

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.

A PHILOSOPHICAL EXPLORATION OF SOME UNSTATED
EDUCATIONAL PRESUPPOSITIONS CONCERNING
POLYNESIAN EDUCATION IN NEW ZEALAND.

A thesis presented in partial
fulfilment of the requirements
for the degree of Master of Arts
in Education at Massey University,
Palmerston North.

Paul Eric Whitehead.
1973.

ABSTRACTA PHILOSOPHICAL EXPLORATION OF SOME UNSTATED
EDUCATIONAL PRESUPPOSITIONS CONCERNING
POLYNESIAN EDUCATION IN NEW ZEALAND.

The prime concern in a multi-racial society should be to encourage harmonious race relations in a system which aims at 'equality'. The Education system is one way of achieving this objective. Historically New Zealand educational policy has emphasised assimilation or its later more euphemistic derivative integration. This policy effectively increased the rate of acculturation but only at the expense of Polynesian culture and 'Maoritanga'. Subsequent academic failure, coupled with a steady decline in enthusiasm for formal education has resulted in the Polynesian devaluing education for other more tangible rewards.

Innovation in educational policy aimed at providing the Polynesian with an education which is intrinsically valuable to him, has been slow. This despite the immediate urgency and despite the findings and recommendations of the various Commissions and Committees set up by Government. Specifically, what is needed is the type of innovation which will encourage a greater degree of involvement by both pupil and parent; innovation that will effectively close the gap in attainment level between Polynesian and European.

In examining this problem it becomes obvious that the assumptions which may be widely held, either consciously or partly or wholly unconsciously, concerning education must also be explored so that the various types of innovation can be analysed in terms of their effect in the system and on the community. An examination of these presuppositions is necessary to allow for, and to counteract, possible bias which may interfere

with any recommendations which may ensue. Also, it allows for critical thought and reflection on that assumption so that the universal tendency to make no systematic attempt to explain and justify the principles on which the education system is based can be avoided.

These presuppositions can be found within existing or implemented policies and have largely determined the various policy statements: educational, racial, social, recreational, penal. Any one of these presuppositions, once exposed and found to be an immediate influence, can be examined to determine just what extent they have influenced, or are influencing, the Polynesian educational structure. A variety of alternatives and possible solutions could instead be implemented.

The principle objective then is: to explore these presuppositions and possible alternatives in order that the resultant recommendations might be implemented in an attempt to raise the level of Polynesian under-achievement. The four main steps in this process are:

1. To show that any one educational presupposition 'may' be held or that it is widely held, consciously or unconsciously.
2. To show what effect this presupposition has had, or is having, upon the Polynesian educational system.
3. To examine this effect and to explore the possible variations and solutions of diverse alternative policies.
4. To arrive at and to recommend what action might be taken to alleviate the discrepancies and inequalities that are found to be important determinants of Polynesian under-achievement.

The solutions and recommendations that are advanced in

this thesis have been the result of careful analysis and examination of the unstated presuppositions, the principal factors affecting them and the principles in which they are embedded. These recommendations are not intended to be prescriptive. They are not the only possible recommendations but are perhaps the most appropriate. They are the end product of an inductive logical inquiry utilizing the findings of empirical research where available and appropriate. Some of them have already been implemented since this thesis was begun. However, it is not desirable, nor necessary, to remove them simply because they have been implemented and therefore rendered obsolete. The argumentation for them, in fact, is given greater credence in a world that views philosophical inquiry as merely a priori. These recommendations must be retained to allow for the continuity of argument and the facts which support them.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Throughout the period that this thesis has been written many people have assisted me and in various ways. To these people I wish to tender my sincere thanks and gratitude. In particular, I would like to acknowledge:

Professor C.G.N. Hill, Of Massey University, in the first instance for approving the topic and for willingly offering his assistance and encouragement on every occasion that he was contacted subsequently.

Mr David Stenhouse, my supervisor, for his enthusiasm and the many hours that he willingly made available to read and comment upon the draft material. His enthusiasm and interest in Maori education became obvious from suggestions made whilst I was completing my M.A. papers in 1970. I completed an initial mini-thesis on this topic during that year, and the suggestion was put forward to complete my thesis on the same topic. As a result of David's interest in, and his awareness of, the need for research within the whole spectrum of Polynesian education, a publication examining the critical issues in Polynesian education is soon to be published.

Mr Hugh Templeton, for arranging borrowing rights on the Otago University Library thus saving many hundreds of miles in travelling to and from Dunedin.

Mr F.W. Kidd, of the Otago University Library, for his able assistance in arranging staff borrowing privileges on the Library.

The Massey University Library, for such assistance as it was able to offer.

Elaine Daamen, for the many hours she put in to proof reading the draft material and for her helpful comments.

Judith Drysdale, my typist, for offering to type the stencils at very short notice and over a limited period of time. Also I would like to thank her for the comments and queries she raised at different points during the final typing.

Finally my wife, Loeta, for without whose patience, forbearance and constant motivation during the past two years, this thesis might not have been completed.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page Number</u>
Abstract	ii
Acknowledgements	v
Table of Contents	vii
List of Tables	viii
Chapter 1	
Why Examine the Unstated Presuppositions of an Educational System?	1
Chapter 2	
Definitions and Terminology	17
Chapter 3	
Historical Survey of Policies and Provisions.	21
Chapter 4	
Europeanisation.	36
Chapter 5	
Equality of Educational Opportunity	59
Chapter 6	
For And Against Separate Educational Facilities.	74
Chapter 7	
The English Language Versus The Maori Language.	91
Chapter 8	
The Attitudinal Barrier	108
Chapter 9	
Where Now?	120
Appendices	122
References	124

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1	Pupils in State Primary and Maori Schools 1962-1966.	Page 53
Table 2	Attainments of School Leavers: 1969	Page 62
Table 3	Destination of School Leavers: 1969	Page 63
Table 4 A.	Percentage of State Secondary School Leavers by Years of Attendance 1955-1960.	Page 64
Table 4 B.	Percentage of State Secondary School Leavers by Attainment 1955-1960	Page 64
Table 5	Maori Sixth Formers in Private Schools as a Percentage of all Maori Sixth Formers.	Page 84

APPENDICES

Appendix I	Maori Education: Forms Three and Four Leavers: School Certificate Passes: Teachers' Colleges and University Entrants 1962-1966.	Page 122
Appendix II	Summary of Researchers in Polynesian Education and Some of their Suggested Determinants.	Page 123

CHAPTER 1.WHY EXAMINE THE UNSTATED PRESUPPOSITIONS
OF AN EDUCATIONAL SYSTEM?¹THE IMMEDIATE PROBLEM:

Polynesian education is an area where public concern to have educational equality is present but where the observable progress to that end within the education system is negligible; where much has been written and spoken, but where little of real significance has been implemented; where Polynesian educational maladjustment and underachievement are present and obvious but where improvement and innovation towards alleviating this existing state is rare. On the one hand it is an area important enough to have a National Advisory Committee set up to report and make recommendations, but on the other hand not important enough to have compulsory courses in the methodology of teaching Polynesian children set up at the Teachers' Colleges. Such courses would aid not only the prospective teachers of Polynesian children in understanding and coping with the specific problems of these children, but more importantly they would ensure that all teachers become aware of the problems associated with Polynesian education.

Even though in the past there has been a good deal of Government and Education Department procrastination toward specifically dealing with the problem of Polynesian or Maori under-achievement, the two years since 1969 have seen several advances and innovations designed to alleviate educational inequalities.

A recent "Review of Developments in Maori Education" was published by the Department of Education setting out in summary

¹Clarification of aspects of terminology relating to this chapter and to the remainder of the thesis will follow in chapter 2.

the "important areas of education in which recent development has taken place". For example, one child in four within the three-to-four-year-old age group now attends a recognised play centre or kindergarten. This represents a considerable increase during the last ten years in the numbers attending pre-school institutions. Then again in 1969, four schools with a mainly Polynesian roll (Ahipara, Bethlehem, Raetihi and Pakipaki) had pre-school groups attached to the school to serve children with particular and special needs, where no other facilities were available. This move would appear to be one which could alter the whole concept of pre-school education as it is envisaged in this country at present.

Although the realm of pre-school education has seen a sharp increase in forward thinking and planning, it represents only a small section of the total educational scene. As the Polynesian moves through the educational system, the efforts being made to narrow the gap between educational and vocational proficiency on the one hand, and Polynesian educational and vocational opportunity on the other, have been minimal. Any innovation represents an appeasement, rather than a conscious and deliberate effort to alleviate inequalities and deficiencies. Unfortunately, changes that have thus far been introduced are so remote from current difficulties that they do little more than maintain a continuation of the status quo. The time lag from planning to introduction appears to be the main cause. Indicative of this is the amount of publicity and public support which had to be generated before the Hamilton Teachers' College was given approval to establish a school of Maori Education.

Historically, the many discrepancies that have existed between educational theory on the one hand and educational practice on the other serve to illustrate that unless the educational presuppositions on which the system is based are examined it would be practically impossible to work out the implicit educational ideals which New Zealanders hold. These ideals have always played an important part in the formation of the differing educational structures and therefore, as a consequence, it can be argued are directly responsible for some

of the present educational inequalities between Polynesian and European. As Peters (1967:19) points out, "given that critical thought about the assumptions in which we are nurtured rather goes against the grain, it will only develop if we keep critical company so that a critic is incorporated within our own consciousness. The dialogue within is a reflection of the dialogue without." From what Peters is stating it is clear that if an examination of the assumptions that people hold is to be conducted then some of the conclusions will appear contentious. This is in part because, as Ausubel (1965) maintains, people do not like criticism, particularly when it runs contrary to the general consensus of opinion or belief.

Obviously then, any attempt to examine these underlying assumptions in Polynesian education is from the outset fraught with difficulty. It involves an investigation of what educators and administrators feel and think about education. It involves examining their biases and prejudices and more importantly it involves an examination of the various principles upon which the educational structure is built. Here Peters (1967:18) maintains that "the understanding of principles does not depend upon the accumulation of extra items of knowledge. Rather it requires reflection on what we already know, so that a principle can be found to illuminate the facts. This often involves the postulation of what is unobservable to explain what is observed. So it could never be lighted upon by experience".

In order to reach a critical understanding of the principles of Polynesian education in New Zealand one must examine the unstated assumptions implicit in these principles. As a consequence of this examination the basic educational structure can then be analysed in the light of any new evidence and/or new facts which may have now been exposed. As Stenhouse (1972) points out, "our beliefs decide which facts we regard as relevant to an issue, which facts we notice; so they are in many ways even more important than the facts themselves . . . decisions about future policies in education, as in other fields, cannot be based directly on facts, because the facts which would determine their success or failure are still in the

future . . . they don't yet exist." If this is so then the beliefs that people hold can and do become the basic rationale for innovation. The facts which relate to any particular belief will verify or falsify the innovation only after that innovation has been finally established. The Polynesian education system in New Zealand is no exception. Practices based on earlier beliefs which appeared advantageous or relevant for various reasons at that time, are now disadvantageous or irrelevant.

For this reason the present examination of those unstated educational presuppositions concerning Polynesian education in New Zealand will set out to achieve its basic objectives in three steps:-

1. to come to believe that a presupposition may 'exist', i.e. may be held, either widely, or by a few key administrators and educators, and either consciously or partly or wholly unconsciously:
2. to establish that this presupposition is held substantially if not universally, and is, or has been, influential within the educational system:
3. to show what effect the presupposition has upon the educational system.

The process involved in coming to believe that a presupposition is or may be held is a complex one. Basically, it is to examine our existing attitudes and beliefs and to examine the education system as it is, and as it should be. In so doing, one is looking 'behind' the education system as it were, to the fundamental principles on which it is based. These principles may have come into existence as a result of some careful analysis of the system. Prior to that, they may not have been recognised as basic; or they may have been based on existing knowledge or facts; facts relevant to the issue involved. In this case, the 'issue' can be and often is the presupposition. For the presupposition rests within our

beliefs and ideas about a particular issue. Thus by carefully examining these presuppositions it is possible that one can become more fully aware of the exigencies in the system.

Stenhouse (1972) points out that "perhaps the most important function of the study of Education Philosophy in universities and teachers' colleges" should be "to lead students into a critical appraisal of the assumptions and presuppositions which underlie the procedures of educating". The appraisal of these presuppositions means that one is able to view the system from an entirely different perspective which is not clouded by aspects of the obvious. One can see the important issues because one is now aware of what a particular issue or aspect presupposes. The real and important questions can now be asked and a number of possible solutions explored. Any problems associated with the questions or the solutions may as a result be exposed. This is one manifest difference between empirical research and philosophical research.

It is for example, assumed that empirical research has 'validity' while philosophical research does not. But the term 'validity' in itself is a concept which can lead to confusion. "Had it been introduced by some careful thinker at an appropriate point in the history of the development of the behavioural sciences to denote some well defined concept, the difficulties that have occurred over the past forty years in clarifying its meaning might not have arisen". (Travers, 1964:191) In order to help in clarifying its meaning, 'validity' has been prefixed by certain descriptive terms designed to specify accurately what type of 'validity' is being referred to; such terms as 'predictive validity', 'content validity', 'concurrent validity', and so on. It can be shown that empirically investigated research can have no more 'predictive validity' for example, than reasoned conclusions resulting from logic or Philosophy. This because the empirical researcher must begin his investigation with an assumption that he believes to be either true or false.

In empirical research, one method is for an investigator

to advance an hypothesis which he expects will be the outcome or final result of his research. He then gathers data in the field which after analysis will either support or refute his original hypothesis. Either way the research is still said to be valid. In philosophical research an investigator may for example, examine the unstated presuppositions of that system or those of any part of it. Relevant information may be supplemented from empirical research, statistical data, direct or indirect observation and from any primary source material. In fact all relevant data is usually explored before a logical and reasoned conclusion is reached upon which, as with empirical research, recommendations can be legitimately made.

Surely the important point is that both types of research are valid in today's society. Each can draw upon and aid the other. Without empirical research, philosophical research of any kind would obviously be less useful. Yet empirical researchers are often loath to recognise the importance of philosophical research. They are however, quick to criticise philosophical enquiry which questions the 'validity' of their own research. Should empirical researchers be encouraged to conduct further research as a result of philosophical enquiry instead of criticising its methodology then the prime aim of philosophical research has been achieved: to promote additional research because others have been stimulated to think seriously about the 'real' issues and 'real' questions involved in any particular aspect of a system.²

As a consequence, the discrepancies, the injustices, the superlatives, and the overall effectiveness of the system can now be examined with clarity. These are the reasons why it is of the utmost importance to not only come to believe that a presupposition does exist but also to probe our inner ideas, feelings, inferences, and assumptions until the presupposition on which our very principles rest is exposed and examined.

²A fuller discussion of the relative values of the two types of research can be found in a later Chapter.

As regards the second basic objective, in order to demonstrate that a presupposition does exist, or is widely held and implicitly believed in, it is necessary to prove its existence and influence by logical reasoned argument. This is achieved by exploring in depth the possible solutions to educational questions. The Polynesian education system if it is to be effectively and fairly examined, must be scrutinised in terms of the aspects directly applying to and impinging on both the majority culture (the European) and the minority culture (the Polynesian). This overall scrutiny then, must include not only those who teach and administer, but also the eventual product of that system and the effect of that product on the community in general and on the Polynesian society in particular. If, however, part of the education system is examined, as is the case in this particular study, the same criteria must still apply. The Polynesian system must be examined in the light of the total education system and the total education system in the light of the Polynesian system, or else the argument, instead of being strengthened, might in fact be considerably weakened.

Obviously then the truth or falsity, the existence or non-existence of an education presupposition rests on a thorough examination of that presupposition and the principles on which it is based. If this were not done, it could be legitimately argued that the presupposition had no foundation within the education system.

The fact that a presupposition does have foundation within the educational system is important. The principles on which the presupposition is based have their foundation within certain educational questions pertinent to these principles. If the principles directly relating to the educational presupposition are to be examined then one has also to examine the educational questions. Because as Collingwood (1940:308) argues that the process of exposing, then exploring and finally validating the existence of a presupposition follows a logical pattern as "every statement, every proposition answers a question: but every question in turn rests upon a presupposition without which the question would not arise". These questions it can be

argued have acted as the prime catalysts for the various reports and recommendations that have been promulgated on Polynesian education in recent years. However, the mere advancing and answering of any educational question, although important does not take full cognizance of the educational presupposition on which that question rests.

Of vital importance then in the process of exposing an educational presupposition is the educational question and as far as Polynesian education is concerned, such questions are:-

Why should a pass in an external examination be recognised as the criterion of educational achievement? Why should the Maori language be compulsory only in full Maori Post-Primary Schools? Why is it that the Polynesian has been labelled "culturally deprived"? Why should French be chosen as the appropriate choice for the beginning of a second language in Primary schools? Why should the Polynesian student have to continue to labour under an educational policy and system designed and instituted for the European? Why should the Polynesian student have a limited educational success when compared with that of the European? What is the point of investigating and making recommendations concerning Polynesian education if the consequences of any change proposed in the educational system have not also been thoroughly investigated?

If these questions are a fair representation of the present educational system for the Polynesian and it would appear that they are, then it is imperative that as many solutions as possible be explored and analysed in order that the presupposition on which those questions rest will have greater credence. It is possible as Collingwood suggests, that while these questions and solutions are being analysed an educational presupposition may also be surfaced.

By examining the educational⁸¹ presuppositions it is possible to advance comprehension of order and a clearer understanding of the total educational structure, rather than an elucidation in part. Too often it is assumed that because particular

strengths or weaknesses have been found in one part of the educational system that these findings can be equally or at least generalised to account for other weaknesses inherent in other parts of the system. Empirical investigations may show a correlation between one weakness and another but it is dangerous to assume any form of causal relationship. (Swift, 1967) Other so-called less significant factors can be vitally important when it comes to determining reasons for the relationship. However, once a relationship has been established, it can be explored both empirically and logically in order that the presupposition on which it is based may be surfaced.

