 35.

TABLE 35

The perceptions by the WHS junior students as to whether the bilingual unit had fulfilled their expectations.

60% indicated 'Yes'

20% were not sure

20% indicated 'No'.

n = 25 respondents

### The Senior Students

On the question of ages, the 22 seniors were either 15, 16 or 17 years at the time of the survey.

On the question of providing the reasons (in the same order of priority of the junior's responses) for choosing to be in the unit, the results from the senior students of the bilingual unit are indicated in Table 36.

TABLE 36

The WHS senior students' reasons for choosing to enter the bilingual unit.

Reasons Stated on the Questionnaire	1st	2nd	3rd	4th	5th
To become a fluent speaker of Maori	9%	9%	46%	27%	9%
To get a better education	18%	9%	18%	46%	9%
My parents/guardians encouraged me	68.5%	27%	0	0	4.5%
My friend(s) were going into the unit	0	36%	27%	18%	19%
Because past pupils told me about the unit	0	18%	18%	18%	46%

n = 22 respondents

There is quite a marked difference between the reasons provided by the juniors and seniors to this question. It seems that whereas the juniors are clear that their priorities were fluency in the language and to get a better education, it seems that the seniors entered the unit because of the encouragement of their parents/guardians. It seems that friends also played a significant role in leading the senior pupils to choosing the bilingual option.

On the question of length of time in the unit, all the senior respondents, except one, had been in the unit for three years or more.

On the questions related to the students' perceptions of their ability to speak the Maori language before entering the unit, and their abilities after being in the unit, the results are indicated in Table 37.

TABLE 37

The perceptions of the WHS senior students of their abilities to speak the Maori language prior to their entry into the unit and since being in the unit.

	Before Entering Unit	After Being In Unit
Fluent	0	0
Competent	20%	30%
Little	50%	70%
None	30%	0

n = 20 respondents

It is apparent that the senior bilingual students are not as confident as the juniors in claiming improvements in their abilities to speak the Maori language. The comments of the senior students intimated that they knew more Maori vocabulary and phrases, but doubted their ability to speak the language better.

Speaking with two senior students, I became aware that the criteria they were using to measure their fluency was in relation to the fluency of young relations and acquaintances attending either kohanga reo or immersion units. They lamented about their inability to converse satisfactorily in Maori with those young children despite their relatively long period in the bilingual unit at WHS. It is clear that the senior students remain determined to acquire fluency in Maori but doubt that they will achieve this through the unit.

On the question of how frequent their contacts were with Maori people both prior to and after being in the bilingual unit, the results are indicated in Table 38.

TABLE 38

The frequency of contacts between the WHS senior students and Maori people prior to their entry into the bilingual unit and since being in the unit.

	Before Being In Unit	Since Being In Unit
Very Frequent	19%	8.5%
Frequent	24%	76%
Seldom	49%	15.5%
None	8%	0

The reduction in the "Very Frequent" row can be attributed to the fact that the seniors may choose to attend meetings on marae. There is no compulsion for them to attend gatherings in their own time.

On the question of whether the students have perceived an **improvement in the specified areas since entering the unit**, the results are indicated in Table 39.

	<b>Affirmative</b>	<b>Negative</b>
Work in class	80%	20%
Behaviour in class	65%	35%
Doing homework	65%	35%
Wanting to do well	95%	5%
Relationships with bilingual students	100%	0
Relationships with other students	95%	5%
Relationships with bilingual staff	70%	30%
Relationships with other staff	70%	30%

n = 20 respondents

On the question of **whether the bilingual unit has fulfilled their expectations**, the results of the senior student respondents are indicated in Table 40.

9% indicated 'Yes'
63% indicated 'Not Sure'
28% indicated 'No'.

n = 22 respondents

Although some of the senior student respondents acknowledged their increased confidence and pride in being Maori as a result of being in the unit, they are generally not clear about what their specific expectations are, although the acquisition of fluency in the language was definitely one.

Interviews with 3 senior students to seek clarity on the question of why acquiring fluency in the language was only the 3rd priority for choosing to be in the unit,

they thought that as they spent a longer amount of time in the unit, they realised that they would not achieve fluency, and therefore this could have been at the back of their minds as they approached the question. Fluency was probably the main reason they chose in the 3rd form, as the present juniors indicate, but this would have become less of a priority now.

Generally, the senior students were more pessimistic and negative about the bilingual unit than the junior students.

## CONCLUSION

The vast range of definitions of bilingualism and bilingual education is reflected in the range of bilingual education models in Aotearoa/New Zealand. There are the more authentic Maori models apparent in kohanga reo (Fleras, 1983) and kura kaupapa Maori (Sharples, 1989 and Smith, 1990) where Maori language and culture are media for teaching and learning, similar to Swain's (1978) immersion and Fishman's (1979) full bilingual education models. The bilingual education models in Aotearoa/New Zealand resemble Swain's Early Partial Immersion model and Fishman's (1979) partial bilingual education model where both languages are used as media of teaching and learning and the resources are in both languages. There is also the model where Maori is taught as a foreign language in primarily Pakeha institutions, similar to those described by Littlewood (1986). The teaching of Maori language in secondary schools, other than those with bilingual or immersion units, teach Maori as a second language. These programmes use English as the main language of communication in the classroom.

The Newtown School immersion unit is more towards the kohanga reo model along the continuum, whereas the bilingual unit at Wellington High School (WHS) is one step from teaching Maori as a foreign language. The Tauranga Boys' College and Western Heights High School units are presently closer to the immersion models than WHS as they have more teaching through the medium of Maori. It is apparent that the different models which appear in this research stem from a philosophical variation in that the immersion model has the acquisition of the Maori language as the primary objective whereas those models where English is more prominent is focused on preparing the learners to achieve success in education. Those in immersion education are adamant that if the Maori students know who they are, and where they belong and come from, they will be more likely to acquire the knowledge, skills, attitudes and values required to make their way confidently through life. In other words, they hold to the view that teaching

through the Maori language and culture increases the likelihood of their students being successful in education.