(Collingwood, 1961) After this, Peters (1967:18) maintains that critical thought and reflection on the assumption will avoid the universal tendencies of societies to make no systematic attempt to explain and justify the principles relating to the presupposition. Further, he maintains that "the basic requisite is that people should first acquire in some way or other the low level rules or assumptions which the principles illuminate. It is both logically absurd and educationally unsound to suppose that people could attain the necessary understanding of principles without first having acquired quite a lot of knowledge; for principles provide backing to rules or assumptions at a lower level of generality".

Another method that will be used to argue for a particular presupposition will be to investigate an established attitude or principle that is either inherent in or prevalent within the educational system. For example, instruction and communication in English is an educational policy promulgated throughout New Zealand. This policy requires that every teacher, should as far as possible, ensure that the end product of the educational process be that every student, regardless of his indigenous language speak, read and write in English. The official justification for this policy is at this point unimportant.³ What is important is that the policy presupposes that English

³The official justification for this policy will be analysed fully in a later chapter.

is not only the acceptable medium for instruction and communication, but that it is the 'best' or 'right' language for the Polynesian student along with any other minority linguistic group. This may or may not be true. Only after careful and critical examination of all factors and principles that relate to the principle can one accept or reject the basic assumption.

For example some changes have been implemented, it would appear, as a result of political expediency rather than on the merits of that particular change within the system. According to Powell (1955) the official policy concerning the use of the Maori language at school in the 1930's was that it should be banned from the classrooms and the playgrounds. Powell further maintains that this was rigidly enforced in some areas. Public pressure to change this policy was such in the 1930's that the Department of Education seemingly abandoned its policy of enforcing this total abolition of the Maori language; it nevertheless retained English as the official medium of instruction and communication.

Although it can be argued that a principal objective of this thesis should be to advance answers to questions, solutions to problems, and conclusions to arguments any such answers, solutions or conclusions can only be relevant if taken as a consequence of the argument which led to their promulgation. When taken out of context or applied to other facets of the system not only their relevance but the validity of the conclusions is lost. Of greater importance however, is not the validity of the conclusions resulting from the 'philosophical' argument in apposition to 'empirical' investigation but that an educational presupposition has been surfaced and examined. Any empirical investigation must embody and be based upon particular assumptions which the researcher may hold consciously or unconsciously. Unless the researcher is himself aware of the possible effect of these assumptions, and takes the necessary steps to counteract their effect, they can and often do bias the empirical phase of the research. Too often, empirical investigation is conducted without due regard for the vitally important question - Why is the factor they found to exist in the

system a factor at all? Only by examining the educational presupposition relating to that factor can the question be satisfactorily answered. Any solution or recommendation resulting from a study of educational presuppositions is designed not to be prescriptive but rather to sharpen individual awareness of the existing educational structure and its inherent difficulties. One cannot, in advance, say that there is a definite solution or answer. Obviously, in combination, several answers or solutions may provide only one acceptable conclusion and even then the conclusion must still be subject to investigation. As O'Connor (1957) points out philosophical investigation of any kind does not set out to prove, but merely to question the nature of the theories and their explanatory function. But arising from this questioning is a set of alternatives and suggestions that can be used to point to the weaknesses and strengths in present educational policy. As a consequence the effect and implications of present theory on the educational system in general and on the education of the Polynesian in particular is made more explicit. Any proposed educational change can then be legitimately justified if the innovation is to be based not only on empirical investigation but also on an examination of the educational presuppositions embedded in the system.

Any change instituted within the system has or should have as its prime function to make the system in some way better. In fact any concept of reform should also include reference to strengthening and encouraging a sense of responsibility particularly from those responsible for structuring educational change.

The full meaning and sense of this latter statement is of vital importance to Polynesian Education in this country. The effectiveness of any education can be measured in terms of the relative cost of the input against the relative benefit of the output. Any proposed change can be measured objectively and relatively against the effectiveness of the output on and in society. If, as Peters (1967) maintains, being educated involves the transmission of "what is valuable in an

intelligible or voluntary manner, and which creates in the learner a desire to achieve it," then the observable result of this should be clearly manifest in the output. Statistical data and empirical investigation for example, show that the Polynesian student is substantially worse off in academic and vocational attainment on leaving school than his European counterpart. He is, in comparison receiving an inferior education. The education received is inferior, because the 'desire to achieve' by the Polynesian is not being manifested in the output. One has only to examine the school leaving statistics of the Polynesian population to verify this. The New Zealanders' ideal of educational equality and opportunity for European and Polynesian alike, is not being achieved. Properly instituted and relevant change can alleviate many of the more critical problems, so that in time there will be the transmission of 'what is valuable', thus precluding any insinuation that the New Zealand educational system is being unequally applied.

THE PLACE OF EXPLANATION:

Further justification for an examination of educational presuppositions is that explanation of various parts of the system can be provided as a consequence.

Professor Willey, in his book 'The Seventeenth Century Background', cogently examines and summarises some important concepts regarding explanation and its place in Philosophical enquiry. He maintains that "the clarity of an explanation seems to depend on the degree of satisfaction that it affords. An explanation 'explains' best when it meets some need of our nature, some deepseated demand for assurance. 'Explanation' may perhaps be roughly defined as a restatement of something - event, theory, doctrine, - in terms of the current interests or assumptions. All depends upon our presuppositions, which in turn depend upon our training whereby we have come to regard (or feel) one set of terms as ultimate, the other not . . . One cannot therefore define 'explanation' absolutely; one can only say that it is a statement that satisfies the demand of a particular time or place." (O'Connor, 1957:83).

Professor Willey however, makes no effort to distinguish true explanations from false ones. This distinction must be made. The explanation, in order to be valid, must relate the presupposition to be examined, to what is known and not just to what one believes to be true. It is not, as Willey suggests, merely a process of bringing what has to be explained into harmony with our beliefs and presuppositions.

Obviously, if an educational system is based upon faulty premises, the explanation and examination of the presupposition becomes all the more relevant. The explanation provides a sound foundation through which innovation can be properly instituted. The explanation becomes of paramount importance in ascertaining what is to be done, as well as what should and can be done.

In order to provide explanation of an unconscious presupposition one first has to supply an answer to the question: if these presuppositions are unconscious then how can one effectively study them?

In answer to this one must locate and analyse the structural source from which the presupposition was drawn. As Stenhouse (1972) points out, "all our unconscious and therefore most basic assumptions are inherited from the past. We have grown up with them; that is why we assume that they are 'natural' ones. But the very fact that we have grown up with them, absorbed them from the very climate of our first breaths of education, indicates that they must derive from earlier times. This means that they may be appropriate for the present; and it makes it likely, indeed almost certain, that at least some of them will be definitely inappropriate for the future.

Although it is obviously difficult to surface these unconscious presuppositions to full consciousness the task is made considerably easier if the method for arguing for a presupposition outlined earlier is followed. Once a presupposition is known to exist it can be justified and substantiated from analysing evidence derived from the literature

and from research data available, as well as from the examination of the system itself.

As the existence of the presupposition could still be questioned it remains to examine the source of that question. For example, educational authorities usually attempt to justify the existing policy by referring to statistical data with minor variations, that apparently suggest improvement over a given period. Obviously, it is in their own interest to do so even though statistics, unless related to some standard or norm, can be entirely misleading. No one likes criticism. Yet it is from constructive criticism that one grows and learns. Constructive criticism is at the heart of sound educational practice. But, if after arguing for any one presupposition it can still be challenged then it has served its prime function: to bring into full consciousness that which was previously unconscious.

One cannot set out all the beliefs, data and factual information pertinent to any one presupposition. Rather it is possible through the process of deduction, analysis, and investigation to arrive at a suggested conclusion or prescription related to the investigation of that presupposition. It must be remembered that the process of deduction in this sense is limited because, "much of our relevant understanding is not expressible in literal terms but depends on metaphor, analogy and paradox. Deductive arguments using, or rather misusing, such statements are quite valueless even when they make sense . . . Many of the terms in which we express the knowledge and beliefs that are vital for educational issues are not exact and precise but vague and ill-defined". (Hirst, 1966:35) The process that is ultimately employed in arriving at the various conclusions is more complex. Generally it is divorced from the formal manipulations of the educational presuppositions and the facts and reasons for their existence, and is embedded in a form of judgement based on as comprehensive a view of the issues as it is possible to obtain.

Philosophical investigation has shown that by systematically examining each issue in this way, a clearer under-

standing of the principles and concepts relevant to the presupposition will be gained. Yet, even after all the relevant literature and research data relating to an issue has been examined, it is quite conceivable that the actual extent to which these presuppositions are held may still be challenged. This is to be expected. But as Stenhouse points out, it is quite clear in the final analysis that "while a certain amount of argument may be possible over the extent to which these assumptions are really held, a few moments thought about what actually happens in our education system, as distinct from what is stated about it, reveals that there is considerable evidence to support an examination and explanation of educational presuppositions", (Stenhouse, 1970:1)

SUMMATION:

Of vital importance is the point that, if the presuppositions pertaining to the Polynesian Education system are to be examined, many questions must be asked and possible answers examined. That there may appear to be no one definite answer or solution to any question or problem connected with education is also important. The education system is much too complex in nature and function for any researcher to categorically state in advance that there can be a definite solution. Rather it is much more likely that a range of possible answers or solutions should be advanced merely as suggestions for further investigation and research if necessary.

This thesis will seek to examine some of the deficiencies and inadequacies of an educational system which was designed principally for the European and was modified and altered only slightly to meet some of the needs and requirements of the Maori. Paradoxically present policy would seem to indicate that one could expect little modification or adjustment to the educational structure as it is envisaged at present. Rather present policy presupposes that the Polynesian student himself must make the adjustment within the existing educational structure. Could not a possible solution be adjustment and adaptation from both sectors; the system itself, and from the community in general; both European and Maori?

This chapter has attempted to show that an issue such as this could be clarified by an examination of the presuppositions involved in the formulation of policy. Such an examination, would set out to elucidate, investigate and finally view all the issues surrounding and underlying the presupposition. That is of course only after that presupposition has been shown to exist or that it is widely held by people in influential positions able to bring about change within the system. This then would, by implication and by explicit study, directly or indirectly involve these people in the examination. As a consequence, many of the latent and often prejudicial attitudes of those directly concerned with administrating and educating may also be surfaced and examined in the light of the system and its policy.

It is therefore necessary, to examine not only the presuppositions but also the system itself in the context of these presuppositions. Awareness of the existence of the presuppositions is essential for a full awareness and understanding of the effectiveness in areas requiring careful scrutiny within the educational structure. Change and innovation can well be the end product of such an examination; in fact it is hoped that this would be the overall result.

CHAPTER 2.

DEFINITIONS AND TERMINOLOGY.

A PRESUPPOSITION

According to the Shorter Oxford Dictionary a presupposition is "antecedent to knowledge", it is a notion or idea assumed as a basis for argument; a preliminary assumption". Peters (1966:114) however, takes this clarification a step further by arguing that a presupposition is in addition, a "form of justification of principles consisting in probing behind them in order to make explicit what they implicitly presuppose". This process of 'probing' and examining the principles is of paramount importance in demonstrating that there is an educational presupposition on which the principle being examined is based. Once a presupposition has been established it must be shown to exist or at least to be widely held. If it were not shown to exist then the recommendations and conclusions that are promulgated as a result of such investigation would be of little value. The vital link therefore, in the formation of reasoned, logical arguments is the establishing of the unstated presupposition. If there were no presuppositions governing our actions then there would be no real meaning in life for the principles and values which underlie those actions and our thinking on any particular topic would be entirely intuitive.

POLYNESIAN

The term 'Polynesian' as used in this thesis will encompass all ethnic and racial groups of Polynesian descent and in addition the few Melanesians and Micronesians who attend educational establishments in New Zealand. The other Pacific Island ethnic groups have been included because the problems and educational difficulties which they encounter have much in common with those of the Polynesian and of the Maori. Much of

this thesis will be particularly concerned with Maori education and the term 'Maori education' will be virtually synonymous with 'Polynesian education', except when otherwise stated. The reason is that much of the available research and statistical data on Polynesian education has been conducted and collated using the Maori ethnic groups as exemplifying the problems of other similar ethnic minority groups. This appears to be standard research practice. For example, Goldberg, (1963:4) in an article on the factors affecting educational attainment in depressed areas, focuses attention on the similarity of the problems which face ethnic minority groups in urban areas and concludes that "although the city schools have, historically, worked to integrate the newcomers into the broader culture, the combination of circumstances confronting education today are sufficiently different from those met in the past, and so much more urgent that schools must reappraise their present concepts and procedures and expose to investigation some long held assumptions".

At the same time I am fully aware of the counter argument that could arise from subsuming within the one classification of 'Polynesian' both the Maori, whose home has been New Zealand for centuries and the 'Island' Polynesian who has only recently emigrated. The degree of acculturation will obviously differ. Acculturation will differ not only between Maori and Island Polynesian but also within the same ethnic group. The degree of acculturation is on a continuum. As a consequence, it is possible that a rural New Zealand Maori could be no less acculturated than a newly emigrated Island Polynesian. Therefore any educational disadvantage which may accrue from the degree of acculturation between Island Polynesian and Maori is presumably nullified as a result of intra-group difference. Because intra-group differences exist, the examination of the unstated educational presupposition would apply equally to both the Island Polynesian and the Maori student.

HISTORICAL SURVEY

In addition to the philosophical investigation of the educational presuppositions it was intended to include a

section in this thesis reviewing the progress accomplished since the earliest mission schools in New Zealand to the current Polynesian education policy. However, three theses have already been compiled in this field: T.H. Beaglehole's "Maori Schools, 1816-1880"; J.M. Barrington's "Maori Education and Society 1867-1960"; and P.O.K. Ramsay's "Historical Survey of Maori Education 1940-1965". Hence, this thesis will include an historical overview only, and then only of those aspects of policy, progress and provision that are relevant to an understanding of the present New Zealand policy concerning Polynesian education. The historical overview will then provide the framework for an examination of the unstated presuppositions in later chapters. Additional background information can be found not only in the aforementioned theses but also in a forthcoming publication edited by Bray and Hill and another edited by Stenhouse, et al., provisionally entitled 'Critical Issues in Polynesian Education in New Zealand'. The aim of this latter publication is to focus attention on certain important issues which have hitherto been overlooked or merely glossed over by other recent publications dealing with New Zealand education or with aspects of Maori education.

The spate of literature on Maori and Polynesian education appearing particularly during the last three years has had the effect of not only increasing public awareness of inconsistencies that have been in existence since education was declared 'free, secular and compulsory', but also of increasing the rate of change and innovation within this area of the educational system. Although on the one hand, it is obvious that Polynesian education is in a state of flux, on the other hand there is a dearth of relevant educational literature that probes a little deeper than a superficial examination of the proposals and policies relevant to it. To the knowledge of the writer of this thesis there has been only one investigation conducted on Polynesian education for a philosophy department. This investigation was presented as a Masterate thesis in 1932 by P.G. Ball and was entitled "Education of the Maori". Unfortunately efforts to obtain this thesis to date have been unsuccessful. This thesis will not aim simply to review the

proposals, policies, and provisions nor to structure a mere compilation of them, but rather it will examine these policies and provisions so that the unstated presuppositions will become evident. The weaknesses and strengths in the system will become clearer, and any future proposals or recommendations should as a consequence be more soundly and logically based.

EDUCATION

The term 'education' in this thesis will entail the whole spectrum of learning from birth to death and not just the education offered as part of the compulsory state system during the formative years from five to fifteen. This will, of course, be the principal concern but does not preclude a study of the years outside this range. Education is a continuing process and for clarification has three basic referents. Firstly, it can refer to a set of techniques which imparts skills and attitudes necessary for successful participation in society. Secondly, it can refer to a set of values or ideals embodied and expressed in the purposes for which the skills and attitudes are imparted. Thirdly, it enables education to direct the amount and often the type of teaching that is imparted. In any society the educational system, is an elaborate social mechanism designed to bring about certain skills and attitudes that are judged at that point to be desirable. Any philosophical inquiry which examines the educational system of a country must include within it a family of philosophical presuppositions linked together by their relevance to contemporary educational issues and by their own philosophical character. For this reason these unstated philosophical presuppositions will focus attention on those aspects of the system which have for too long been considered as a necessary and often indispensable part of the Polynesian educational machinery.

CHAPTER 3.

HISTORICAL SURVEY OF POLICIES
AND PROVISIONS.

THE EARLY MISSION PERIOD 1814-1847.

The first school in New Zealand was the direct result of the efforts of Marsden, Hall and Kendall. It was opened in August of 1816 with a total Maori roll of thirty-three pupils. Their ages ranged from seven to twenty. By 1817 the school remained open seven days a week and had increased its roll to seventy pupils. All instruction in this and subsequent Mission schools was in the vernacular and there was a strong desire to read and write on the part of the Maori. Brown (1845) recounts what an early trader said, "if one native in a tribe can read and write, he will not be long in teaching the others. The desire to obtain this information engrosses their whole thoughts, and they continue for days with their slates in their hands".

These early 'Native Schools', from all accounts, (Parr, 1963; Barrington, 1966) were particularly successful: firstly, in motivating the Maori to read and write and secondly in introducing and converting the Maori to Christianity. By 1843, however, enthusiasm and attendance at the schools were beginning to decline. Bishop Selwyn, (1843) noted "a general complaint in all parts of the country, the schools are not so well attended as heretofore"¹ The reasons for this decline in educational interest were varied:

1. The upsurge of Maori nationalism precipitated by Heke's war; (Barrington, 1966).

¹Henry Williams letters: 67, 15/6/1843. "Confidential" (Auckland Institute and Museum Library).