The mother tongue (MT) maintenance programmes that Skutnabb-Kangas (1988) describes are not found in Maori bilingual classrooms as over the years, since the Education Ordinance, English has become the first language of the children and Maori, the target language. Maori, is the students' second language. However, Skutnabb-Kangas' emphasis on ensuring the status of both languages and the resources allocated to the acquisition of both languages is the same, is appropriate advice for the situation in this country. Wallwork's (1984) diglossia does exist in Aotearoa/New Zealand as English is the language with high status and Maori with low status. Generally, the staff and Boards of Trustees of Newtown and Wellington High Schools ascertain that the amount of written materials and the premises of their units are inadequate, and that the staff require more support to continually achieve the goals they have set for themselves.

Governor Grey's 1847 Education Ordinance which elevated English to the sole medium of instruction in Aotearoa/New Zealand schools provided legislative backing to diglossia. There is a similar situation as that described by Chisimba (1984) in Namibia; where submersion of the Maori students' first language (Maori), and the elevation of the second language English, was the goal. This diglossia, combined with a lack of resources, mean that these forms of bilingual models resemble Fishman's (1979) transitional and monoliterate models rather than the partial and full bilingual education models. The first language is merely used as a tool to increase proficiency in the second language, English, and the resources are targeted to English acquisition.

The challenge to this position in Aotearoa/New Zealand has been deliberate, and this research exposes the uniformity of the rationales and goals articulated by the advocates of bilingual education in this country, especially in the last fifteen or so years. There is an agreement that full bilingualism, biculturalism, biliteracy, educational achievement and the achievement of Maori self determination are the primary reasons for the establishment of bilingual education, as Spolsky (1987), Fleras (1983), Smith (1990), Sharples (1989) and Penetito (1988) found out. In addition, the bilingual education models which have been established is a statement about these goals being achieved with Maori as the medium of learning and teaching. Grey's Ordinance is being turned on its head.

As Fleras (1983) concluded, the Pakeha political, economic and social institutions have been destructive influences on Maori language and culture in the belief that

if Maori were assimilated into these systems, their life chances would improve. However it has become clear that if this policy continues, there will be further destruction and oppression of the Maori. The new bilingual education initiatives are beginning to turn the trends around through the proactive formulation, by Maori people, of the theories of education, teaching and learning styles, types of resources and equipment utilised in classrooms, the designs of learning places, and in the management and consultation processes in educational institutions.

However, one needs to be cautious in ascertaining whether bilingual education in Aotearoa/New Zealand is either successful or unsuccessful depends firstly on the criteria established by the administrators, staff, parents and students to make such judgements. Secondly, the methodologies used to measure success depends, as Swain and Cummins (1982) must take into account the types of tests, the language of the tests in relation to the language of instruction and the first language of the learners, the IQs, the relative status of the languages and a number of factors, such as resources allocated to the units, within the school. Within the scope of this research, criteria such as the ability of the students to understand, speak, read and write both languages, their achievements in education, increasing the participation and interest of parents in their children's education, eliciting the concern and support of management, and deducing the support and commitment of staff to this form of education can be utilised to assess bilingual education.

Although one is unable to assess the relative merits of the different types of bilingual education, it is evident from the case studies that the Boards of Trustees is concerned and supportive of their units. They show admirable commitment to the staff, parents and students, have high expectations of, and positive attitudes to, the units. The staff of the units are dedicated to their units, working hard to ensure the success of the students through their unique brands of education. The staff are innovating methodologies and resources which suit the particular goals and objectives of the unit. There is a concern however that bilingual and immersion staff will burn out because of the demanding work loads. Other staff in the schools are also supportive of the units, have high expectations, and are concerned about the lack of resources. Both the Boards of Trustees and staff have increased their awareness of Maori issues and improved their attitudes to Maori educational initiatives through the presence of the units in their schools.

The parents of both units have increased their involvement and interest in the education of their children since their contact with the unit. They attend meetings and volunteer to participate in the various activities of the unit and school. In addition, the parents' awareness of issues affecting Maori and Pakeha people in

this country has grown. The parents are predominantly Maori with only some knowledge and experience with the Maori language and culture. This is probably the main reason they enrolled their children in the units - to enable the children to become fluent in the Maori language.

The students stated that their primary reason for choosing to be in the units was the encouragement of their parents. This backs Swain's (1978) assertion that parents are the powerful force in the establishment and maintenance of bilingual and immersion programmes. The acquisition of fluency in the language and educational success were also important reasons for the children opting for a bilingual or immersion education. It seems that the influence of past pupils and friends in this choice are less significant.

The students indicated that their ability at Maori language, behaviour in class, doing homework, their desire to do well, and their relationships with the bilingual staff and students all improved as a result of their involvement in the units. The majority also maintained that the units have fulfilled their expectations. However, there was a minority of students who still had problems relating positively with students and staff who are outside of the units.

Despite some negative feedback from the senior students at WHS, there is no doubting the advantages of the unit to Maori students when compared with schools without units. The educational and linguistic achievements are probably the most important criteria politicians, staff and parents would use to make judgements of education initiatives.

Students seem to perform well against these criteria. For example, when comparing the achievements of the WHS and Tauranga Boys' College Maori students with two secondary boarding schools for Maori boys funded by the State, the results (as shown in Table 41) are quite revealing. The two boarding schools for boys cited here do not have bilingual or immersion units, although they have a strong emphasis on Maori language and culture. They teach Maori as a foreign language. Parents/guardians pay an average annual boarding fee of \$4,500 per student.

Table 41 compares the distribution of School Certificate grades for two Maori boarding schools for boys with all the Maori students at Wellington High School and Tauranga Boys' College. It is an interesting comparison as Tauranga Boys' College and Wellington High School are both state schools.

TABLE 41

The percentage distribution of School Certificate grades for two Maori boys Boarding Schools, and Wellington High School and Tauranga Boys' College Maori students.

Year	School	A	B	C	D	E
1984	Boarding School 1	0.7	6.8	23.1	48.1	21.4
	Boarding School 2	1.4	9.5	24.4	45.9	18.7
	WHS (Maori Students)	0.0	9.6	18.1	38.3	34.0
	TBC (Maori Students)	0.0	5.7	34.5	40.2	19.5
1986	Boarding School 1	2.1	7.4	18.5	39.4	32.6
	Boarding School 2	0.9	7.2	24.7	45.5	21.7
	WHS (Maori Students)	4.4	12.1	29.7	28.6	25.3
	TBC (Maori Students)	0.0	5.7	25.3	46.0	23.0
1988	Boarding School 1	1.1	2.8	22.8	49.3	23.9
	Boarding School 2	0.7	4.8	20.1	55.7	18.7
	WHS (Maori Students)	4.9	10.6	20.3	40.7	23.6
	TBC (Maori Students)	0.6	6.8	26.7	37.5	28.4
1991	Boarding School 1	0.0	5.4	26.9	47.1	20.6
	Boarding School 2	0.0	13.8	44.1	37.9	4.1
	WHS (Maori Students)	0.8	9.8	22.7	33.3	33.3
	TBC (Maori Students)	0.0	2.1	12.1	52.9	32.9

Note: WHS had their first bilingual students sitting School Certificate in 1984 and Tauranga Boys' College (TBC) in 1987.

It is clear that during the period (1985-1988) when WHS had a stable bilingual staff, the achievements of the Maori students increased. In fact it is apparent that during the period from 1984 to 1988, there was a marked improvement in the achievements of Maori students at WHS whereas the students at the Boarding Schools either remained constant or declined. It is difficult to deny the positive influence the WHS bilingual unit has had on the overall performance of the Maori students in Maori and other subjects. The absence of a bilingual or immersion unit at the two Maori boys' boarding schools may similarly be claimed as an important

reason for the lack of improvement in their School Certificate results in the 1980s. It is clear however that the TBC and WHS Maori students perform well in the School Certificate examination when compared with these boarding schools which have an environment and policies which are focused on Maori students.

The relatively poor performance of the WHS Maori students in the 1991 School Certificate examination points to the staff changes taking place in the bilingual unit in 1990 and 1991. The relatively poor results of the Tauranga Boys' College Maori students in the same 1991 School Certificate examination is also founded in drastic unit staff changes in 1990 and 1991. Two of the three foundation staff of the unit left on promotion. These results clearly point to the impact of staff on the success of bilingual/immersion units. The lack of qualified and appropriate staff in all subjects is a problem which needs to be addressed urgently. Bilingual education units suffer from a dearth of qualified staff who are also fluent in Maori.

My view from this research is that the presence of the bilingual and immersion units had the following effects.

- \* The Board of Trustees (or Board of Governors in the initial stages) are aware of the issues facing Maori people and are politically supportive of the bilingual/immersion unit.
- \* The total staff of WHS and Newtown School are supportive of the staff and programmes being planned and implemented in the units.
- \* The Board of Trustees and staff of both schools are generally in favour of bilingual units achieving more Maori self determination.
- \* The parents/guardians are involved in partnership with the staff of the units in the decision making processes affecting teaching and learning styles, the classroom environments, and student support services.
- \* The involvement of the bilingual/immersion students, staff and parents/guardians in Maori activities outside of the school.
- \* The Board and total staff support the bilingual and bicultural goals of the bilingual/immersion staff, students and parents/guardians.

- \* The students are involved in the decision making processes (even at Newtown School).
- \* The bilingual staff, students, parents/guardians and resource people share in developing and reviewing the assessment and evaluation procedures of the units.
- \* The awareness of the students about their educational and linguistic aspirations increased.
- \* The Maori students at WHS achieved better than their predecessors in the School Certificate examinations, and compared more than favourably with similar students in other schools.

Mention was made of the need for further research to investigate the performances of children in bilingual and immersion education in reading Maori and English. Rakaumanga School, a full immersion school in Huntly, have devised their own methods to assess the reading ages of children in Maori and English.

They have utilised Clay (1979) and Warren-Roberts and Ryles (1991), as Newtown School has, as well as advice from the Waikato Education Centre, reading advisers and neighbouring schools to establish assessments of reading. Amongst other things, they have assumed that reading is a highly individual and complex process, children respond in different ways, and reading cannot be isolated from other subjects taught at the school.

The results so far are quite revealing, remembering that the children learn all their lessons through Maori. For example, in a standard two class (9 and 10 year olds) of 26 students in 1993, 19 students have reading ages in Maori of 10 or over. Their reading ages in English are:

Over 10 years	13%
9 to 10 years	20%
8 to 9 years	17%
Below 8 years	50%

One is reluctant to claim the validity of these results. However, the results are encouraging for the staff, parents and children. The results for English reading ages for the Form 1 and 2 children (12 and 13 year olds) were more revealing. Of the 33 children, the following results were recorded:

Over 15 year old reading ages	45.5%
12 to 14 years	12%
10 to 12 years	12%
9 to 10 years	12%
8 to 9 years	3%
7 to 8 years	6%
6 to 7 years	9.5%

Again however, the results are in need of technical clarification. It is sufficient however, at this stage, to salute the trends. The results, when comparing those of the 9 and 10 year olds with the 12 and 13 year olds support Swain's (1978), Skutnabb-Kangas (1983) and Toukoma (1976) assertions that the English skills of English speaking students increase as their years in French immersion classes increase. The 12 and 13 year olds have spent more years in the Maori immersion classes than the 9 and 10 year olds, and this is reflected in the numbers reading at ages in excess of their chronological ages. This is similar to the better performances in Swedish by Finnish children who moved to Sweden as ten year olds than Finnish children who had moved as five year olds, as Skutnabb-Kangas (1983) discovered.