2. The difficulty of collecting and of keeping Maori children at school when collected.
3. The inefficiency and lack of training of many teachers. (Baker, 1854)² This problem was to be evident well into the 1880's.
4. The inability of many Maoris to obtain the necessary European clothing to be worn during school hours (Parr, 1963).

Even worse, was the fact that the Maoris were losing interest in schooling. Mission teachings no longer had the same impact. The example set by the increasing arrivals of European settlers who paid only lip service to Christianity served to depreciate the value of Christian ethics for the Maori still further. Thus it was obvious that Selwyn (1847) should observe the development of "a growing indifference to religion, and a neglect of the opportunities of instruction, which the natives had formerly prized so highly".

In an attempt to check the Maori apathy to education, Governor Grey evolved the Education Ordinance of 1847. Basically the Ordinance aimed at establishing boarding schools, instead of the then day schools for which subsidies would be paid. These schools were to remain in the control of the Missions but instruction was now to be in English as well as in the vernacular. (1847 Education Ordinance). The Government's policy remained the same as it had been in 1844: to "speedily assimilate the Maori to the habits and usages of the European". (1844 Native Trust Ordinance). Grey's Ordinance marked the beginning of a policy that was aimed at Europeanising the Maori and counteracted missionary efforts to retain and make full use

²C. Baker, Letters and Journals (Auckland Institute and Museum Library).

of Maoritanga' in the curriculum.³ His policy was "the result, not the cause, of the missionaries' change of front . . . missionaries resident in New Zealand who, preferring to instruct in Maori, always refused to teach English to the Maoris". (Parr, 1963:214). The reasons for the missionaries preferring to instruct in Maori were varied. Three principal reasons were:

1. the 'contamination argument' which was that instruction in English would lead to the Maori peoples associating and communicating with Europeans of bad character; (Parr 1963)
2. that the teaching of English would be a slow process taking not months but years. While Buddle, (1846) was convinced that "only a few of the most intelligent are likely to ever read and speak it with accuracy and intelligence";⁴
3. that the Maoris themselves were not interested in learning English. Not only was it extremely difficult to master but it was of little practical value to them. (Parr, 1963:215).

Although the missionaries continued to block efforts to introduce English as the medium of instruction and communication for the Maori, they were eventually compelled to succumb. The subsequent effects on Maori education at this time were therefore not surprising. There was a continuing and steady decline in the numbers attending schools and by 1860 "most Maoris had acquired only a commercial pidgin English" (Parr, 1963:218).

³Note the similarity of Grey's policy with that of Commissions' (1961) summation of future policy almost 120 years later. "The Maori child must be equipped to take his place on terms of equality as a New Zealand citizen but, in addition the dignity and pride of race which are his heritage, must be safeguarded to him".

⁴T. Buddle, School Report, Wesleyan Native Institution, 1846.

THE MISSION SCHOOL DECLINE 1847-1867

By 1847 Henry Williams in commenting on the Maori's lack of enthusiasm for education failed to believe that "in any other country such reluctance is shown as by the Aborigines to the schools".⁵ Three years later many young Maoris refused to attend school (unlike their fathers) and did not want to become literate in English or Maori. By 1853, some educational authorities went so far as to offer free board and lodging but by now the Maori parents cared even less than their children for education. Parr, (1963:221) questions, "What had happened? Where were the self-appointed teachers, the hundred mile journeys to obtain books and instruction, the eager learners of letters, the crowded day schools of only a dozen years before?"

The reasons for the decline of the Mission schools were similar to those that led to the apathy of the Maori in regard to education in the early 1840's. Once this decline had become obvious it was merely a continuation. The novelty of having an education had worn off; apathy and loss of interest were evident; and Maori nationalism continued to gain strength and support. In addition the boom in agricultural prices occasioned by the Victorian gold rushes had the effect of diverting the attention of the Maori from learning to economic considerations. However, even when the boom collapsed in 1856 there was little interest shown in education. The younger Maoris still avoided the Mission day schools partly because of their relative inefficiency and partly because the teachers lacked real enthusiasm and purpose. The training and remuneration offered to attract teachers were almost non-existent. Payment of the teachers depended largely on the money received from the Maori parents. This too was virtually non-existent. (Parr, 1963). As a consequence the standard of the teaching profession was low, as was the quality of the teacher. Baker, (1854) writes "the teachers do not come up to what is required of them: they make no advance in learning, hence some of the young men are more than a match for them and despise them on account of their

⁵Henry Williams Letters 1847. Auckland Institute & Museum Library Zeroxed).

ignorance". (Parr, 1963).

The Mission schools, particularly the day schools, had failed to motivate the Maori sufficiently to appreciate school attendance even though they may have succeeded in spreading the virtue of Christianity. The missionaries had been unable to recognise that the assimilation of foreign ideals and values by an indigenous culture seldom progresses at a uniform rate. Acculturation is a slow but continuing process. Its process can be slowed even further if the indigenous culture deliberately opposes further acculturation. Lovegrove, (1963:267) adds "immediate goals turned out to be distant and results were often intangible rather than clearly defined".

The central boarding schools, although in essence the Missions' solution to the decay of the day school, did not achieve a great deal more as far as increasing the proportion of those receiving educational instruction from those who did not. The intention of the central schools was to have a nucleus of trained teachers leaving them to return to and revitalise the day schools. This aim was never fully realised because the whole concept of separating parent from child was contrary to Maori custom and tradition. In addition it was expected that the pupil should as part of his practical instruction, give manual labour to assist in the everyday running of the school. This too met with opposition from the Maori parents. The result was that although the number of boarding schools had increased since 1852 the numbers attending in 1858 were no more than they were in 1852. This number was estimated for both periods at between 700 and 800. (Parr, 1963).

In a final attempt to halt the educational decline the Native Schools Act of 1858 was passed. The Act provided financial support in the form of land and money distributed on the basis of the average number of pupils efficiently instructed. The official policy remained unchanged: "assimilation of the Maoris into the Pakeha civilisation". For a short period after 1858 the education scheme appeared to work satisfactorily but by 1862 it was apparent that the system

of native education had failed. Carleton, in a report of April, 1862⁶ wrote "it is evident that education is exceptional, that it does not reach the masses . . . the fault must be in the system". Spragg, (1942) concluded that while the Maori well-wishers advocated the education of the Maori to combat rapid deterioration in the Maori character, the Maori land league and the King Movement were methods chosen by the Maori to stay this decline in 'mana' by segregation from European encroachment".

THE BEGINNINGS OF GOVERNMENT CONTROL 1867-1879

It was not until 1867 after much of the Maori-European conflict had ended that Donald McLean the then Minister of Native Affairs, proposed and had passed the Native Schools Act. The principal objective was to institute a national system of secular village day schools, controlled and administered by the Department of Native Affairs. These were ultimately to replace the government-aided denominational boarding schools. All schools were subject to government inspection and instruction was to be in English. An inspector of schools in 1862 sums up government policy when he stated that "the native language was another obstacle in the way of civilisation" (Parr, 1963:231). Here, perhaps, was the first major move to establish English as the official medium of instruction. The policy of assimilation was to continue.

An integral part of the plan which was to prove the major 'stumbling block' to the Act was that the Maori people were to make equal contributions of money and land as the condition of their receiving government assistance. The Act stated that schools would only be built on the condition that the Maoris wrote to the Colonial Secretary requesting a school for their area. Further they were required to guarantee the provision, on their own account, of 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 the school site. As a consequence, by 1871 Parr, (1963:230) points out that "only

⁶Carleton, 1862 quoted in Spragg, H.W., M.A. Thesis, 1942.

thirteen Government day schools containing 219 scholars existed".

An attempt to alleviate this problem was taken by McLean in 1871 when he had the Act amended to allow the poorer Maori communities to have schools built without having to make financial contributions. As a result, there was a significant increase in the number of Maori communities requesting schools so that by 1874 there were at least 38 day schools with 1,167 pupils. However, there were other factors which continued to impede the progress of establishing schools in some areas. Barrington (1966:3) points out that some of these were: the persistence of attitudes of hostility or apathy towards European influences with the Government's failure to establish schools in the Waikato in 1872 being a reflection of this latent hostility. That in many areas the Maori's habit of following seasonal labour seriously affected their children's school attendance. Finally, that the progress of the Maori schools was also affected by the unsatisfactory conditions under which many of them managed to function; and the remoteness of Maori communities. Despite these difficulties Maori schools continued to be built so that by 1880 there were 57 Maori schools with a total enrolment of 1625 children.

Two assumptions that Barrington (1966:4) makes from these statistics are that they indicate "clearly the Government's determination to provide for the education of the Maori children and also, significantly, that the Maoris were not so determined to 'withdraw' from European influence". Clearly Barrington bases his assumptions on the hypothesis that because he can show that there was an increase in the number of Maori schools to 57 he can presuppose that the Government was committed to Maori education and that the Maoris desired education. Since statistics cannot be used in this way the argument is obviously invalid and the assumption is therefore false.

One cannot assume that an increase in the number of schools, particularly under the policy that was in existence at that time, is proof of Government education commitment. As Smyth, (1931:234)

points out, "there was no recognition of Maori mentality. A superior code of morality was imposed without the slightest effort to study the mental effect. The European has but to compare his own history records from 950 A.D. to 1450 A.D. with the same period in Maori tradition to discover that the Maori mentality had fine qualities equal to the European". Furthermore, the upsurge in interest for education at this time was probably due not so much to any 'government determination' to increase the number of schools as to general Maori curiosity in European ideas and standards which they believed could be satisfied by receiving a European education. "Once the schools were definitely established the authorities responsible seemed to be obsessed with the idea of Europeanising the Maori regardless of his pride of race or anything connected therewith. The Maori was expected to throw off everything Maori, and to agree passively to be impelled into a totally new environment with a new speech". (Smyth, 1931:235).

The Education Act of 1877 made education 'free, compulsory and secular'. The spirit of the Act was democratic. The right to control and establish primary schools was vested in the people; through school committees and Education Boards. But the Maori schools had been excluded from the Act. It seems that two main reasons were advanced:

it was thought that the education of the Maori people would need special care and attention if they were to compete on anything like equal terms with Europeans, and secondly, . . . that, owing to language difficulties and to isolation, the Maori people were not yet ready to assume the responsibilities that the Act gave to the local communities. Thus was established at the very beginning of our national system a separate administration for Maori schools. (Halvor Holst, 1958:54).

From 1879 on the Department of Education controlled Maori schools while Education Boards controlled the public schools. Both authorities had the power to establish schools but there appeared to be no fixed policy that decided whether a school with a predominantly Maori roll would be a Board school or one administered by the Department.

EUROPEAN ETHNOCENTRICISM 1879-1930

The move in 1879 to transfer the Maori schools to the Department of Education from the Department of Native Affairs heralded what was in reality a dual system of education which was to remain until 1969. Once the Department took control its first task was to draw up a Code for Native schools which was completed in 1881. English was to be the only language used in the schools. The staffing of these schools was, it was hoped to be solved by employing married couples. The husband was to be the teacher, his wife the sewing mistress. But a separate and lower salary scale was drawn up which did nothing to attract the trained teachers. The result was that these schools were staffed largely by untrained, uncertificated and unqualified teachers. Halvor Holst, (1958:55) concludes by stating that "although the schools catered almost entirely for Maoris, no thought was given to the benefit that a knowledge of their own culture would bring to the children. The Maori race was dying and the sooner the survivors were equipped as Europeans the better". Furthermore, he adds that "although it was recognised that the Maori children had special needs, no attempt was made to give specialised training to teachers wishing to work in this field."

The Syllabus made English compulsory and that it was to be the sole language used in schools. In some schools the speaking of English was enforced to the extent that the speaking of Maori within the precincts of the school was forbidden and became a rigidly enforced ban. (Powell, 1955:263). There was, however, an emphasis in the code which was designed to bring about extending the school's activities to bring the whole life of the Maori community within its sphere of influence. (Native School Code 1880).

As a result, the importance of practical education was seen as a means of achieving unity of school and community. Many Maori schools therefore included in the curriculum in the 1880's agricultural, technical and health instruction. The schools were often used to distribute new crops and to demonstrate improved agricultural techniques. Under the

direction of James Pope, the first organising-inspector of Maori schools, woodwork and other craft activities were introduced in the schools. By 1900 it was estimated that as a result of co-operation between Maori parents and teachers fourteen workshops had been attached to Maori schools.

In order that the Maori schools might achieve a measure of co-operation with the Maori community, all teachers under the influence of Pope were required to know Williams' "First Lessons in Maori" and to be able to translate a passage from the Maori Bible. In addition they were to have some knowledge of Maori traditions and customs. (1880 Code: 3). However, the effect of these stipulations on the education of the Maori and the community appears to have been minimal. A gradual hardening of Pope's liberal policy became evident. William Bird, Pope's successor, commended those teachers who had ceased to use the Maori language in their classes and suggested that they encourage the Maori children to "speak English only in the playground". (A. to J., E-2, 1906:4).

Many difficulties continued to militate against the efficient running of the Maori schools.⁷ By 1906 out of the total Maori Schools' roll of 4183 pupils only 29 were able to pass the proficiency examination, the majority of whom were Pakeha children attending the Maori schools. (Barrington, 1966:6). To pass this examination, competency in the use and grammatical aspects of the English language were required. The enforcing of English as the medium of communication and instruction in Maori schools had serious limitations and implications.

The policy of assimilation was proving to be more difficult and was taking longer than was originally anticipated by the Department. Barrington, (1966:5) maintains that "the slowness of the educational progress and unsatisfactory health

⁷In general a continuation of the earlier problems plus remoteness of schools and the distance of pupils from them.

standards in Maori communities inspired the formation at Te Aute, in 1897, of the Association for the Amelioration of the Maori Race". Apirana Ngata and Peter Buck strongly emphasised the value of an academic education for the Maori so that he would be better equipped to find employment in the professions and in the civil service. Pomare's influence in reinforcing the idea of the 'practical' rather than the 'academic' was to have the greatest effect on Maori education from around 1900 to 1930. This type of thinking led to the curtailment of academic subjects at Te Aute in 1908 and the emphasis being placed on practical subjects such as agriculture. (Barrington, 1966:7).

The official policy for the secondary schools in particular could be summed up by the following statement made in 1909 by William Bird: "It will be of greater use to the Maori boy to know the principles and practices of agriculture, the elements of dairy farming, wool classing and the management of stock, than the declension of Latin nouns and verbs", (A. to J., E-3, 1909:9). Although Te Aute College placed emphasis on an agriculturally based course, Earnest Loten, (a Headmaster of Te Aute College in the 1920's) states that "after ten years' experience with the secondary education of the Maori boy, I say without hesitation that when tactfully handled and efficiently taught he is as intelligent, enthusiastic, and as eager to learn as the European boy".

PRACTICAL EDUCATION 1930-1950

The educational policy of the 1930's further entrenched the emphasis of the 1920's on agriculture by its virtual acceptance within the state school system. Educationalists and administrators believed that Polynesian children should receive an education which would enable them to actively participate and understand the rural life. During 1932 the then Senior Inspector of Maori Schools, in his official report, stated: "agriculture is assuming a position of some importance in the curriculum of the native schools not only for its intrinsic values, but also for the opportunity it affords to

draw school and community closer together". (E.3, 1932:4).⁸ The effect of this policy on the educational advancement of the Polynesian was twofold: firstly, the academic type education so necessary to equip the Polynesian better for life in the urban centres was lacking; secondly, because of the tendency for the Polynesian family to be larger than that of the European family, the emphasis on an agricultural education tended to help keep the Polynesian in the lower socio-economic group. His general standard of living and his home environment were, therefore, both at a lower level than that of the European. (Recent surveys suggest that there has been little improvement of the situation).⁹ The depression of the 1930's further aggravated the position so that the Polynesian student was often forced to leave school because the cost of education to the family could not be justified in terms of the financial assistance that could accrue from even part-time employment of that student. For example, in 1930 out of 17,880 children of school age between five and fifteen only 14,912 were attending school. (Hunn, 1960:23). Obviously these figures do not accurately reflect school leaving as such, but they do serve to illustrate that a large number of Maori children were unable or unwilling to attend school.

Another noticeable trend becoming evident during this period was the increasing percentage of Maori pupils who were being educated in Public schools. The percentage attending

⁸The quote from the Appendices to the Journals of the House of Representatives was cited in the M.A. Thesis of P.D.K. Ramsay. Because Ramsay reviewed this valuable source of primary material so thoroughly little purpose would be served by re-searching these documents. Although designated in their official form I acknowledge Ramsay's work in this respect.

⁹A recent survey of disadvantaged children in the Waikato, King Country and Thames Valley areas conducted in November 1971 by the Waikato Branch of the P.P.T.A. found that disadvantage and low socio-economic factors were highly significant in low academic attainment of the Polynesian children. (Journal P.P.T.A. March 1972:27-29).

Public schools had increased from 57 per cent in 1930 to 71 per cent by 1958. This trend was to continue until the abolition of the 'Maori schools' in 1969.

A feature of Maori Education of the 1930's was that there were limited opportunities for Maori children to advance to secondary and higher education. In 1931, for example, the National Adjustment Expenditure Commission recommended the abolition of all scholarships for Maori pupils to the denominational colleges. This recommendation, although not entirely instituted, did have the effect of reducing the number of two year scholarships from 179 to 136 and third year scholarships were discontinued altogether. This policy could be considered insignificant, owing to the fact that the statistics applied only to denominational colleges. Even so, few Maori students were able to avail themselves of the free 'place' secondary education, because of the absence of any secondary school in the main areas of Maori concentration.

From 1941, however, facilities for secondary education were available for the first time to predominantly rural Maori communities. First on the East Coast and then later to other areas, the Maori District High Schools were opened. In 1942, two-thirds of all eligible European children received at least one year of post primary education, compared with only one-third of all eligible Maori children. As the transportation and communication network improved, more and more isolated Maori communities were able to avail themselves of the secondary education offered. By 1956, 85 per cent of Maori primary leavers continued their education in the secondary schools. (Holst, 1958:57). It was noticeable, however, that the secondary education of these new schools was in fact a continuation of the policy of the 1920's and 1930's.

The core of the curriculum (of the new school) will be homemaking; homemaking in the widest sense, including construction, furniture making, metalwork and home gardening for the boys and home management for the girls. The aim is to teach the skills and develop the tastes that make the house not merely a place of habitation but a home in the best sense of the word. It was emphasised that education of a practical nature only (would) be provided in the school". (A. to J., E-3, 1948).

Although the home-making practical education was of value to some of the less academic Maori, there is little doubt that this type of curriculum was one of the major factors "mitigating against the upward vocational mobility of the Maori sectors of the population. The preoccupation of policy makers and teachers with things manual prevented the full realisation of Maori academic ability". (Ramsay, 1969:80).

THE ERA OF REPORTS 1950-1970

From 1950 real progress toward alleviating the educational difference between the Polynesian and the European began to manifest itself. At least an effort was being made. At times it was evident that there was a genuine interest in, and concern for, the Polynesian student and his difficulties. However, the low academic achievement and the problem in staffing the rural high schools still continued to depress conscious efforts to encourage the Maori child to stay at school. Yet by 1960, over 90 per cent of all Maori school leavers were receiving some form of secondary education. The mere fact that a greater number of Polynesian students were being educated beyond the primary school level did little to alleviate the educational inequalities. The Polynesian had made significant inroads into secondary education but the educational gap between the Polynesian and the European was widening. Whereas the Polynesian was remaining at school long enough to receive some secondary education, the average European was staying at school long enough to complete the fifth form year. In addition, the trend towards university education, so evident today, was beginning to manifest itself particularly in the late 1950's.

In 1955, in an endeavour to find a solution to the problem of the educational deficiency of the Polynesian the then Minister of Education set up a Committee to investigate how the needs of the Maori children could best be met. Its findings were predictable in some areas, but in other areas its findings were far reaching if not searching. For example, it recommended that everything possible should be carried out to

'improve' and 'spread' the teaching of the Maori language.¹⁰
The setting up of this Committee heralded what could be called an 'Era of Reports'.

These Reports and their recommendations are of major importance to this thesis. In particular, they will be analysed and synthesised in the light of the education system at that time, and as it is today. Therefore, because it could be repetitive, little purpose would be served by continuing the historical survey beyond 1955.

In addition the various Reports tend to summarise implicitly, if not explicitly, the various policies and provisions at that time. Although this thesis does not limit itself to this period entirely, the major emphasis will be centred on it. It will not then, be necessary to continue this survey into the period from 1955-1970 but rather to incorporate the points which are relevant to the presuppositions being discussed in the body of the thesis.¹¹

¹⁰A recommendation which was not implemented to any significant extent until 1971, some 16 years later.

¹¹For a review of this period from 1950-1968 refer to P.D.K. Ramsay; Planning, Policy and Practice in Maori Education 1936-1968.

CHAPTER 4.EUROPEANISATION

BASIC PRESUPPOSITION NO.1. THAT THE EUROPEAN IDEALS, CONCEPTS AND GENERAL LIFE STYLE ARE NOT ONLY NECESSARY IN EDUCATION POLICY BUT ARE DESIRABLE TO ENSURE THAT POLYNESIAN ACCULTURATION CONTINUES.

In the history of Maori contact with the European the Maori has undoubtedly yielded, borrowed, and changed in the direction of the European pattern of life. Maori assimilation and acculturation has been continuing steadily as a matter of official policy rather than by individual or Polynesian community choice. The assumption that the Maori people should be converted into Europeans and to totally absorb all aspects of European life style as rapidly as possible has been fundamental to Maori-European relations and a basic aspect in European-Maori policy since 1840.

An attempt will be made in this chapter to show:

1. that this assumption has been outlined in various ways and in various policy statements since 1840 but that the degree to which it has been enforced and applied has changed only slightly since the 1844 Native Trust Ordinance;
2. that merely changing the name from, for example, assimilation to integration, does not alter the underlying policy of 'Europeanisation';
3. that the policy of 'Europeanisation' has been one of the main contributing factors in Polynesian underachievement;
4. that this policy has falsely assumed that

harmonious race relations and educational equality can best be attained through its adoption.

ASSIMILATION-ABSORPTION-INTEGRATION

The first major policy statement of any significance relating particularly to Maori assimilation was that laid down by the Native Trust Ordinance of 1844. This, in essence, stated that the educational welfare of the Maori people "may best be attained by assimilating as speedily as possible the habits and usages of the native to those of the European population". Geddes, (1961) asserted that this policy, as it was then conceived was unsound, because it falsely assumed that the assimilation of the Maori people to a European way of life required the destruction of specific Maori consciousness, and the destruction of the group consciousness through which Maori identity was inculcated. Furthermore, it grossly underestimated the capital resources needed to meet the problems of occupational training, housing and efficient farming.

If the effects of the assimilation policy had been studied more assiduously then the conclusion that this involved no more than 'Maori detribalisation' as conceived by Piddington, (1968:257) would have been self evident. This policy Piddington argues is not the only method that could have been employed to fit the Maori people to a European way of life. The Maori life style did not have to be subordinated to the European. Piddington points out that the effects of such policies on primitive peoples commonly involved "marked conflicts and tensions within the community, the disintegration of indigenous authority, the weakening of traditional sanctions for morality and the breakdown of tribal institutions generally".

The early missionaries, in adopting their policy of conversion to Christianity, probably had a similar long term effect. The essential difference is that the Maori culture was consciously preserved particularly as all instruction was in the vernacular. No effort was made except as it contravened Christian ethics, to break down their tribal system and then, this, only in part. (Beaglehole, 1955).

Historically, culture contact with other societies by a dominant or more powerful society has shown that deleterious effects educationally, vocationally and in terms of detribalisation have taken place. Explicitly or implicitly these processes of 'Europeanisation' have been assumed to be universal, pervasive and more importantly necessary features of culture contact. Such an assumption, according to Piddington, (1968:257) "ignores the highly variable character of culture contact situations and the possibility that the direction of change in such situations may not always or even usually, be unilinear".

Too little concentrated thought was applied to the consequences of such policies. An awareness of the fact that the indigenous culture dictates the environmental and often economic circumstances was insufficient to avoid "culture conflict". Lack of understanding and insight was more harmful in the area of personality development. It has since been shown that long established cultural patterns are the key to the healthy development of a positive self concept (Katz, 1964). Katz maintains moving into a school with white pupils does not automatically enhance the pupil's self concept and may, where social acceptance is lacking, degrade it. Preservation of a sense of identity with the indigenous culture is essential and it is therefore imperative that the school tackle this problem effectively and consciously through carefully planned teaching strategies.

Established cultural patterns develop from birth as a result of interaction with other persons and the immediate environment. Ball, (1967:5) stated that:

the foundations of personality are laid in the earliest years by parents and family, and their beliefs, values, and attitudes will almost certainly be the most powerful influences the individual will encounter during his life. In his most formative years, the Maori child absorbs the hopes and fears of his parents, accepts the values they consider important, and, in any opportunities for experience provided by their way of life, develops his language and manual skills. This acquisition of Maoritanga is what makes him a Maori, a whole person in his society.

Obviously the child cannot but be a product of his environment. The school must try to bridge the gap which research has shown exists between the average European environment and that of the Polynesian environment. There is little doubt that the confrontation of the Polynesian culture with that of the more complex European one has had a disintegrating effect on the established values and mores of the Polynesian. In particular, the principal educational practice, even in the 1960's, was to treat the Polynesian child not as a Polynesian but as any other child. He was thus expected to cope and adapt to the requirements of the classroom situation and to compete on equal terms with his European counterpart.

Admittedly the problem is not peculiar to the more populous Maori rural areas nor to the now more densely concentrated urban Polynesian communities. The problem is basically one of degree - the degree to which the Polynesian has been Europeanised in this way. Documented evidence exists to show that even the Maori Service school did not offer the Polynesian student any special facilities or provision to meet their specific needs and requirements. These schools were in many cases inadequately staffed with trained teachers (Williams, 1860; Holst, 1958; Barrington, 1966) who had little idea of how to cater for these children. (Holst, 1958:55). As Ball, (1967) points out "we seem to have failed to appreciate and make provision for the peculiar needs of children from markedly different cultural and economic backgrounds".

Assimilation had failed. It had failed in terms of education, vocation and detribalisation. It had failed to speed up the process of 'Europeanisation' or more particularly, 'absorption'. Failure was due to lack of insight and sufficient thought. The policy merely followed the course and the pattern of culture contact that other societies had followed.

Specifically, the early policy of assimilation and the later more euphemistic term 'integration' contained much the

same elements. Both largely neglected the Maori culture, identity and pride of race. Metge, (1967:215) has perhaps defined the concept of nineteenth century assimilation more succinctly than most. She maintains that Government followed a policy "assuming that equality between Maori and Pakeha could be attained only by eliminating all differences and turning Maoris into Pakehas". The Maoris, however, resented the policy of assimilation, "when Pakehas tell us we ought to assimilate, it is like a shark saying 'let's assimilate' to a snapper and then opening his mouth and swallowing him for breakfast". (Schwimmer, 1968). Assimilation is a complex process involving continual interaction, reaction, progress and development. It involves the gradual breakdown of Maori cultural patterns, the disintegration of indigenous authority and the weakening of traditional sanctions. The end product is that the Maori becomes fully absorbed in the European cultural pattern.

Assimilation and integration are conceptualised as being part of the total continuing process of acculturation. Metge, (1967:213) sees acculturation "as an unilineal continuum proceeding from Aboriginal Maori culture through stages characterised by a progressive loss of Maori culture to complete assimilation to Pakeha culture". The assumption here being that acculturation is an irreversible process. Furthermore it implies that groups or individuals of a given cultural origin who differ from the dominant culture (usually in terms of numerical majority or economic superiority) may be arranged in some form of rank order according to their degree of acculturation.

The process is, however, not always on a continuum, nor is it necessarily unilinear. (Piddington, 1968). Government policy toward Maori acculturation assumes that it is always on a continuum and is unilinear and therefore official policy has varied little. In essence, government policy changed from one of complete absorption (detrabalisation-assimilation) to one of eliminating all differences of inequality and discrimination (integration). (Metge, 1967). What, for instance, is meant by the elimination of differences? Can it be legitimately

interpreted as meaning total absorption within the European culture? Powell (1955) believed the policy of integration was no different from that of assimilation. It was to "continue with Europeanisation of the Maori as quickly and as completely as possible. In other words it was to turn out imitations of Pakehas; only with brown skins instead of white".

In the past twenty years there has been an upsurge of interest in Polynesian education and a renewed call for the retention of Maori culture. Yet apparently this has had little effect in initiating any major changes in the educational structure. For example, Hunn (1960:15) merely reappraised and redefined the declared policy of the 1840's with no radical change or difference with a theoretical discussion on the inevitability and desirability of rapid racial integration. Integration in this sense was defined rather obscurely as a combination but not a fusion of Maori and Pakeha elements to form one nation, with the Maori culture remaining distinct. This, the Report maintains, is different from assimilation which entails becoming "absorbed, blended, amalgamated, with complete loss of Maori culture".

If this is correct then why did the Education Commission, (1962:402) in their summation, suggest 'assimilation' as the principal concept in Maori-European relations?

There is the feeling in this country, in the minds of both Maori and Pakeha, that if other races are with such energy setting about the task of assimilating and adapting to their needs the European economic, political, and social structure, the New Zealand Maori should definitely not lag behind.

If 'integration' is not a fusion of Maori and Pakeha elements but is instead a 'combination', then the distinction between the two is somewhat tenuous. It would appear that both Hunn and the Commission have their own peculiar interpretation of 'integration'. Hunn maintains that 'integration' aided by 'evolution' will be well nigh completed in two generations. The Commission argues that there should be a desire in their assimilation policy "to preserve the strength of old cultural achievement". Both the Commission's policy of 'assimilation'

and Hunn's policy of 'integration' will not it seems include a loss of Maori culture. Yet Hunn, in particular, implies that like Britain it will be inevitable that after integration, assimilation must follow. Assimilation is the end product of integration; a fusion of the Maori culture completely within the Pakeha culture. Eventually there will be little to distinguish the patterns of life of the Maori from the Pakeha, except for the colour of their skins.

Integration is obviously very little different in terminology and in its adoption from the earlier term assimilation. Piddington, (1968:260) suggests integration means that the "Maori of the future are envisaged as dark skinned Pakehas, having no distinctive cultural characteristics of their own". If this is true, how could the policy of 'integration' become the key concept in educational development over the last twenty years. It reflects no more than a change in the application of the terms. 'Integration' supposedly incorporates, recognises and reinforces the changes toward acculturation that have already taken place. That is, 'integration' retains 'maoritanga' by educating at the primary school level in the Maori arts and crafts, music, myths and legends, whereas 'assimilation' does not incorporate these.

It appears that later statements indicate that the Education Department interpreted 'integration' as seen in the Hunn Report, differently. The Education Department saw it as the elimination of differences that involve inequality and discrimination and further, that the Maori was able to retain his language and culture if he wanted to. In fact does the Maori have a choice? Even if he had, is it possible for him to accurately consider and make a decision on all the possible consequences that could result from that decision? Metge, (1967:215) points out, "translating this policy into action poses some interesting problems. Do certain differentiating laws involve unnecessary privilege or compensation for disability? What if the Maori themselves prefer inequality to change?"

From the literature available it is evident that throughout the nineteenth and for most of this century, the Government has followed the policy of assimilation assuming that equality between Maori and Pakeha could be attained only by eliminating all differences between the two. Compare this with the official interpretation of integration as conceptualised by Booth (1962:2) Research Officer for the Department of Maori Affairs:

Integration denotes a dynamic process by which Maori and Pakeha are being drawn together, in the physical sense of the mingling of the two populations as well as in the mental and cultural senses, where differences are gradually diminishing . . . We regard the integration of Maori and Pakeha as the making of a whole new culture by the combination and adaptation of the two pre-existing cultures.

'A whole new culture' implies the total fusion of one with the other so that the minority culture by definition becomes lost in the majority culture. In practice it matters little what term is used to refer to Maori-Pakeha 'togetherness'; the result is ultimately synonymous with the full meaning of 'absorption'.

INCLUSION AND BICULTURALISM VERSUS ASSIMILATION & INTEGRATION

Schwimmer, (1968) maintains that much more can be achieved educationally and in terms of harmonious race relations; if the Parsonian concept of 'inclusion' were used instead of any of the terms hitherto referred to. Inclusion, as conceptualised by Parsons, (1965) contains three basic constituents: firstly, a recognition and granting of equal rights; secondly, a full participation and sharing in the pursuit of the collective goals of the society. (This in terms of the processes of government and the exercising of power); finally, equality of the resources and capacities necessary to make 'equal rights' into fully equal opportunities.

Obviously, in this sense, few would claim that the Polynesian is a fully accepted and participating member of the New Zealand societal community. His members of Parliament are not representative of New Zealand on a population basis and more importantly the practice exists as an almost discriminatory failure. Finally, the Polynesian's resources are totally

inadequate. They do not allow him to share fully and equally in the country's financial life. In part, this breakdown can be levelled at the education system but the greater part must be borne by Government's ill conceived policy.

The education system has failed to produce a Polynesian society which has the capacity needed to be truly equal with those of the European. Schwimmer (1968:12) justifies this when he states that "his educational qualifications are lower and he is faced with a cultural handicap which places him at a disadvantage in the race for occupational status". The obvious benefit from the Parsonian conception of inclusion is that it does not imply assimilation or even integration. Religious, ethnic groups and culture will continue to maintain and use their own attitudes and organisations.

One serious drawback with 'inclusion' is that it does not take full cognisance of whether the Maori himself wishes to be included. Mol, (1965) for example, refers to the plea the Maori people made for the right to be excluded from integrated Maori Church services. It seems that if the Maori culture is to survive it must have symbols of unity and some institutions to express these symbols.

Schwimmer, (1968) suggests that the concept of biculturalism overcomes many of the questionable aspects of inclusion. Biculturalism, as he sees it, involves a tacit acceptance of the values of the dominant culture. Furthermore, the Polynesian must, to some extent be familiar with the values so that he can, if necessary, turn to them for subsidiary relationships. In this sense Schwimmer maintains "the Maori is already, for the most part, bicultural".

Schwimmer, however, fails to point out that biculturalism does not necessarily preclude a gradual absorption of the minority culture's ideals, concepts and mores; for this in fact can take place. Furthermore Schwimmer's conception of biculturalism assumes that the bicultural person is able to

inculcate the complexities of two distinct and variant cultures to such a degree that he is able to use them "for subsidiary relationships". This requires of the average Polynesian a degree of educational and mental sophistication of which he is not capable. Few would be able to combine the elements of both cultures as some form of symbiotic relationship without the dominant culture, taken over time, becoming parasitic. The result would then be no different from the 'absorption policy' which has been evident since the 1840's.

Piddington, (1968:260) conceptualises a policy which appears to overcome the principal objections of the other two by demonstrating that the process he terms "emergent development" is the "positive and spontaneous emergence of new types of social institutions within cultures undergoing change. Such developments combine formal elements from both cultures . . . it envisages neither an outright return to the 'old days' nor complete assimilation to the politically and economically dominant culture".