Future research on bilingual and immersion education needs to be completed to address the numerous questions. Overseas methodologies used by Cummins and Swain could be adapted to measure more specific technical aspects of bilingual education in this country. This research is merely one phase in the exploration of educational and linguistic initiatives which ensure that the needs and aspirations of Maori people are met. There is much to do to find ways and means to turn around the trends of Maori language loss and relatively low educational

performances. Bilingual and immersion models are providing the much required hope.

The challenges which bilingual and immersion units face are to overcome the demands on the teachers' time and effort to produce resources as well as teach. Resources are not forthcoming as they are for mainstream classes. The English-based education tradition and diglossia, as well as the recent emergence of the bilingual education movement, has resulted in few teaching and learning resources. More commitment and effort by the Ministry of Education and Learning Media to bridge the enormous resource gap which exists.

Another challenge is to defy the links made between education achievement and socio-economic levels. The parents of the children involved in bilingual and immersion education in this country are generally from the lower echelons of society. This contrasts in general with the situation in Canada. The parents there are generally economically well off compared to their counterparts in this country. In addition, the predominantly Maori parents have also spent less time in formal education than their Canadian and mainstream parents. Further research is required to ascertain the relationship between socio-economic levels and educational achievement in the Aotearoa/New Zealand situation as the trends in this research are indicating interesting correlations, in that even with students from the lower socio-economic levels, above average educational achievement is possible.

Additional problems stem from the variety of models and their claims to success. Smith (1990) maintains that the kura kaupapa Maori model is the only option for Maori. This research is reporting positive results from the particular models mentioned in the research. Littlewood (1986) emphasises that teaching languages as a second or foreign language can be successful. Fleras (1983) prefers the language rather than the developmental models for kohanga reo. Parents and staff are left in a quandary, with this conflicting and confusing advice, although, in the main, the type of model established generally depends on the qualifications, knowledge and skills of the teachers available at a particular place at any given time. Furthermore, with this skills and knowledge variance, a model may change with an incoming teacher. For example, if a teacher not fluent in Maori replaces one who is fluent, the model could revert to a second language from an immersion model. In summary however, as Mackey (1970) asserts, bilingual education means different things to different people.

The success of bilingual and immersion units are highly dependant on the teachers, as the fluctuating results of Tauranga Boys' College and Wellington High School illustrated. This poses real problems as long as the dearth of qualified and skilful bilingual and immersion teachers still exist to the degree it is at presently. The support of the Board of Trustees, principal and staff are also important determinants for a successful unit. The question remains as to whether there will be negative implications for the Newtown School and Wellington High School units if either the Boards, principals or staff changed. The research clearly indicates that as long as these groups are supportive, the unit will produce positive indicators. Particular factors internal to the unit, such as the skills of the teachers, and external to the unit, such as support from other staff, are important to the success of the unit, as Swain (1978) emphasised.

Despite the successes in the units identified in this research, the opinion by all participants is that further improvements are possible. There needs to be no compromises in terms of the goals set. Acquiring fluency and literacy in both Maori and English, achieving education success, and equipping the students to participate fully in the areas of their choice, seem to me to be non-negotiable.

Also, in terms of the factors required to achieve these goals, the allocation of adequate and culturally appropriate resources, the presence of trained and skilled bilingual and immersion teachers, parent commitment and support, and the backing of decision-making bodies are also essential to ensure success of the units.

**Ko te pae tawhiti  
Whaia kia tata  
Ko te pae tata  
Whakamaia kia tina**

**The distant horizon  
Pursue so that it becomes closer  
The near horizon  
Grasp it.**

The distant horizon for Maori people has come closer over the last decade especially. History for Maori people during the period of contact with the Pakeha people has been quite tumultuous. The positive results emanating from the

bilingual and immersion initiatives are an encouragement to take the next steps along the continuum. It is an exciting time to be involved in Maori education.

Maori people are turning back the negative statistics primarily through their own initiatives. The promise indicated in the first missionary schools are becoming a reality again. Positive interventions which revert to a genuine linguistic and cultural base are proving to be the base from which Maori children are successfully launched to overcome the challenges of an ever-changing and highly technological world.

## APPENDIX 1

**QUESTIONNAIRE TO THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES AND STAFF WHO HAVE NO DIRECT CONTACT WITH THE BILINGUAL/IMMERSION UNIT**

Please place a tick in the appropriate box. You may comment if you wish in the space provided.

1 Identify whether you are a member of the Board of Trustees or Staff:

Board of Trustees  Staff

2 My attitude to the bilingual/immersion unit is:

Very supportive  Supportive  Not supportive

---



---



---



---



---

3 My expectations of the bilingual/immersion unit are that:

a The Maori **achievement** rate would

Increase  Remain the same  Decline

b The Maori **retention** rate would

Increase  Remain the same  Decline

c The **participation** rate of Maori parents in the school activities would

Increase  Remain the same  Decline

---



---



---



---

4 Through the presence of the bilingual unit:

a My attitude to the establishment of specific Maori education units has

Improved       Remained the same       Declined

b My understanding of the Treaty of Waitangi has

Increased       Remained the same       Declined

c My appreciation of equity issues has

Increased       Remained the same       Declined

---



---



---



---

5 With regards to the funds and resources of the bilingual/immersion unit, my impression is that:

a the budget is

Excessive     Sufficient     Not sufficient     Don't know

b the amount of written material in the Maori language is

Excessive     Sufficient     Not sufficient     Don't know

c the equipment is

Excessive     Sufficient     Not sufficient     Don't know

d the premises are

Elaborate     Sufficient     Not sufficient     Don't know

6 Please write about either your contact or lack of contact with the bilingual unit and any other comments you would like to make.