The 'emergent development' concept also implies that it is both cultures which are changing not just the Polynesian or minority culture. Each absorbs aspects from the other. The assumptions are that success in education, commerce, industry, and race relations need not rest with the ideals and life style of the majority culture. Successful organisation can be a complementary combination of the two. Why then, have New Zealand administrators persisted with variants of the absorption-assimilation policy for so long? The answer must be to make it easier to introduce aspects of policy that allow for some preservation of 'Maoritanga' with no fear that it might become the dominant culture pattern.

Overseas experience in race relations shows quite conclusively that 'fear' of the minority culture has forced the dominant culture into policies of absorption, or worse to policies of apartheid. Why should the Maori Social and Economic Advancement Act of 1945, for example, set up a system

of tribal committees whose principal functions were "to preserve, revive and maintain the teaching of the Maori Arts, crafts, language, genealogy and history in order to perpetuate Maori culture?" Two possible solutions suggest themselves: firstly, the Government now felt they had little to fear from the militant right wing of the Maori community who were pressing for a retention of all the Maori basic traditions; or secondly, as Geddes (1961) suggests, it implied the belief that changes which bring the Maori greater social and economic similarity and even identity with the European are more likely to be adopted by a people fortified by group membership and proud of their ethnic associations than by those who are disorganised and demoralised.

EUROPEANISATION - A FACTOR IN UNDERACHIEVEMENT.

Unfortunately, because Europeanisation has been the principal aim of educational administrators and educators alike, the concentration by them on the policy of integration or its variant assimilation has not been surprising. But the subsequent under-achievement by the Polynesian at school, and in terms of the European criteria, has to a significant degree been caused by endeavouring to acculturate the indigenous culture too quickly and with too little thought. For example, Hilliard (1961) asserted that the Maori child was under a definite disadvantage in board schools if his family background did not conform to pakeha standards. Europeanisation, Hilliard declared, seemed to have become a precondition of educational attainment.

The policy of Europeanisation has permeated the system to such an extent that almost any form of educational innovation, particularly that which involves any suggestion for restructuring, has been ignored or its implementation delayed. It may be difficult to substantiate the claim that many suggestions for educational innovation have been ignored; it is not too difficult to evince that when any policy to restructure or reconceptualise the Polynesian education system has been promulgated, it has met with constant and persistent delay. This in itself could presuppose by implication 'that the

Polynesian will fail anyway'. (A presupposition which will be examined later in this thesis). At best it suggests, that possible changes need to be thoroughly investigated before implementation. But even if this were the solution, it does not excuse those who have delayed implementation of worthwhile recommendations unnecessarily.

This could be one of the many reasons why Mitchell, (1968) emphatically believes that we are 'two people not one'. The ramifications of such a statement for education are of vital importance particularly if they are found to be true. Polynesian reluctance to participate fully with the education system for example, could indicate that it is mainly due to the realisation that the system is basically devised for children of a different culture. (Powell, 1955; Ball, 1969; Schwimmer, 1966). The Maori still finds security from his own group and from Maoritanga. This contrasts sharply with the individualistic, materialistic and capitalistic ideals of the European society.

There appears to be little doubt that any effort to raise the educational attainment of the Polynesian must be accompanied by an effort to ensure that the methods used to accomplish this end are essentially Polynesian in origin. Europeanisation can no longer be justified even in terms of an 'adoption theory'. (Beaglehole & Beaglehole 1946) argued that an effective adaptation to the European life-style would be necessary if the Polynesian was to enjoy educational success. They believed the Polynesian had to strive "to adapt himself successfully to the values and demands of pakeha society. To become a pakeha . . . to think like a pakeha, feel like one, behave like one, and pick up enough tools, tricks and graces of living so that he can earn a livelihood and enjoy as far as he is able what positive pleasures and happiness modern western civilisation has to offer". Even a superficial examination of this theory would lead to the conclusion that complete 'absorption' is suggested rather than adaptation.

Since 1946 the pressures to Europeanise have lessened, as it has become obvious that the Maori himself must see the need

for education. He must see it on his own terms and in terms of his own culture. "He must wish to raise his own economic status, and ensure that his children have better educational opportunities than he had. He must also be given the opportunity to initiate or at least participate in the planning of suitable programmes to meet these felt needs". (Ball, 1969).

The Commission on Education when considering these elements recognised the fact that the early educators believed it was in the best interests of the Maori race to have them adapt as quickly as possible to a European type of education. They then openly state 'that today's thinking is very different'. The belief that the Maori child must be equipped to take his place on terms of equality as a New Zealand citizen, however, is not retracted.

But is this 'very different'? When one examines the Commission's argument it can be seen that the only difference referred to is that today there is a belief in "the dignity and pride of race which are the Maori's heritage and which must be safeguarded". The difference would appear to be little more than an additive component to the existing educational policy and not a change as suggested.

The examples cited are but two, and many could have been chosen to illustrate the point that Polynesian education is not progressing as rapidly as it could nor as fast as that of European education. The education system is designed more specifically to meet the requirements of the majority European culture. The minority Polynesian culture must adapt in order to benefit, or be classified as an 'educational failure'. But it is an educational failure only from the European viewpoint. Could the Polynesian view point differ? Does he in fact want to be a 'brown pakeha'? Should not the school system give the Polynesian a sense of personal worth? (Schwimmer, 1968; Pinfold, 1957;). Is it not the basic responsibility of the teacher to ensure 'personal' success, rather than 'academic' success? Is it not time for a complete revaluation of the specific objectives that are required from Polynesian students?

Ball, (1965:9) argues cogently that:

Not only Maori education, but the stability and welfare of New Zealand depends on the restoration of his faith in his inherent equality. After long years of withdrawal and insecurity this is going to be most difficult to achieve.

Evidence suggests that educationally the young child's attainment can be affected in two ways: first, by his indigenous culture which dictates his value system, and is the source and foundation of his 'Maoriness'; second, by the requirements and philosophy of the modern society in which he must live. If the two facets differ too greatly then 'conflict' occurs. Schwimmer, (1966) believes that this conflict, which is initially one between the indigenous culture and the European culture, widens to encompass individual role conflict within the school environment. He lists six of these role conflicts indicating the possible consequences of each. Where satisfactory integration of the conflicting roles takes place, educational attainment approximates that of the European norm. Where such integration does not take place, educational failure and withdrawal often follows.

The widely held presupposition that the Polynesian can adequately cope with the effects of two conflicting culture patterns within the Europeanised classroom needs to be closely scrutinised and examined before future policy is promulgated. The real danger is that this assumption presupposes that the European values are the 'right' ones for all minority cultures in New Zealand. Watson, (1967:8) aware of this pseudo-ethnocentric idealism, questioned the validity of continuing to adhere to this assumption:

The values of the schools to which the Maori youngsters were being sent had come from the other side of the world; the curriculum and textbooks used often gave little heed to local needs, let alone the traditions and values of the Maori people.

Watson proceeds to develop an argument which suggests that educators and administrators admit, in retrospect that this assumption was false; yet he does not attempt to argue that the assumption is not now universally held. That it still exists and is valid is beyond question. Corich, (1969) states "I

challenge the assumption that Maori pupils in our secondary schools are being adequately catered for . . . The Maori pupil is too often merely being processed into a facsimile European". Then again, Ball (1965:7) emphasises, "the crucial factor in the regeneration of the Maori people . . . is that a people cannot be divorced from their cultural roots. They are the living embodiment of their racial background".

Although it has been established that the policy of 'integration' has been a significant factor contributing to under-achievement at school, I have suggested neither a satisfactory alternative nor any concrete proposal for remedial action. This has been deliberate. As far as a satisfactory alternative is concerned, little constructive or noticeable improvement in educational attainment would be gained if one were suggested at this point. Administrators and Government are now assured that the policy has been for the most part successful: successful, in that the indigenous Polynesian (the Maori) but not the 'new Polynesian' have from an observer's point of view become 'brown pakehas'. On a closer examination it is only too obvious that the crime rate differs, the occupational status differs, the economic state differs, the home environment differs. The difference, however, is not to their advantage. In the New Zealand society the difference places them at a disadvantage to the European. (Ausubel, 1960; P.P.T.A. 1970; Brown & Maurer, 1971). For the new Polynesian, however, the situation is deplorable. Integration is not the solution. Goldberg, (1967:51) who has researched the problem of improving the educational difference between European and minority ethnic groups concludes:

The issue is not whether to imbue these children with middle-class values or to strengthen the positive aspects of their own unique cultural forms. The issue is rather to provide these children with the skills and knowledge which will enable them to select their future direction rather than be hemmed in by the increasingly limited sphere of operations left to those who lack these skills.

In other words a restructuring of the education system is required, not simply a temporary remedial proposal. (Aspects on how this can be achieved will be discussed in the next chapter under equality of opportunity).

For example, the 'Europeanisation' assumption falsely assumes that educational advancement and harmonious race relations are best attained by following and adopting this policy of integration. The present term is used because this policy is still, in essence, the official one. The Commission has stated that improving the serious lag in Maori educational achievement is seen as an essential basis for strengthening racial harmony. Hunn, (1960:256) states: "The purpose of the Foundation is to maintain racial harmony through education". Then again, as has been argued elsewhere in this thesis, only a name change has occurred. To support this contention the Department of Maori Affairs states:

Integration is adopted as the basis of its policy not only because of the Government's conviction that this is the only way of giving Maoris the fullest opportunity to succeed in their aspirations but also because such a policy is dictated by events which every day are bringing Maori and Pakeha into closer contact. These events make any other policy unrealistic.

Until now, any change in the policy has been resisted. But the increasing tendency for the indigenous and the 'new' Polynesian population to migrate to the larger urban centres has produced a problem which has precipitated moves to have this policy discarded and not reformulated as in the past.

Studies of Polynesian population growth and movements during the years 1951 to 1967 show that the areas of high concentration of Maori population are moving from rural and semi-rural to metropolitan and urban areas. The problem is such that by 1966, 49.9 per cent of the Maori population were living in cities. (1966 Census Statistics). The Auckland metropolitan area has absorbed 33,926 or 34 per cent of all Maoris living in New Zealand. This is nearly five times that of the next biggest urban Polynesian concentration - Rotorua (Rowland, 1971).

What should this demographic shift mean for the educational authorities in particular, and for the Polynesian student in general? Curson (1971:162) concludes that perhaps one of the most striking features of

Polynesian groups in Auckland is the apparent concentration of their residences in particular areas of the city. While nowhere does this approach the highly segregated ghetto situation of many North American cities, there are nevertheless areas within Auckland which over the last ten years have become progressively more and more Polynesian in their ethnic character . . . It would appear that residential proximity to persons of the same ethnic background provides an important means of preserving traditional culture patterns and group identity.

As a consequence, certain schools in Auckland have a greater concentration of Polynesian pupils both Maori and 'new Polynesian' than do some others. This poses additional problems for teachers intending to cater for the special needs of the Polynesian student. Curson further states that "these recently arrived migrants are far from being assimilated into the wider community and their concentration within particular parts of the city and a thinly veiled European hostility to their presence, have forced them to fall back on their own resources".

Doctor Sheen falsely assumes that the Polynesian problem "is just another group problem in our education system, in this respect not different from the problems of country children as opposed to urban children, (or vice versa) or of, physically, socially, emotionally or intellectually handicapped children as opposed to normal children". But the problem is not just another "group problem", it is a special problem, having special requirements, and one which does not compare easily with the other handicapped groups.

Deutsch (1964) suggests that there are certain critical periods in which an individual has a maximum susceptibility to particular stimuli. If the environment lacks these stimuli certain essential behaviour may never appear or if it does it could be particularly impaired. Furthermore, Deutsch promulgates a cumulative hypothesis, which evidence seems to suggest, can be particularly applied to the Polynesian situation. This hypothesis would indicate that children who have been given a poor start in relation to their environments have with increasing age, tended to lag further behind their

contemporaries in both intellectual power and function. The obvious ramifications of this are pertinent to this study but greater purpose will be achieved by pursuing these in the section under the attitudinal barrier later in this thesis. It involves more particularly the deprivation hypothesis which is not, I argue, culturally induced but is a direct consequence of negative attitudes to Polynesian educational advancement.

As was briefly stated earlier, demographic information reveals that those schools which have a large percentage of Polynesian children are now no longer confined to particular rural areas; they are more likely to be located in large urban areas, particularly Auckland and Rotorua. For example, in the Auckland district in 1962 there were 9,679 Maori children attending primary schools, but by 1967 there were 15,850 children. This represents an increase of 64 per cent in five years. (See Table 1)

TABLE 1.

FUPILS IN STATE PRIMARY AND MAORI SCHOOLS 1962-67

<u>District</u>	<u>All Pupils</u>			<u>Maori Pupils</u>		
	1962	1967	Increase per cent	1962	1967	Increase per cent
Auckland	89,197	113,608	27.4	9,679	15,850	64
South Auckland	62,762	73,454	17.0	12,039	16,009	33
Taranaki	16,144	16,892	4.6	1,810	1,976	9
Wanganui	24,530	27,069	10.4	2,739	3,607	32
Hawkes Bay	27,324	31,018	13.5	6,258	8,124	30
Wellington	46,657	57,203	22.6	2,517	4,200	63
Nelson	10,196	10,742	5.4	163	238	46
Canterbury	53,389	59,826	12.1	622	970	56
Otago	25,598	26,559	3.8	166	241	45
Southland	15,965	17,979	12.6	142	311	119
Maori Schools	11,937	7,590	-29.6	10,953	7,590	-31
	383,699	442,754	15.4	47,148	59,116	25

Increase 1962-67

59,055

11,968

Source: Young Leaders' Conference - University of Auckland 1970.

The magnitude of the rural-urban drift is not fully realised until it is noted that these statistics are not in isolation but that it is a national problem. The implications and ramifications for education of such a demographic change in the mobility of one sector of the population are of vital importance, especially if the population is to advance academically within an education system designed almost in its entirety for the Europeans.

It can be seen from Table 1 that overall, the greatest growth has taken place in Auckland, South Auckland, Wellington and Canterbury. Auckland and South Auckland alone account for about 60 per cent of the increase of 59,055 in the total enrolments, and Wellington (17.9 per cent) and Canterbury (10.9 per cent) for almost 30 per cent.

If Maori enrolments alone are considered, Auckland and South Auckland districts account for over 10,000 or 85 per cent of the total increase of 11,968, the Auckland Board district itself accounts for more than half the increase. There are fairly large increases also in Hawkes Bay and Wellington. In the South Island districts where numbers and proportion of Maori pupils are small, there has been significant growth.

The thesis of the argument is that the Polynesian problem appears to be one of displacement rather than one of integration. The Polynesian remains a separate identity in a new location; in reality, a misfit in today's urban society. He is a misfit in the urban society, not only because the education system has failed to meet his special requirements, but also because he too has failed to meet the requirements of the urban society.

As Cohen, (1969:829-30) points out, the school is

a highly analytical environment in all its salient characteristics and requirements . . . many of those who attend school have to demonstrate a relational approach to reality organisation. Relational and analytical conceptual styles were found to be not only different but mutually incompatible . . . In practice, it was found that children who had been

socialised in shared-function environments could not participate effectively in any aspect of the formal school environment even when native ability and information repertoires were adequate.

Therefore if one takes full cognisance of Cohen's findings it can be legitimately assumed "that many of the difficulties met within school are the result of different cognitive configuration, rather than a low level of intellectual functioning". (Harker, 1971:50). Furthermore, this seems to be the main way in which cultural background and socio-economic status affect school achievement. Support for this contention can be seen from the Rakau studies conducted by Ritchie (1963:151) who argued that analytic problem solving was so rarely a feature of the thinking people in Rakau that the rather formal academic approach which dominated the curriculum was almost certain to promote attainment difficulties.

The problem of displacement is therefore, a societal problem as much as it is an educational problem. Too often adjustment is made at the educational level to alleviate one specific problem, without due regard for either the attitudes of the group for whom the adjustment is to be made, or for the overall ramifications and implications of such innovation on that minority culture and for the society as a whole. Educational success can only be achieved through re-education programmes. These must actively involve both culture groups. This can take place only if the parents, teachers and the community are in agreement that the time has arrived for a considered and concerted effort to alleviate inequalities in the education system. Powell, (1955:261) argues,

There is no reason why the Maori people should not achieve an intimate intermingling with Pakehas into New Zealand Society such as to allow them complete equality of opportunity economically, artistically and in other ways but at the same time permitting them to retain certain socially desirable elements of their own culture. This is what the aim of administrators and educators should be . . . and there would be no feelings of guilt such as would follow the deliberate annihilation of a culture.

The second section of the assumption examines Hunn's (1960)

belief that harmonious race relations are best attained and maintained through education. He fails, however, to fully appreciate that this assumption by implication presupposes that without education there would inevitably be racial tension. Obviously, this is not necessarily true. Recent evidence would seem to validate the claim that instead of maintaining racial harmony, the pressures of education have increased racial tension. (Ausubel, 1960). The manifest inequalities and exigencies in the system have caused this unrest and disquiet about many of the expected outcomes of education. The Maori is only now fully realising that he has been effectively depressed. Until 1955, for example, when the National Committee on Maori Education was formed the Maori had no direct influence on educational legislation. Schwimmer (1968:346) believed this move to be merely a peace offering on the part of the then Minister of Education who authorised the setting up of the committee. This committee was "to ensure that the gradual disbanding of the Maori Schools Branch in the Education Department would not run into fierce Maori opposition and possible stone-walling". Then again, the Commission pointed out that only since 1957 have "Maori school committees had the same status and responsibilities as those under Education Boards". Finally it was not until 1963 that a Maori was appointed to the Department of Education and then only as an assistant to the European Officer for Maori Education; the post established in 1956.

Racial harmony like educational equality can only be achieved, if at all, through educational innovation.