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

Make any further comments here

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

## QUESTIONNAIRE FOR PARENTS OF THE BILINGUAL/IMMERSION UNIT

Please place a tick in the box when appropriate.

Write your name: \_\_\_\_\_

I would like each parent/guardian to provide information with regards to the following:

1 The ethnic group I identify with is

Maori  Pakeha  State other \_\_\_\_\_

2 My age group is

25-34  35-44  45-54  55 and over

3 My ability in the Maori language is

Fluent  Competent  Not fluent  Little  Nil

4 My involvement with Maori cultural activities (hui, meetings) is

Very often  Often  Seldom  Nil

5 Place the number (either 1,2,3,4 or 5), in order of priority, opposite the statement which coincides with the reasons you decided to allow your child to enter the bilingual/immersion unit:

a to become fluent in the Maori language

b to become fluent in English

c to achieve in education

d to get a good job

e to be with his/her friends

Add any other comments you wish to make:

---



---



---



---

6 Write either 'yes' or 'no' in the box opposite the following statements.

Since my child has been in the bilingual/immersion unit, I have

- a become more interested in education
- b become more aware of Maori education issues
- c gained more awareness of the Treaty of Waitangi
- d visited the school more often
- e become involved with the Board of Trustees
- f become more involved in classroom activities
- g involved myself in the parents' group of the unit
- h contacted the staff more often
- i assisted more often with homework
- j taken more interest in my child's activities

Add more comments if you wish:

---

---

---

---

---

---

## QUESTIONNAIRE TO STUDENTS OF THE BILINGUAL/IMMERSION UNIT

Unless otherwise stated, fill in the form by either placing a tick in the appropriate box or by writing on the lines (in either Maori or English).

Form \_\_\_\_\_ Age \_\_\_\_\_ Name \_\_\_\_\_

1 Why did you choose to enter the bilingual/immersion unit?

Put the number 1 to 5 beside the statement which best fits your reasons for choosing to be in the unit. 1 would be alongside the main reason, and 5 beside the least.

- |  |                          |
|--|--------------------------|
| My parents/guardians encouraged me         | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| My friend/friends were going into the unit | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| To become a fluent speaker of Maori        | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| To get a better education                  | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Because past pupils told me about the unit | <input type="checkbox"/> |

List any other reasons:

---



---



---



---



---



---

2 How long have you been in the unit? \_\_\_\_\_

3 How good were you at speaking Maori?

Fluent     Competent     Little     None

Make any additional comments you would like to make here

---

---

---

4 How good are you at speaking Maori now?

Fluent  Competent  Little  None

Make any further comments:

---

---

---

---

5 How frequent were your contacts with Maori people (through hui etc.) before you entered the unit?

Very frequent  Frequent  Seldom  None

Make any further comments here

---

---

---

---

6 How frequent are your contacts with Maori people (through hui etc.) since being in the unit?

Very frequent  Frequent  Seldom  None

Make any further comments here

---



---



---



---

7 Do you think you have improved in the following areas since entering the unit? Either write yes or no, or a tick (for yes) or a cross (for no) in the box:

- |  |                          |
|--|--------------------------|
| Work in class                                    | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Behaviour in class                               | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Doing homework                                   | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Wanting to do well                               | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Relationship with bilingual/immersion students   | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Relationship with other students                 | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Relationship with bilingual/immersion unit staff | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Relationship with other teachers                 | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Write any further comments here:

---



---



---



---

8 Has the unit fulfilled your expectations?

Yes  No  Not sure

Give reasons for your answer

---



---

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

Aitken, Judith & Noonan, Rosslyn, "The Politics of Resource Allocation in Education: The Implications for New Zealand Women", in Clark, Margaret. *The Politics of Education in New Zealand*, Wellington: New Zealand Council of Educational Research, 1981.

Apple, Michael, W. *Education and Power*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1982.

Barik, H.C. and Swain, M "Evaluation of a Bilingual Education Program in Canada: The Elgin Study through Grade Six. *Bulletin CILA* 27.

Barton, Bill, "He Matauranga Tau Ahua Reorua: He Kitenga O Tetahi Kaiako. Bilingual Mathematics Education: A Practitioner's Point Of View", in SAMEpapers 1990, Centre for Science and Mathematics Education Research, University of Waikato, Hamilton: Longman Paul.

Barton, B. Towards Bilingual Mathematics Education. Presented to SERU seminars, Waikato University, 1985.

Barton, B. & Cleave, P. (1989a) *Ethnomathematics and Language Use: Field Notes on Maori Mathematics*. Presented to Linguistics Seminar at Victoria University of Wellington.

Barton, B. & Cleave, P. (1990) *Semantic Domains in Maori Mathematics Vocabulary*. Presented to Linguistics Seminar, Victoria University, Wellington.

Beare, H., Caldwell, B. J. and Millikan, R.H. *Creating An Excellent School: Some New Management Techniques*, Routledge: London, 1989.

Beeby, C. "Towards an Educational Myth", in Renwick, W.L., 1986.

Benton, Richard. "Is Bilingualism a Handicap?", contained in *Set 77, New Zealand Council of Education*. (Contained in Department of Modern Languages, Massey University, Linguistics and Second Language Teaching, Paper 64. 232, Posting 2)

Benton, R.A. "Should Bilingual Schooling be Fostered in New Zealand?" New Zealand Council of Educational Research, Wellington, 1974.

Benton, R.A., *The Maori Language in the Nineteen Seventies*, N.Z.C.E.R., Wellington, 1979.

Benton, R.A., "The Role of Ethnic Languages in Education", in Bates, R.J. & Codd, J.A. (eds.) *Theory and Practice in New Zealand Education*, Palmerston North: Dunmore Press, 1980.

Benton, R.A., *The Socio-linguistic Survey of Language Use in Maori Households*, N.Z.C.E.R., Wellington, 1979.

Best, Elsdon, *The Maori*, Tombs, 1924.

Birmingham Centre for Contemporary Cultural Studies, *Unpopular Education: Schooling and Social Democracy in England*, London: Hutchinson, 1981.

Bourdieu, Pierre, "The school as a conservative force: scholastic and cultural inequalities" in *Schooling and Capitalism: a sociological reader*. Dale, R., Esland, G. and Macdonald, M. (Eds) Open University Press: London. Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1976.

Bray, Douglas and Hill, Clement. *Polynesian & Pakeha in New Zealand Education, Volume 11: Ethnic Difference and the School*, Heinemann, Auckland, 1974.

Especially contributions by Ranginui Walker (Maoritanga and the Teacher), Geraldine McDonald (Pre-school Education and Maori Communities: A Matter of Values), Marie M. Clay (Polynesian Language Skills of Maori and Samoan School Entrants), P.A. Blank (Catering for the Educational Needs of Children at a Multi-ethnic Primary School in the Inner City), T.K. Royal and J. Tapiata (The Teaching of Maori Language in Schools), A.F. Smith (Providing for Maori Children in a Secondary School), and Arapera Blank (Where the Manuka Bends).

Brookover, Wilbur B., John H. Schweitzer, Jefferey M. Schneider, Charles H. Beady, Patricia K. Flood, and Joseph M. Wisenbaker. "Elementary School Social Climate and School Achievement," *American Educational Research Journal*, 15, 1978.

Caldwell, B. and Spinks, J. *Policy Making and Planning for School Effectiveness, Effective Resource Allocation in Schools Project*, University of Tasmania: Hobart, 1984.

Cameron, Kathie. "Responding to the Challenge of Multicultural Education" from *Delta* 34, Massey University, 1984.

Carringer, D.C. "Creative thinking abilities of Mexican youth: the relationship of bilingualism", *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 5, 1974.

Chemers, Martin M., and G.J. Skrzypek. "Experimental Test of Contingency Model of Leadership Effectiveness," *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 24, 1972.

Clay, M. *The Early Detection Of Reading Difficulties. A Diagnostic Survey With Recovery Procedures*. Heinemann, 1979.

Codd, J, Harker, R, and Nash, R (Editors) *Political Issues in New Zealand Education*, Second Edition, Palmerston North: Dunmore Press, 1990.

Cohen, M. "Effective Schools: Accumulating evidence." *American Education*, January/February, 1982.

Commission on Education in New Zealand, 1962 Report (Currie Report), Wellington, 1962. Commission on Education in New Zealand, 1962 Report (Currie Report), Wellington, 1962.

Cuban, L. Effective Schools: a friendly but cautionary note. *Phi Delta Kappan* 64(10), 1983.

Cummins, J. *Bilingualism and Minority Language Children*, OISE Press, Toronto, 1981.

Cummins, J. *Bilingualism and Special Education: Issues in Assessment and Pedagogy*. Multilingual Matters Ltd., Clevedon, Avon, 1984.

Cummins, J. "Linguistic minorities and multicultural policy in Canada" contained in Edwards, J.R. (ed.) *Bilingualism, Pluralism and Language Planning Policies*, London: Academic Press, 1983.

Department of Education, *Educational Policies in New Zealand*, Report Prepared for OECD Examiners in March 1982, Chapters 1&2, Wellington: Government Printer, 1983, pp. 11-22.

Department of Modern Languages, Linguistics and Second Language Teaching, *Language and Society*, Paper 64, 232, Massey University, Palmerston North, 1984.

Dixon, B.R. and Bouma, G.D. and Atkinson, G.B.J. *A Handbook of Social Science Research*, Oxford University Press: London, 1988.

Dodson, C.J. *Bilingual Education: Evaluation, Assessment and Methodology*, University of Wales Press, Cardiff, 1985.

Edwards, H., and Smyth, F. "Alternatives to Early Immersion Programs for the Acquisition of French as a Second Language", *Canadian Modern Language Review* 32, no.5: 524-33, 1976a.

Edwards, H., and Smyth, F. *Evaluation of Second Language Programs and Some Alternatives for Teaching French as a Second Language in Grades Five to Eight*, Ontario Ministry of Education, Toronto, 1976b.

Ekstrand, L.H. "Bilingual and bicultural adaption". Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Stockholm, 1978.

Fishman, J.A. *Bilingual Education*, Rowley, Mass: Newbury Press, 1973.

Fishman, Joshua. "Bilingual Education: What and Why?" contained in Trueba, A.T. & Barnard-Mizrahi, C. (eds.) *Bilingual Multicultural Education and the Professional: From Theory to Practice*, Rowley, Mass.: Newbury House, 1979.

Fleras, Dr Augie, (Unpublished) "Te Kohanga Reo: preparation for life or, preparation for school". A preliminary report on the organization, objectives and implications of Maori language nests presented to the Department of Maori Affairs, 1983.

Foster, W. Toward a critical theory of educational administration. In Sergiovanni, T & Corbally, J (eds). *Leadership and Organization Culture*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1984.