Tauroa, (1961), Biggs, (1961) and the Maori Synod have all questioned the assumption that racial harmony through Polynesian-European contact in the schools would lead to a better understanding of each other's way of life. Watson, (1967:32) argues further, "at base, the gravest problems affecting the schooling of the Maoris are those associated with rapprochement and articulation of the contrasting value systems of school and home. Deep within many Maori hearts resentment for past wrongs and indifference continues to smoulder, irk and

sometimes overwhelm; the base of corporate solidarity for many has been shattered". The school must offer not only a greater degree of scope for the Polynesian child but allow for a greater participation, exchange and contribution of ideas from the Polynesian to the school. Too often, as in the past, the ideas, the curriculum and the values have been European. The Polynesian has contributed little. This applied as much to the Maori Service school as it did to the predominantly European state school.

Until Department officials and innovators fully recognise that no education system can claim to be 'equal' when it is organised in such a way as to favour those who have been socialised from one culture rather than another, little progress in Polynesian educational advancement will be noticeable.

In summary, the argument so far has been that the presupposition which suggests that the inculcation of European ideals and European life style is desirable and necessary for Polynesian participation and advancement in New Zealand society. This is at best quasi egalitarian and at worst totally unacceptable. It is unacceptable because:

1. It presupposes that one 'life style' is inferior to another and that this should be changed to the other superior and more acceptable one.
2. The assumption presupposes that successful participation in the educational system and economic advancement can only be achieved through this policy of Europeanisation.
3. The assumption falsely assumes that it is the European type educational system and economic advancement which is superior to that which could be 'biculturally amalgamated'.
4. The assumption is unacceptable because it presupposes the methods that were employed in an attempt to achieve the end product of

'Europeanisation' were the best: absorption, assimilation, fusion, integration, and adaptation. All these terms basically refer to the same process - "Europeanisation as quickly and completely as possible".

5. It is unacceptable because it presupposed that the formal education system was the best vehicle which could be employed to 'Europeanise' and often with deleterious effect: the education system could have been used in such a way that both cultures were contributing equally towards an end product of 'biculturalism' (Schwimmer, 1968) rather than integration.
6. The assumption is unacceptable because it falsely presupposed that not only could the education system be effectively employed to Europeanise but that it was the best means of maintaining and ensuring harmonious race relations.
7. The basic presupposition is unacceptable because its inclusion in the education system has led to its being one of the main contributing factors leading to underachievement.
8. Finally, the presupposition is unacceptable because it presupposed that the Polynesian could adequately cope with the effects of two conflicting culture problems within a Europeanised classroom.

CHAPTER 5.EQUALITY OF EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITY

BASIC PRESUPPOSITION NO.2. THAT EQUALITY OF EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITY IS OPEN TO ALL WHO PARTICIPATE AS STUDENTS WITHIN THE EDUCATION SYSTEM.

The fact that New Zealanders firmly believe and adhere to this assumption; that equality of educational opportunity is open to all, expresses succinctly the quasi-egalitarian sentiments which are widely held. Equal educational opportunity does not presuppose equal education. That all New Zealanders receive the same education is at the heart of the educational inequality problem.

Equality of educational opportunity usually amounts to saying that all ought to be treated equally. In New Zealand it is tantamount to saying that all should always be treated in literally the same way, unless they have some physical or severe mental deficiency. Equity or justice demands that students should be treated differently if there are relevant grounds to support the provision. Injustice results just as much, as Aristotle pointed out, from treating "unequals equally as it does from treating equals unequally". At base then, equality of educational opportunity rests on the principle of distributive justice, which can be formulated in such a way as to say that equals should be treated equally and unequals unequally.

Formulated in this way, distributive justice refers in the first injunction to treatment within a category, while the second refers to treatment between categories. (A point to be taken up later under the principle of 'separateness in education'). The New Zealand policy maker at this point would probably be aware of the fact that given sufficient thought on the matter, it would not be too difficult to discover differences between people which could be argued as relevant

grounds for treating people differently. Therefore, the 1877 and 1964 Education Acts lay down that educational provision shall be the same for all, except for those requiring 'special education'. (i.e. physically and mentally handicapped). Does this policy give sufficient scope and provision? What of the mentally bright? What of the Polynesian student? Surely there is sufficient difference in specific needs and requirements to justify something other than 'sameness of schooling'? As Peters, (1966:120) Aptly points out:

All men need some food but different categories of men need different amounts and types of food. Obviously, therefore, such similarities cannot always be cited to justify equality of treatment if the issue is a distributive one between individual men or classes of men; for whether these differences are relevant will depend on what is being distributed and on the point of distribution . . . Such arguments show, I think that the search for positive grounds for treating men equally is futile.

If Peters is correct, and there is no reason to assume that he is not, then the futility of the following recommendations and policy statements concerning 'equal' education in this country can be easily seen. The assumption underlying all these statements on equality of opportunity is that it is the like treatment of students that requires justification. The Education Commission, (1962) believed implicitly in the assumption that equality of educational opportunity could be achieved when it concluded "in providing true equality of educational opportunity for the Maori people of New Zealand . . . we have a task of imperative priority". Then again, Hunn, (1962:251) states "the Maori Education Foundation will set out to close the gap between the occupational, educational and social status of Maori and Pakehas". Ball in 1967 states "since 1867 successive Governments in this country have endeavoured to give the Maori full equality with the European". Finally, even the National Advisory Council, (1969:3) believed in the attainment of equal educational opportunity "to achieve the goal of equal opportunity it is often necessary to take measures that are vastly unequal". However, the Advisory Council, to the knowledge of this writer is the only official body to have

recognised that there might be a little more to equality of educational opportunity than the sameness of schooling.

"Whether or not people in distress ought to be helped is not a matter of justice. What is a matter of justice is whether some forms of help ought to be given to some categories of people and others to others and whether there are grounds or not for making exceptions to the rule." (Peters, 1966:124).

If the present educational system in New Zealand is supposedly offering equality of educational opportunity then the observable results of such equality graphically portray the inequality of the system.

The idealistic premise that education can be an important route to apparent equality in societies where men are born unequal is, and will remain, a powerful one. To persuade administrators and educators that the assumption is essentially false however, is difficult. When one considers that two special service schools were instituted for multi-racial groups in Auckland demonstrates in itself, that equal opportunity is not considered sufficient for equal achievement. Furthermore, this demonstrates by implication, that special education is considered necessary for a minority group but only when the cost is not too great, or change too extensive. As education comes to be regarded more and more as not only appropriate for preparing people for jobs in a community, but as an avenue to power and prestige in the community, the extent to which access to education and its distribution can be questioned is governed by the contentiousness of the issue. As J.R. Gass, (1971:7) states quite clearly, the widely held assumption of 'equality' needs re-examination in the light of the fact that:

The competition for educational success appears to operate in favour of those already privileged by the circumstances of birth. Despite educational expenditures which have been growing nearly twice as fast as national wealth, there is a baffling failure to overcome the starting handicaps of the socially disadvantaged . . . The idea that has failed is the one that starts with the proposition that equality is provided when equal facilities are provided. But what research shows is that the vicious circle of inequality starts very soon after birth, and is very hard to break in later years.

I have quoted from this document rather fully because it summarises and negates much of the current educational thought on the possible provision and attainment of equal educational opportunity. An obvious factor contained in this assumption and one which contributes to Polynesian underachievement and failure in this country is that the children from impoverished homes enter the educational system with a handicap which manifests itself in low levels of achievement and then in high 'drop-out' rates.

For example, on 1 July, 1967, 39.4 per cent of European secondary pupils were in Forms V and VI (27.1 per cent in Form V and 12.3 per cent in Form VI). But on the same date only 28.4 per cent of Maori pupils were in Forms V and VI (25.1 per cent in Form V and 3.3 per cent in Form VI). In 1969, 77.5 per cent of Maori pupils left with an educational attainment below that of a pass in one subject of the School Certificate examination compared with 38.9 per cent for Europeans (Table 2). See also Appendix I; Maori Education in Terms of Forms III and IV Leavers, School Certificate passes, Teachers College & University Entrants 1962-1966.

TABLE 2.

ATTAINMENTS OF SCHOOL LEAVERS

Attainments of School Leavers 1969.	Number		Percentage	
	Non- Maori	Maori	Non- Maori	Maori
University Scholarship	164	1	0.3	-
University Bursaries examination	2,301	21	5.0	0.4
Higher School Certificate	2,819	67	6.1	1.1
University Entrance	5,973	131	12.9	2.3
Lower Sixth Certificate	4,373	215	9.5	3.7
Endorsed School Certificate	349	19	0.7	0.3
School Certificate 3 or more subjects	5,913	311	12.8	5.3
School Certificate 2 subjects	3,163	210	6.8	3.6
School Certificate 1 subject	3,191	336	7.0	5.8
Other	17,993	4,512	38.9	77.5
Total	46,239	5,823	100.0	100.0

Source: Annual Report, Maori Education Foundation, 1970.

As for the high 'drop out' rates, note the destinations of school leavers 1969, in terms of occupation related to educational attainment. (Table 3).

TABLE 3.

DESTINATION OF SCHOOL LEAVERS
1969

Destination of School Leavers	Number		Percentage	
	Non-Maori	Maori	Non-Maori	Maori
Full-time at university or agricultural college	5,381	96	11.6	1.7
Teachers' colleges	2,373	128	5.1	2.2
Kindergarten training	185	4	0.4	0.1
Technical training	617	19	1.3	0.3
Commercial training	1,143	16	2.5	0.3
Art	105	6	0.2	0.1
Draughting cadets	387	18	0.8	0.3
Technical trainees	1,063	61	2.3	1.1
Health services	2,865	236	6.2	4.0
Office work, Government	2,010	199	4.4	3.4
Office work, Local Body	548	26	1.2	0.5
Office work, private	6,868	386	14.9	6.6
Shop and warehouse assistants	3,955	345	8.6	5.9
Skilled trades, Government	665	205	1.4	3.5
Skilled trades, Local Body	226	17	0.5	0.3
Skilled trades, private	6,134	512	13.3	8.8
Farming	2,820	480	6.1	8.2
Factory operatives and clothing workers	1,769	855	3.8	14.7
Domestic work and at home	839	594	1.8	10.2
Armed Forces	586	105	1.3	1.8
Other occupations	5,700	1,515	12.3	26.0
	46,239	5,823	100.0	100.0
Continued full-time education at another secondary school	7,636	1,030		
Total	53,875	6,853	-	-

Source: Annual Report, Maori Education Foundation, 1970.

It is noticeable that Polynesian school leavers are entering all occupational fields but not in the same percentage as the European. This fact is particularly noticeable when comparing the numbers entering the professional and semi-professional occupations. The percentage of Polynesians entering the unskilled occupations is much higher than that of the European.

Compare the statistics from Table 2 with those of the years 1955 and 1960. It will be seen that although gradual improvement in attainment levels has taken place over the span of five years span it is not particularly significant when compared with the overall improvement in the Non-Maori sector.

TABLE 4.

(A) PERCENTAGE OF STATE SECONDARY SCHOOL LEAVERS
BY YEARS OF ATTENDANCE, 1955 AND 1960

	Maori		Non-Maori	
	1955	1960	1955	1960
Left during, or at the end of:				
First year	26.8	19.1	10.8	7.0
Second year	37.1	37.0	36.8	32.0
Third year	21.9	27.5	28.7	32.7
Fourth year	10.1	12.2	15.8	18.6
Fifth year or later year	4.0	4.2	7.9	9.7

(B) PERCENTAGE OF STATE SECONDARY SCHOOL LEAVERS
BY ATTAINMENT, 1955 AND 1960.

	Maori		Non-Maori	
	1955	1960	1955	1960
Without School Certificate	95.9	95.2	75.9	70.3
With School Certificate or Endorsed School Certificate	3.1	3.3	14.5	17.9
With University Entrance or higher	1.0	1.4	9.6	11.8

Source: Adapted from Annual Reports, Department of Education.

More significant is the fact that whereas the Maori attainment level improved, so too did the European attainment level and at a faster rate than that of the Polynesian. The educational 'gap', or in other words the relative levels of educational achievements between Polynesian and European, is being maintained not lessened; this is a point which is seldom mentioned when statistics are being employed to show gains in educational level made by the Polynesian.

Lovegrove, (1963:15) reiterates that, in general, this educational under-achievement "is related to the economic, social, and cultural activities of the Maori people; yet it is generally acknowledged that education provides one of the most effective means of remedying environmental inequalities".

The fact that this has been recognised is implicit in the text of a recent speech by Mrs. Tirikatene-Sullivan. She stated that: "As I see it, the immediate and urgent aim must be to obtain equal educational achievement for the Maori student within the next ten years". This, however, presupposes that there are methods which can be employed to make it possible to achieve this aim. As has been shown elsewhere in this thesis, improvement in educational levels cannot be achieved unless radical changes are made also within the realm of community attitudes.

At present there is no conclusive body of evidence to support any statement which implies that many of the important steps and recommendations to bring about equality of educational opportunity as outlined by the Commission of Education in 1962 have been taken, or are about to be taken. They are in fact only gradually being implemented and then only in part. Equal facilities do not presuppose equal opportunity.

The all too obvious deficiencies and inequalities in the educational system were the main factors which led Peter Fraser in 1939 to promulgate the 'new look' educational policy which still is the basis of official educational thought today. It is the assumption: "that every person, whatever his level

of academic ability, whether he be rich or poor, whether he lives in town or country, has a right as a citizen to a free education of the kind for which he is best fitted and to the fullest extent of his powers".

That this assumption still stands, is obvious by the number of times it is stated and restated in educational literature. Perhaps Mitchell, (1968:48) concluded correctly when he stated that: "This repeated quoting may be due to the fact that it is one of the few general principles enunciated by the educational policy-makers in this country and, in part, to the approval normally accorded it".

Peter Fraser's statement, although sincere in intention, by reflecting the idealistic sentiments of most educators in this country lacks clarity and depth of meaning.

Firstly, part of the statement presupposes that educators can ascertain when a student is realising his potential. This is not only a false assumption but is empirically impossible. At present there is no test, or any other means, by which one can measure a child's potential accurately. Even if there were, would it not be possible to achieve beyond this point? Current research suggests this with the term 'over-achieving'. Many extraneous factors militating against an accurate assessment must affect the result.

Secondly, further analysis of Fraser's policy statement reveals other serious anomalies. If Fraser meant that all children Maori or Pakeha have a 'right' to attend a school then the educational system has in part achieved this ideal, especially with the gradual extension of compulsory education. If, however, the assumption is that every child has a 'right' to an education that is both gratuitous and compulsory, then this has not been achieved. Few, if any, would venture to conclude that New Zealand education was without cost to the parent. Parents, in addition to compulsory taxation, are constantly paying for sports' fees and incidental expenses incurred by having children at school. Further payment is

made via donations, gala days, art exhibitions, craft exhibitions and a variety of cultural performances. In fact the public accept, as part of their duty, the cost of supplying certain specific teaching aids such as projectors, tape recorders, library books, film strips and so on. Education is not free.

Because education is not free and because it is a continual liability (in terms of expense) to the family receiving the average income, it places a differential burden on the various sectors of the community according to their socio-economic level. Ritchie, (1956) has shown that the Polynesian is generally a member of the lower socio-economic sector of the community and that the average weekly wage of the Polynesian is below that of the national average. Then again, the Commission points out that not only does the Maori tend to have a larger family than the European but also that they tend to live in "inadequately sized and even primitive homes, lacking privacy, quiet and even light for study. Too often there is a dearth of books, pictures and educative material generally to stimulate the growing child".

In part, it is the Polynesian's economic inability to meet the cost of providing a stimulating immediate environment and his endeavour to provide equivalent opportunity for each family member to attend school that has precipitated an educationally impoverished environment. This could be one reason for the high proportion of early Maori school leavers. It is realised that this argument can also be an effective rationale for the individual parents to have the children leave school as soon as it is legally permissible. Contrawise, it can act as a rationale for the adolescent himself.

Thirdly, Fraser presupposes that the education system can offer the individual an education for which he is best fitted. Such a system, at present, does not exist. One can assume that Fraser was endeavouring to point out that 'individual differences' in the widest sense of this term would be recognised. To this degree the education system has been

successful. Individual differences have been recognised. However, little has been done on a national scale to alleviate inequalities within the system which militate against an individual minority group. At no point can it be stated sincerely that the education for the Polynesian is of a "kind for which he is best fitted". The fact that the kind of education at present being offered only approximates each individual's special needs and requirements is of little consolation. The education system has failed in this respect. Attempts have been made within education to cater for children with special physical needs and disabilities but little has been implemented for the deviant; or for the child who is mildly intellectually dull; or for the Polynesian who has his own particular and special requirements.

Mitchell, (1968:49) emphasises this when he points out that:

The 1964 Act makes no mention of specially talented children in its definition of 'special education'. This coupled with the relative rigidity of secondary school courses, the employment of insufficiently qualified teachers, and the growing unrest over inadequacies in Maori education, is evidence of clearly recognisable deficiencies. Thus despite the general accord given to the assumption, it, is an expression of aspiration rather than fact.¹

The Education Department has often used as a counter-argument to this accusation that those schools once classified as Maori Service Schools were introduced to provide special education for the Polynesian. They may be compared with those schools specifically designed to provide special education. Such schools, by definition, are guaranteed specialist staff and equipment, unlike the Maori Service Schools. The Maori School was merely an adaptation of the conventional state primary

¹The important point to be taken from Mitchell's modification is that it draws attention to one of the basic misconceptions about New Zealand education: despite the objectives explicit in the Education Acts of 1877 and 1964 the educational system does not cater for the exceptional child; i.e. the gifted, the retarded or the Polynesian. It caters instead for the child who falls within the broad and indeterminate spectrum labeled as 'average'.

school and staffed with conventionally trained teachers. No special requirements or skills were called for except that it was assumed that the prospective teacher was genuinely interested in Maori education. Furthermore, these schools were for the most part located in remote rural districts; and were, as a consequence, at an immediate disadvantage in being located away from many educational amenities. Historically, there has never been specialised training as such, offered to prospective teachers of Maori children. A brief examination of the system of education is in itself evidence of this fact.