Freeman-Moir, J. "An introduction to the economic and employment context of education", in Ramsay, P.D.K. (ed) *Family, School and Community: Perspectives on the Sociology of New Zealand Education*, Sydney: Allen & Unwin, 1984.

Freire, Paulo, *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*, Penguin Books, 1972.

Gadd, Bernard. "Adapting to Cultural Differences", contained in Codd, J.A. & Hermansson, G.L. (eds.) *Directions in New Zealand Secondary Education*, Auckland: Hodder and Stoughton, 1976.

Galtung, J. *The true worlds: a transnational perspective*. New York: The Free Press, 1980.

Genesee, F., Tucker, G.R., and Lambert, W.E. "Communication Skills of Bilingual Children", *Child Development*, 1975, 46: 1010 - 14.

Habermas, J. *Knowledge and Human Interests*, trans. Jeremy J. Shapiro. London: Heinemann, 1972.

Habermas, J. *Theory and Practice*, trans. John Viertel. London: Heinemann, 1974.

Handy, C.B. *Understanding Organisations*, Penguin: London, 1988.

Harker, R.K. "Bourdieu and Education" in *New Zealand Cultural Studies Working Group Journal*, No. 4. 1982.

Harker, R.K. "The crisis in Maori education: where does it come from?" *The New Zealand Social Worker*, 8 (3), 1972

Hirsch, W. (ed.) *Living Language - Bilingualism and Community Languages in New Zealand*, Heinemann, Auckland, 1987.

Holmes, J. *Bilingual Education*, English Language Institute Occasional Publication No. 11, Victoria University, Wellington, 1984.

Hughes, J. *The Philosophy of Social Research*, Second Edition, Longmans, London, 1980.

Hunn, J.K. *Report on the Department of Maori Affairs*, Wellington: Government Printer, 1961.

Kelsey, Jane, *A Question of Honour: Labour and the Treaty 1984-1989*, Allen and Unwin, Wellington, 1990.

Kemmis, S. and Highes, C. "Seven Principles for Program Evaluation in Curriculum Development and Innovation" in *The Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 1982.

Kennedy, Graeme, "English Language Education in a Multicultural New Zealand", from *Education*, vol. 29, no.2.

Khliief, Budd. "Language as Identity: Towards an Ethnography of Welsh Nationalism", contained in *Ethnicity* vol. 6, 1979.

Lambert, W.E. "A Social Psychology of Bilingualism", *Journal of Social Issues*, vol.3, 1967.

Lambert, W.E. "The Effects of Bilingualism on the Individual: Cognitive and Social Consequences". in Hornby (ed.) (1977) (qv), pp15-27.

Lather, P. "Research as Praxis", *Harvard Educational Review*, 56, pp257-277, 1986b.

Macnamara, J. *Bilingualism and Primary Education*, Edinburgh University Press, 1966.

Macnamara, J. "Problems of bilingualism", *Journal of Social Issues, Special Issue 23*, No. 2, 1967.

Manatu Maori (Nga Kairangahau) *E Tipu, E Rea: Maori Education - Current Status*, Ministry of Maori Affairs, 1991.

Manatu Maori (Nga Kairangahau) *Nga Putunga Tatauranga Maori: A Directory of Maori Statistics*, Ministry of Maori Affairs, 1991.

McLaren, I.A. *Education in a Small Democracy: New Zealand*, London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1974, pp3-46.

Metge, J. *The Maoris of New Zealand*, Routledge & Kegan Paul, London, 1967.

Middleton, S., Codd, J.A. and Jones, A., (Editors). *New Zealand Educational Policy Today: Critical Perspectives*, Allen and Unwin: Wellington, 1990.

Ministry of Education, *Maori Education Statistics 1989*

Mulgan, R. *Maori, Pakeha and Democracy*, Oxford University Press,

National Advisory Committee on Maori Education, *Maori Education*, Department of Education, Wellington, 1971.

Ohia, Monte, "The Unresolved Conflict: An Overview of Bilingual Education in New Zealand Secondary Schools", *SAMEpapers*, University of Waikato, Hamilton: Longman Paul, 1990.

Ohia, Monte, Maloney, Mihi and Knight, Gordon *A Survey of Mathematics Teaching in New Zealand Secondary School Bilingual Units*, Department of Mathematics and Statistics, Massey University, Palmerston North.

Ohia, Monte, Maloney, Mihi and Knight, Gordon *Case Studies of Mathematics Education in New Zealand Secondary School Bilingual Units*, Department of Mathematics and Statistics, Massey University, Palmerston North.

Peal, Elizabeth and Lambert, Wallace E., "The Relations of Bilingualism to Intelligence", *Psychological Monograph*, 76, 1962.

Penetito, Wally. "Taha Maori and the Core Curriculum", contained in *Delta 34*, Massey University, 1984.

Penetito, W.T., "Maori Education For A Just Society", submission to the Royal Commission On Social Policy, March, 1988.

Picot Report: Source, *Administering for Excellence*, Report of the Taskforce to Review Education Administration, Government Printer, 1988.

Rado, M. (ed.) *Bilingual Education*, Bundoora, Victoria, Centre for the Study of Teaching and Human Interaction, School of Education, La Trobe University, 1974.

Rata, Elizabeth. "Kura Kaupapa Maori", from *New Zealand Post-Primary Teachers' Association Journal*, Term 3, No.30, 1989.

Renwick, W.L. *Moving Targets. Six Essays on Educational Policy*, New Council of Educational Research: Wellington, 1986.

*Reviews of National Policies for Education* Paris: Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development, 1983, pp. 10-24.

Shakeshaft, C. Barriers to women's advancement into school administration. *Women in Educational Administration*. Newbury Park, Cal: Sage, 1987.