In July of 1879, the 59 Maori schools in New Zealand were transferred from the Department of Maori Affairs to the Department of Education. They were to be known from then on as Maori Service Schools and had at that time a total roll of 1,625 children. Even though this move was seen as a major innovation in the field of Maori education, any advantages which might have accrued from the change were not capitalised upon. Even in 1969 when Maori School Service was abolished it was still not necessary to have any specialised training or particular requirements from any teacher who wished to serve in a Maori school. The Department held that the interest of the individual who had applied for the position was adequate assurance that an education suited to the needs of the Maori student would be implemented. An assumption which could not be justified on this rationalisation alone. Many teachers who held positions in Maori Service Schools applied for them not so much out of any interest in Polynesian education but because the system dictated that they were required to serve a period of two years in a school designated as 'country service' in order that their salary might rise beyond a certain point. Interest alone is no guarantee that an education suited to the special needs of the Polynesian would be carried out. Currently, there is still little evidence that the Teachers' Colleges will institute compulsory courses designed specifically for those who will or may later teach in a school with a predominantly Polynesian population. Because no special form of education was offered in the Maori Service schools, it is not unreasonable to assume that these Maori Service schools did not impart an

education which was "best fitted" for the Maori. Nor did the education imparted develop the Maori to the "fullest extent" of his powers.

The objective, then, must be to bridge the gap between the declared objective of educational equality and its realisation. This can only be satisfactorily accomplished by formulating the objectives in precise operational terms. It is essential to establish realistic operational targets, formulated in terms of resource and other practical implications, and to follow practical performance by constant evaluation. "Until now educational policy has, on the whole, been based on the assumption that urgent problems could be solved by creating supplementary activities and leaving the nucleus of the system intact." (Emmerij, 1971:28). The question remains: how far, and in reality, can equality of educational opportunity be attained within the existing social, cultural, and financial constraints? Promises of equal educational opportunity, without first obtaining a clearly defined and active operational policy, and a statement as to how much can be achieved and over what period of time, are of little value, either to educators or to the community at large. An essential step must be to ensure that co-operation is secured between the innovators and the educators on the one hand, and the community on the other. Both groups must see the value of the objective and both must strive actively to achieve it. There is little to be gained in instituting educational change if there has not been first a total appraisal of the possible future effect on the system and on the group for whom the change was instituted. Re-education must, therefore, begin within the home, and if necessary, at the adult level.

In summary, before any objective can be defined in operational terms, three problems need to be solved. First, how far and to what extent education can be proffered to meet the needs and peculiar requirements of the Polynesian ethnic group. Second, to determine how best the Polynesian can take the fullest advantage of the education offered to him. Third, to define the objectives in clear unambiguous operational terms

that may be achieved within a limited financial constraint and over a specified period of time.

Clearly, equality of school inputs has ceased to be a valid criterion; what really counts are the effects which these inputs have on bringing about equality of opportunity. Coleman, (1969:23) suggests that this "does not imply that all students achievements come to be identical"; a problem with which educators in this country have been preoccupied: "But only that the averages for two population groups that begin at different levels come to be identical. The diversity of individual scores could be as great as, or greater than, the diversity at grade 2". Two points have a direct bearing on this.² First, the deprived pupil needs approximately 0.43 years of additional educational effort per year to catch up with the non-deprived pupil. Second, immediately after the end of compulsory schooling, the 'drop-out' rate of deprived children begins to rise steeply, reaching between 15 and 30 per cent for the sixteen to seventeen age groups. (Head Start; Fantini & Weinstein, 1968; Emmerij, 1971).

Bearing these two points in mind, how can the averages in attainment for the two groups begin to equate with each other? Obviously, it is not sufficient that each go to the same sort of school; they would have to come from the same sort of home; they would all have to be genetically the same. Even the size of the family, as well as the degree of parental education and harmony between parents would also influence the result. Could arrangements be made to remove such familiar inequalities? The answer, is a resounding, no ! But this does not preclude certain remedial measures being taken: parental education and re-education, pre-school programmes, child rearing programmes and family planning circles. Most of these have already been investigated and efforts made to establish these in outlying

²For a fuller discussion on the assumption that 'deprivation' is a viable presupposition in its various forms: social, economic, cultural etc., see the section in this thesis on 'compensatory education programmes' in chapter 8.

Maori districts.³

But what of the 'new Polynesian urban areas? 'Sameness' in education is offered, but this is insufficient. Can New Zealand 'afford' to adhere to the principle of viewing education as a kind of commodity to which all have an 'equal right'? "It is rather like the right to vote, a case where the explicit presumption is that equals should be treated equally. Selection is delayed and works like a free market economy on the basis of the survival of the fittest". (Peters, 1966:131). The 'fittest' not being the Polynesian. "Maori pupils have to be given more than equal provision if they are to enjoy equality of opportunity". (Ball, 1964:10).

Ball's statement, however, might be better stated thus: Maori pupils have to be given more than equal educational provision if the attainment gap is to be narrowed. Because Ball presupposes that there is 'equality of opportunity', and that this equality can be attained by providing something other than 'sameness' of schooling, he cannot see the trap into which he has fallen. The trap is, that descriptively speaking, in the words of Peters (1966:140) "there is no equality of opportunity and never can be unless equalitarians are prepared to control early upbringing, size of families, and breeding". Obviously, this is unlikely to be brought about, if for no other reason than the moral issue involved. Therefore, Peters is logically correct: "there is no equality of opportunity". If then, there can be no real 'equality of opportunity', what can be initiated within the educational system that will aid the educational progress of the Polynesian?

Unlike educational 'equality', educational progress, through special educational facilities, can be achieved because it can be defined and objectified in operational terms. This type of progress will see that the levels of educational

³See Ball, (1965) 'As the Twig is Bent' for a fuller discussion.

attainment, when compared with that of the European, narrow and do not widen as at present. To begin with, immediate steps must be taken to ensure that the 46 recommendations of the National Advisory Council be implemented. Then the educators, the teachers themselves, must be re-educated to cope with the problem of Polynesian education in general, and with the peculiar idiosyncracies and needs of the Polynesian, in particular.

CHAPTER 6.FOR AND AGAINST SEPARATE
EDUCATIONAL FACILITIES

BASIC PRESUPPOSITION NO. 3. THAT THE POLYNESIAN STUDENT, BY BEING EDUCATED WITHIN THE STATE EDUCATION SYSTEM (INSTITUTED PRINCIPALLY FOR THE EUROPEAN) IS NOT RECOGNISED AS HAVING SPECIAL NEEDS.

As the process of urbanisation increases, the Polynesian community in New Zealand is changing in outlook from one which was predominantly rural to one that is an intermixture of both rural and urban outlooks. The accompanying changes in child rearing practices, attitudes and habits which must occur are substantial. The thesis of this argument is that if the Polynesian is unable to adapt fully to an urbanised pattern of existence then the children inculcate an attitude of inadequacy which multiplies and manifests itself in underachievement in the state education system.

As has been shown in the historical review (chapter 3), the assumption that the state school is the appropriate system for educating the Polynesian has not always been held. The Mission schools, for example, believed that native education should be in the vernacular and at a school set aside and equipped to cater for the Maori. The Private Maori Schools remaining today, are for the most part, a consequence of these early schools. After 1840, the Government acknowledged a share of the responsibility in educating the Polynesian by providing limited finance to the various Missions. The schools remained principally for the Polynesian student. Not until 1867 did the Government assume direct control and responsibility for the education of the Polynesians. The Native Schools Act set up administration for the native schools under the Department of Maori Affairs and later, in 1879, control was transferred to the Department of Education, in whose hands it remained until 1969.

Although a separate inspectorate and special staffing arrangements were made in 1879, official policy presupposed that the state school system was the most appropriate for the Polynesian student. The state school system at this time included "instruction of Maori children up to the fourth standard in reading, writing and speaking the English language, and in arithmetic, geography and such other subjects as would fit them to become good citizens". (Holst 1971:6). Thus official policy presupposed, in addition to that concerned with the state school system, that a European 'type' education was the best education a Polynesian could have and that it was in their best interests. Gradually, until in 1928 when the same syllabus for both Maori and European was adopted, the provision of a European 'type' education was being implemented. In 1928 the official policy had dropped the 'type' and added instead a success clause to presuppose, that a European education was the best education a Polynesian could have and that it was in their best interests to succeed in it. In just under 90 years the Government and the Education Department had transmogrified the education system from one primarily designed for the Polynesian to one primarily designed for the European.

That the effects of this latter assumption were gradually being recognised and implemented can be substantiated from a cursory examination of the Acts of 1877, 1908, 1914 and 1964; from the 1881, 1886 and 1909 Native Schools' Codes; and from the various syllabuses documented for primary schools. Reference after reference is made to instruction being in English¹ and in what is now commonly known as the "three R's". (Reading, Writing and Arithmetic). Emphasis on 'success' at school, was evident prior to 1928 with the 'Certificate of Proficiency' virtually restricting free post-primary education to those who had passed this examination at the end of standard six (U.N.E.S.C.O. 1952:59). The Polynesian student was thus effectively prevented from entry to secondary schools by this

¹This aspect of the presupposition will be examined more fully in chapter 7.

examination until 1941 when secondary education was available for virtually the first time in rural areas. In 1940, for example, there were less than 1,000 Secondary Maori pupils, or less than 10 per cent of all Maori leavers. (Holst, 1971:13). Even though the number of Polynesian students was to increase to over 17,000 by 1970 the emphasis on passing external examinations became more important. In 1934 the School Certificate examination was introduced, followed by accrediting of the University examination in 1944. The raising of the school leaving age in the same year had the effect of forcing Polynesian children to remain at school longer but with no provision being made to cater for their specific problems and needs. Statistics showing the steady increase in numbers of Polynesian children attending secondary school are, therefore, grossly misleading. High failure rate, and drop-out from the third and fourth forms was a direct consequence of this legislation. How could educators argue conclusively that this type of education 'was in their best interests' or that 'it was the best fitted for them'? Even if it were in their 'best interests' economic considerations could not be discarded.

From 1935 to 1937 the N.Z.C.E.R. (New Zealand Council for Educational Research) conducted an investigation into the economic circumstances of the family and how this affected their overall education. They concluded:

It is clear that a child leaving primary school in a city has as a rule three choices; work, technical school, or secondary school. The economic circumstances of the home play a large part in the decision; there is evidence, for example, to show that some able children are deprived of further schooling, because of the limited means of their parents.

Although expressed cautiously and for the total population, the full impact of the findings is still there. Other research, (Metge, 1967; Schwimmer, 1968) has shown conclusively and in not such cautious terms, that the average Polynesian family does not have the same socio-economic level as that of the average European. The family is often unable to

afford secondary education for their dependants. At the moment few city or country Maoris move into professional classes. Many of them, whether they live in the city or in the country, are unable to keep their many children at school beyond the age of fifteen and indeed instances can be quoted where they are encouraged to leave school for economic reasons. (Royal, 1968:5). It is the contention of this writer that the social and economic factors are most significant in the overall education of the Polynesian and that they will warrant increasing attention in the future.

Curson (1970:162) concludes similarly, "the growing number of Polynesian Pacific Islanders in New Zealand cities has often been commented upon, but its social and economic implications have until recently been largely ignored".

The Commission warned that economic considerations were vital to Polynesian educational advancement in 1962; yet obviously, little has been implemented to alleviate the disadvantage. The Commission, (1962:418) stated that there are still too many Polynesian children prevented from educational advancement because:

too many live in large families in inadequately sized and even primitive homes, lacking privacy, quiet, and even light for study: too often there is a dearth of books, pictures, educative material generally, to stimulate the growing child. Nor are these typical accompaniments of European culture always, or even often, replaced by strong and living Maori interests.

Butterworth (1967); the P.P.T.A. (Post Primary Teachers' Association) in 1970 and 1972 and (Ritchie 1963:103) have found that for the Polynesian minority, economic factors, poor housing, malnutrition and insanitary conditions are definitely factors in under-achievement. Finally (Harker, 1971:38) concludes from his investigation into Maori achievement that "many aspects of the Maori educational problem are in fact socio-economic problems which will gradually lessen as the socio-economic position of the Maori improves, regardless of whether or not, in the process, Maoris become more acculturated to Pakeha ways and values".

Why then, given the almost constant reminders in not only the professional periodicals and reports, but also from the press, radio and television, has the Government or policy makers not taken positive and definite action towards removing these inequalities? If the present rural-urban movement of the Polynesian (Rowland, 1969, 1971, 1972; McCreary, 1969) and the movement of the Island Polynesian to the cities (particularly Auckland) continues, (Curson, 1970) then the problem of socio-economic deprivation is going to be the most important in regard to Polynesian educational advancement in the future.

It is the writer's contention, that unless immediate and positive action is taken in an effort to: firstly, raise the socio-economic level of the Polynesian to that comparable with that of the European; and secondly, to provide special educational facilities to meet their needs and requirements, the Polynesian will continue to under-achieve within the present education system.

In support of this contention, McCreary, (1968:196) points out that "the Maori population movement is not a simple matter of the transformation of a rural to an urban people but is a complex social phenomenon". Maoris tend to live in approximately the same area of a city and as a consequence there is likely to be a greater proportion of Maoris in certain schools, while in others a lesser proportion is evident. It is obvious that the state school is not equipped to meet the immediate demands and problems of the new urban Polynesian, whose numbers in the city are increasing rapidly.

For example, recent statistics show that whereas the European population of Auckland increased between 1961 and 1968 by 22 per cent, the Maori population increased by 94 per cent (P.P.T.A.). The increasing number of Maori pupils who will be attending the schools must be adequately catered for. It is apparent that this cannot be accomplished given the present educational structure. Yet the P.P.T.A. believes that successful education of the Polynesian can only be achieved through the existing educational structure. "The schools are

the only agency that can be equipped to produce major social change that is so vital to New Zealand". (P.P.T.A. 1970). The schools are not the only agencies capable of producing major social change. Evidence (Ritchie, 1970) seems to suggest that the family is the principal agent of social change. Therefore, if educational change is to be instituted within the school system, a re-education programme needs to be implemented at the family level first; not at the school level. The P.P.T.A. (1970) presupposes that education enriches and supplements the Polynesian home environment from the earliest possible age.

This presupposition raises a number of vexing questions. Firstly, can education (i.e. the school) 'enrich' the home environment? Education could supplement the home environment, but it is doubtful whether any form of enrichment can be directly attributable to the present education system. This is especially so if the range and heterogeneity of schools, school environments and teachers are taken into account. In addition to the differential education evident as a consequence of this range, any enrichment of the home environment after a child has begun his formal education could be attributed to a multitude of differing variables and not just that of education.

The second question that could be asked is: does education enrich the home environment from the "earliest possible age"? If current research is any criterion then it would seem that it does not. For example, Bruner, et al. (1966) in discussing several experiments with preschool children, concluded that if enrichment and education programmes were conducted regularly from as low as six months of age then facilitation and enhancement of cognitive growth is more likely to be advanced at a much faster rate. Then again, how can one ascertain at what point is the earliest age that children can benefit from formal education? Inhelder (1965:15) found that children of as young as two years of age benefited cognitively from experiments designed to enhance symbolic acuity. Without discussing at length the polemics of this type of argument it is hypothesised, that the New Zealand education system is not enriching the home environment to any substantial or effective

degree and nor is education being conducted on a formal basis from the earliest possible age. (At present a preschool committee under the chairmanship of Professor Hill is investigating not only the possibility of extending present preschool services but whether preschool education is in fact, being carried out early enough.)

Thirdly, could not the presupposition be interpreted as meaning an incursion on all Polynesian home environments? It claims not only to supplement, but also to enrich. The school, in many instances, could have the opposite effect. It could depress, not enrich and detract, not supplement. Mitchell (1970:182) for one, believes that because the European refers to the Maori as a psychologically homogeneous group this carries with it the implicit danger of the 'self-fulfilling prophecy' becoming a reality especially with the impact of the mass media in bringing about attitudinal change.

With all the publicity given to the educational problems of their race, I consider that many Maori parents under-rate the ability of Maoris per se to achieve educational success. As a consequence of this being transmitted to the student himself, the probability of failure is now considerably increased. This opinion is communicated to their children, generating in them feelings of inferiority which often lead to the very behaviours the parents had predicted in the first instance.

An important aspect is to ensure that the child's image of himself is not negatively sanctioned. Katz, (1964) concluded that coloured students moving into a school with white pupils does not automatically enhance the pupils' self concept² and may, where social acceptance is lacking, degrade it. If Harker's (1971:38) conclusion that "in cultural terms the academically successful Maori group identifies itself less strongly as a Maori" is valid, then it becomes imperative for the school and the family to combine and to tackle this problem

²Borg (1955) states that the self concept is an "individual's perception of himself. That is, simply the ideas, perceptions and beliefs that form the image of himself that the individual has created".

consciously through planned teaching strategies aimed at improving not just an individual student's self-image but also the self-image of the Polynesian community.