Shakeshaft, C. "Differences Between the Ways Women and Men Manage Schools", in Shakeshaft, Charol, *Women in Educational Administration*. Beverly Hills, Ca: Sage Publications Inc., 1987.

Shakeshaft, C. The female world of school administration. *Women in Educational Administration*. Newbury Park, Cal: Sage, 1987.

Shuker, Roy, *The One Best System? A Revisionist History of State Schooling in New Zealand*. Palmerston North: Dunmore Press, 1987.

Simon, Judith. "Ideology in the schooling of Maori children", contained in *Delta Research Monograph No. 7*, Massey University, 1986.

Skutnabb-Kangas, T. *Bilingualism or Not: The Education of Minorities*, Clevedon, Avon: Multilingual Matters, 1981.

Smith, Alan. "Bilingual Education at Ruatoki", from *Education*, vol. 28, no.8, 1979.

Smith, Graham Hingangaroa. "Taha Maori: Pakeha Capture", from Codd, John, Harker, Richard, & Nash, Roy. (eds.) *Political Issues in New Zealand Education*, Dunmore Press, Palmerston North, 1990.

Spolsky, B. *Report on Maori-English Bilingual Education*, Department of Education, New Zealand, 1987.

Spolsky, B. and Cooper, R. (Editors) *Frontiers of Bilingual Schooling*, Rowley: Mass. : Newbury House, 1972.

Swain, Merrill. "Bilingual education for the English-Canadian. Three Models of Total Immersion", contained in Boey, L.K. (ed.) *Bilingual Education*, Singapore: RELC, 1980.

Swain, Merrill & Cummins, Jim. "Bilingualism, Cognitive Functioning and Education", contained in Kinsella, V. (editor) *Surveys 1*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982.

Temm, Paul, *The Waitangi Tribunal: The conscience of the nation*, Random Century.

Te Tino Rangatiratanga Waananga, (Unpublished), Article prepared for Te Kohanga Reo, 1989.

*The Curriculum Review*: Report of the Committee to Review the Curriculum for Schools, Department of Education, Wellington, 1987.

The New Zealand Government, *Ka Awatea: A Report of the Ministerial Planning Group*, The Ministry of Maori Development, 1991.

The New Zealand Government, *Tomorrow's Schools: The Reform of Education Administration in New Zealand*, Government Printer, 1988.

The Treasury, *Government Management*, Brief to the Incoming Government 1987, Volume I, Wellington: Government Printer, 1987.

The Treasury, *Government Management*, Brief to the Incoming Government 1987, Volume II Education Issues, Government Printer: Wellington, 1987, pp1-21.

Wagemaker, Dr Hans, "Maori and Pakeha School Performance: The Challenge for Educational Policy and Research", paper presented at the Comparative and International Society 1987 Conference in Washington D.C.

Wagemaker, H. *Maori-English Bilingual Education: Tauranga Boys' College*, Research Report, Department of Education: Wellington, 1988.

Waitangi Tribunal Report, "Finding of the Waitangi Tribunal Relating to Te Reo Maori and a Claim Lodged by Huirangi Waikerepuru and Nga Kaiwhakapumau i Te Reo Incorporated Society, Wellington, (1985, p.51).

Waiti McPherson, Pauline, "A Maori Person's Viewpoint on the Education of Maori Children and in Particular, Science Education", *SAMEpapers* 1990, Longman Paul: Hamilton.

Waititi, Hoani R. *Te Rangatahi* 1 and 2, Government Printer, Wellington, 1964.

Walker, Ranginui, *Ka Whawhai Tonu Matou: Struggle Without End*, Penguin Books

Wallwork, J.F. *Language and People*, The Chaucer press: Suffolk, 1984.

Warren-Roberts, J., Ryles, G. *Finding Out, A Resource Book For Assessment in English*, The Jacaranda Press, 1991.

Weinreich, V. *Languages in Contact*, The Hague: Mouton, 1953.

Williams, H.W. *A Dictionary of the Maori Language* (7th Edition), Government Printer, Wellington, 1971.

**Massey University Library  
Thesis Copyright Form**

**Title of Thesis:**      **Bilingualism and Bilingual Education: Their Scope,  
Advantages, Disadvantages and the Implications for Maori  
Learners.**

- (1)      I give permission for my thesis to be made available to readers in  
Massey University Library under conditions determined by the  
Librarian.

I do not wish my thesis to be made available to readers without my  
consent for .... months.

- (2)      I agree that my thesis, or a copy, may be sent to another institution  
under conditions determined by the Librarian.

I do not wish my thesis, or a copy, to be sent to another institution  
without my written consent for .... months.

- (3)      I agree that my thesis may be copied for Library use.

I do not wish my thesis to be copied for Library use for ... months.

Signed:

Date:

The copyright of this thesis belongs to the author. Readers must sign their name  
in the space below to show that they recognise this. They are asked to add their  
permanent address.

NAME AND ADDRESS

DATE

**Massey University Library  
Thesis Copyright Form**

**Title of Thesis:**      **Bilingualism and Bilingual Education: Their Scope, Advantages, Disadvantages and the Implications for Maori Learners.**

(1)      I give permission for my thesis to be made available to readers in Massey University Library under conditions determined by the Librarian.

I do not wish my thesis to be made available to readers without my consent for .... months.

(2)      I agree that my thesis, or a copy, may be sent to another institution under conditions determined by the Librarian.

I do not wish my thesis, or a copy, to be sent to another institution without my written consent for .... months.

(3)      I agree that my thesis may be copied for Library use.

I do not wish my thesis to be copied for Library use for ... months.

Signed:

Date:

The copyright of this thesis belongs to the author. Readers must sign their name in the space below to show that they recognise this. They are asked to add their permanent address.

NAME AND ADDRESS

DATE