Educational innovation in the past has been preoccupied with improving the Polynesian student's under-achievement by concentrating on factors of under-achievement directly attributable to the Polynesian group. That this policy has failed is not surprising because the assumption has been that it was somehow the Polynesian who was at fault and that it was his educational standard that had to be improved. This assumption is false. Educational innovators should have set out to analyse the problem of Polynesian under-achievement from the perspective of both the majority culture and from the minority culture. As a consequence of this investigation, any proposed change would have been more soundly based and would have undoubtedly met with a greater degree of success. This is not a mere a priori judgement as Harker (1971:46) might suggest. Systematic research has shown conclusively that changes in one level produce changes in another level until a form of 'equilibrium' is restored (Homans 1961; Buckley, 1967). While changes in the education system are being made at one level and for one group only (the Polynesian), the changes that are occurring to restore a level of equilibrium within the other group (the European) and within the education system as a whole, are doing no more than maintaining or increasing the educational 'gap' between the two. What is required is that a specific innovation in Polynesian education be followed by a specific change within either the state education system or within the European community. An example of complementary change would be one instituted at the level of existing attitudes towards and about Polynesian education in this country.³

Justification for the majority of educational recommendations thus far instituted to bring about an effective

³See the argument that is developed in chapter 8 "The Attitudinal Barrier".

increase in Polynesian educational attainment, is noticeably absent. Harker, (1971:46) attempts to justify empirical research as the only criterion on which educational recommendations can be based, and, for examining and explaining Polynesian educational achievement. Harker arbitrarily dismisses any form of philosophical or a priori reasoning as bogus, when he states that many authors attempting to explain Maori underachievement rely on either "a rather slender body of research" supplied by six researchers⁴ "or on a priori assumptions which have little empirical backing". Harker conveniently disguises the essential point that all empirical research is affected by a priori intuitive assumptions. Empirical research must be based upon and embody particular assumptions which often bias the findings. These assumptions must be recognised and appropriate action taken to control their effect if the empirical findings are to be valid. Harker implies that only empirical research is valid and objective. Therefore, one can assume that he believes philosophical inquiry to be valid and subjective.

Assume there is a particular class of facts, (class A) which contains 'all the facts that there are'. The problem for the researcher is to select from 'class A' those facts relevant to the hypothesis he has promulgated. In order to select from 'class A' the researcher would need to have a criterion or basis for selection. Any given piece of empirical research can be regarded as having selected as relevant a relatively small subset from the total set of 'all the facts that there are'. Since all the facts relating to the hypothesis are to be found in 'class A', the criterion itself cannot be a member of that class. Therefore, the criterion itself cannot be factual. It must, therefore, be subjective, intuitive, a priori; an assumption or presupposition which may be unconscious, selected by the researcher to relate to all the facts in 'class A'. Because the criterion is itself intuitive any and every piece of empirical research embodies and is based upon subjective

⁴Ausubel, (1961); Lovegrove, (1965); McClew, (1958); McCreary, (1966); Benton (1965); Smith, (1956).

a a priori intuitive assumptions.⁵ These assumptions or presuppositions can only be appreciated and adequately controlled through philosophical methods.

Without entering into a philosophical debate on the basis of objectivity versus subjectivity⁶ it is blatantly obvious that there is a place for both types of research. Each contributes and gives credence to the other. Philosophical inquiry questions and examines the system as it is, suggesting avenues for empirical research. Empirical research then attempts to validate or invalidate the propositions advances from philosophical enquiry. It is debatable, however, whether empirical research conducted to validate any one recommendation or innovation is in fact any more valid than an intuitive or a priori judgement. An empirical statement, concludes Waismann, (1965) is never 'completely verifiable', since no battery of tests can establish its truth. Therefore, "what has been discarded . . . is the conception of a kind of empirical knowledge which is wholly trustworthy, free of any risk of error" (Passmore, 1967:394).

The necessity of implementing more than the 'sameness' of education, as has been argued previously, would seem at first glance, to overcome many of the objections implicit in the state school system and in the present pre-school education programmes. The assumption that the state school meets the needs and requirements of the Polynesian student, it has been argued, is false. If the state school has failed, could it also be conclusively argued that 'the private school has failed to meet the needs and requirements of the Polynesian'? As stated the answer is in the negative. Academic 'successes' from the private schools have been significantly higher than the national

⁵c.f. Thomas Kuhn, The Structure of Scientific Revolutions Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1962.

⁶See Raymond S. Peters (Ed) The Concept of Education 24-60.

average. Although still not as high proportionately as that of the European children it warrants consideration. For example, the disproportionate representation of sixth formers in the private schools when compared with the state schools can be seen in Table 5 and reflects a long established tradition of those Polynesian students who were able to afford it, or who had obtained scholarships to denominational schools.

TABLE 5.

MAORI SIXTH FORMERS IN PRIVATE SCHOOLS
(PERCENTAGE OF ALL MAORI SIXTH FORMERS)

<u>Year</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>Private</u>	<u>Percentage</u>
1961	192	70	36.5
1966	377	138	36.6
1967	475	154	32.4
1968	574	161	28.0

Source: Harker (1970:145)

This tendency to attend denominational schools has been due to the avidly held belief that these schools, with their emphasis on the Maori language and other aspects of Maori culture, were best able to cater for students of Polynesian origin.

From the table the decline in percentage of those attending private schools could be explained in part by the trend for Polynesians to move to the cities and to the state school system. However, many reasons have been advanced to explain the difference in educational attainment between the state and the private schools, besides the parental belief in the private schools as being the best. These include: better home conditions and environments of those pupils attending; a greater proportion living in hostels where there are regular hours of supervised study and individual tutoring can be provided; smaller classes allowing for more individual attention; the effect of belonging to a cohesive community with shared

interests; better quality of teachers who understand and fully appreciate the needs of the Polynesian student and as a result take appropriate measures to facilitate success. Here, as in most other areas of Polynesian education, little research has been conducted which can attempt to fully explain why one type of school is more successful than another. It is the writer's contention that the difference in success is obviously a combination of many factors, including those above, but more importantly it is because special facilities are being provided which cater specifically for the Polynesians. This is contrary to the Commission's (1962:434) view: "the aim must be to abolish all special provisions and all emergency measures". Surely, the aim must be to increase such facilities and provisions. One possible solution could even be to provide some form of 'separate' education. This is not a new idea, (McKenzie, 1970; N.Z.C.E.R., 1962;) but one to which the egalitarian New Zealander is generally opposed to.

The introduction of special facilities and special measures would not be without its difficulties. The suggestion hints at some hidden form of apartheid in education, a concept that is abhorred by most New Zealanders, if not in private, then at least in public. Yet it is of importance to note that the New Zealand Council for Educational Research (N.Z.C.E.R., 1962), recommended that separate schools with specialist staff could improve the educational level of the Polynesian and that its immediate implementation would benefit the society at large. Writing at the same time, the Commission reached the opposite conclusion. They strongly opposed any suggestion of implementing separate educational facilities for Polynesians or for Europeans in New Zealand. "While schools that are apparently separate exist, undesirable racial distinctions have a greater chance to flourish, and indeed, strangers are inclined to suspect that some form of segregation is being practised - an idea abhorrent to the New Zealand community".

The implication in this statement is that the Commission was more concerned with maintaining observable harmonious race relations than they were with the education of the Maori people.

The Commission, by implication, avoided adverse criticism from those who would have had a basis for ascertaining that Maori-Pakeha relations were not as harmonious as they might appear. More importantly, the Commission opposed separatism in education because it would delay the effective integration and assimilation of the Maori into the European pattern and way of life.

Yet it has been shown that equal treatment has not given the Polynesian educational equality. Would separate educational facilities be any more successful? If the argument advanced in this thesis on equality of opportunity is any criterion then the answer must be in the negative. 'Educational equality' as defined earlier does not exist. But would separate educational facilities in any way enhance educational success and raise the level of Polynesian achievement?

An examination of this question may reveal a different set of criteria and a different answer. Researchers (Ausubel, 1961; Harker, 1971; Butterworth, 1967) have shown that the Polynesian children generally come from an educationally impoverished environment where their parents are unlikely to have had an academic education beyond primary school. Hence when they meet the more academically advanced and often more sophisticated European within the school, negative attitudes could be propagated toward education and the educational setting. Psychologists point to the inherent dangers of children who have had little opportunity to experience success when at school, and this would add weight to any proposition to change radically the existing structure.

Further evidence to change the existing structure is illustrated by the fact that levels of attainment in schools where there is a large percentage of Polynesian students attending tend to be lower than the average. Parents of the wealthier classes, therefore, cannot be blamed if they remove the more academically minded children, and as a consequence reduce the standard further. The writer is aware that teachers do not want to see any racist labelling develop in the schools

by giving different treatment to Polynesian pupils. But it seems that while the New Zealand Educational Institute (N.Z.E.I) and the New Zealand School Committees' Federation are so committed to a policy of 'integration' and opposition to "any form of State aid to independent Maori Colleges" (Nat.Ed. 1971:231) little can be implemented. This view is indicative of the narrow thinking of some of the more influential educationalists who are, as a result, blocking the educational advancement of the Polynesian. Increased State aid to Private schools does not mean that state education system has necessarily "become the second best designed for pupils whose parents cannot afford the other".⁷ If it were true, then Hamill is by implication admitting that a superior education is being offered by the private schools and thereby supporting the contention that separate education leads to increased educational attainment, the thesis of this argument. The State school system need only provide special facilities for the Polynesian within the existing framework in order that an education more suited to his needs can be provided. The question of the grounds on which classification of those requiring these special facilities is a relevant one. But the provision of this type of education would remain flexible so that at any time a student could be transferred from and to, or opt in or out of either type of education; state or special-state on a set of specific criteria, incorporating the difficulties faced by Polynesian groups. The basic points being made, are that unequals should be treated unequally, and that differences in provision must be made within the same school, whatever the differences in educational aims. There is little difference between this type of education and that offered the educationally able or the educationally retarded. The same basic principles apply. As Peters (1966:124) explains:

whether or not people in distress ought to be helped is not a matter of justice. What is a matter of justice is whether some forms of help ought to be

⁷Quoted in National Education, March 1st 1971-79.
A statement by E.F. Hamill, immediate past-president of the P.P.T.A.

given to some categories of people and others to others and whether there are grounds or not for making exceptions to the rule.

Special educational facilities would, in addition to the points mentioned, serve to meet the objections to the existing state school system advanced by Ball, (1964:9);

the assumption that the curriculum and teaching methods in the public schools are suitable for Maori children would have had more validity if two conditions had been met. Firstly, if provision could have been made to ensure that all children of whatever race and background, commenced school with approximately the same degree of pre-school experience and language ability, and secondly, that teachers understood the cultural forces at work in these Maori children.

If the separatist view of education is to be rejected on the grounds that it is discriminatory or that it is impractical, what are the alternatives? There would appear to be tendencies in New Zealand toward several different approaches and these need careful study. One alternative is to accelerate even further the process of assimilation. This policy would be disastrous, particularly for the newly immigrated Island Polynesian. History would repeat itself. The problems and difficulties which have been evident over the century of state education would manifest themselves again. Another alternative (Irvine, 1960) would be a compromise; one that would involve moulding together the elements from both races and both cultures into a single integrated tradition. But is this in fact any different from one of assimilation? Harker (1971:39) suggests another alternative, a combination of the two ideals: separatist and assimilative. "These two alternatives are, of course, extremes . . . a case can be made for a policy which includes a little of each". This position is close to the thesis of this argument, that the provision of specialist facilities will lead to an improvement academically in the relative positions between the European and the Polynesian. Another alternative which suggests itself is that given specialist and separate facilities the Polynesian can more easily identify with his own race and as a consequence gain the

'sense of belonging' which Schwimmer (1968) feels is so important to Polynesian educational success. *

In summary, separatism in education is seen as strengthening Maori culture and mores by allowing more opportunity for the Maori to identify with his own race rather than that of the European. It seems that on the one hand the Commission (1962) in opposing separate educational facilities, was genuinely concerned with preserving the Maori culture and identity, while on the other hand was committed to a policy of eventual integration and assimilation. They solved this dilemma by advocating a position between these two extremes. In so doing they achieved a compromise between prospective employers who expect standards of efficiency comparable with that of the European and the Department of Education who advocate, as has been shown, the eventual assimilation and Europeanisation of the Maori.

Although agreeing in part with the Commission, J.K. Hunn, an advocate of assimilation, criticised the state school system as an effective means of aiding Polynesian academic achievement. He believed that part of the reason for Polynesian under-achievement was that the "sameness of schooling favoured the Pakeha child and ignored the handicaps of the Maori child . . . it is uniformity not equality". The handicaps contributing to educational failure are "substandard living conditions, deafness and difficulty in learning a new culture and language both foreign to the majority of Maori children". In addition, he draws attention to the lack of pre-school services, the parental inability to help, shortage of money for clothing, books and fees. Hunn, although reasoning logically, presupposes that any handicap directly affects the amount that can be learned. It is possible that in some instances certain handicaps could be an advantage, particularly if one is educated in some other setting rather than the classroom, for example, within the home.

Many educators, although they would not give any verbal adherence to assimilation beliefs, are nevertheless acting on the presupposition that education as it is prescribed today will produce a generation which will be virtually

indistinguishable from the European (Except for darker skins and some vestiges of a culture pattern in the Maori language and arts and crafts). Few stop to think of the effects of this assumption on the Polynesian and his attitudes to schooling. Watson (1967) believed that because of the schooling being equated with that of the European and because they had offered all the advantages of an education which "had come from the other side of the world" much harm had been done educationally. "In good faith the community thus thought that it had offered the Maori child full equality with the Pakeha, and possibly it was deluded by the fact that no segregation was immediately visible".

Several questions could still be asked which have a direct bearing on the issue of separate education for 'majority' and 'minority' races. Stated in this way, using the terms 'majority' and 'minority' it could be argued that there is a definite suggestion of discrimination, which in itself immediately implies attitudinal bias. This need not be implied nor have any effect in a decision to improve Polynesian education.

Obviously there is a need for prescription and implementation of an entirely new education system for the Polynesian. Whether there is sufficient evidence to support the establishment of separate educational facilities, or whether it is more desirable to establish specialist facilities within the existing educational structure, is a matter for thorough investigation and research. It should be noted, however, that available evidence does support some form of educational restructuring for the Polynesian student, if educational and vocational advancement are to be attained and steadily increased.

CHAPTER 7.

THE ENGLISH LANGUAGE VERSUS
THE MAORI LANGUAGE.

BASIC PRESUPPOSITION NO. 4. THAT THE ENGLISH LANGUAGE IS REGARDED AS THE APPROPRIATE MEDIUM FOR EDUCATIONAL INSTRUCTION AND COMMUNICATION FOR MINORITY LINGUISTIC GROUPS.

This particular presupposition has, according to Powell, (1955:263) "been one of the main factors causing the decay of the Maori language". The historical survey earlier in this thesis pointed to the assumption that the English language should be the principal means of communication and instruction but this has not always been held. The Mission Schools' policy was that instruction was to be in the vernacular. Later, after 1840, both English and Maori were acceptable. In 1867 Government insisted, as seen in the Native Schools Act 1944, that instruction was to be in English only. From that point on, the Maori language was constantly being eroded as a result of the official policy which insisted on the speaking of English within the schools.

In addition, an ambivalent situation was developing as the influence of the children being forced to speak English at school began to take effect within the home. The gradual erosion of the Maori language was such that Powell (1955:263) states that

for many years head teachers have been instructed to discourage the use of Maori in the school environment. In certain schools fortunately a minority, this resulted in a firmly enforced ban. I have, indeed, been placed in the demoralising position of being under orders from higher authority to check children using the forbidden language while at play.

Other writers, for example Parsonage, (1956:10), believe that the ban was not as widespread as Powell would suggest. However, on interviewing several people who had been educated

in primary schools in the Gisborne area, there seems little doubt that such a policy, even as late as 1933, was still being rigidly enforced.¹ Since this time, however, a gradual relaxation of the policy has been evident until in 1971 the Maori language was once again re-introduced into the primary school curriculum, as an optional language at the Forms I and II level. (Some 35 schools at the end of 1971 were engaged in the plan).

The Commission (1962) sums up present official policy: it was "wiser to choose English as the teaching medium from the outset and that the exceptional situations are more likely to diminish than increase". Whatever the present rationale advanced, the assumption was that instruction and communication in English be, as Parsonage (1956) pointed out, "in accordance with the prevailing policy of assimilating the Maori as rapidly as possible into the European way of life". The success or failure, and the reasons for and against this policy have been argued elsewhere in this thesis, and therefore, these will not be recapitulated. What remains instead is the question: was this policy in accordance with and in the best interests of the Polynesian people? Furthermore, was it in the best interests of Polynesian education? It is the line of this particular argument that the answer to this question, although complex in nature, is essentially in the negative. The adherence to and the ethnocentric belief in the English language as being the best and most appropriate language for instruction has contributed (in addition to the other assumptions discussed earlier) to the present low level of Polynesian under-achievement. Briefly, the primary aim of language is to convey in an intelligible manner information about feelings, desires, emotions and ideas. In other words a language's principal function is to communicate thoughts from one person to another. Communication with the language group normally includes a feeling of, and a desire for empathy; a feeling that what is

¹I acknowledge the assistance of Mrs. Philip Brooks in arriving at this conclusion.

said will be sympathetically received and that there is present a mutual assumption of goodwill and effort toward understanding. One's language is a deeply personal possession and any degradation of it is felt as a personal degradation.² "Certainly, language is the basis of our very humanity and the cornerstone of all human culture and civilisation". (Bender, 1971:15). Its development is central to the whole growth of any child. This needs to be fully appreciated by educators who are in contact with those children whose 'home' language is not only different, but of such restricted nature that it is inadequate for the task the school asks of it. As Watson, (1967:11) emphasises:

Language and symbolic expression after all play a most important role in all aspects of schooling, and since they are the most important vehicle of a teacher's insight and skill, it is understandable that language difficulties should be viewed by teachers as the most serious of all the frustrations they face in teaching Maori children.

If psychologists and researchers are correct in suggesting that the development of linguistic skills is important not only as the basis of the child's scholastic learning, but also as a factor in the development of his personality, then if the native tongue which forms the basis of thought and the means by which the world is appraised breaks down, so too does the very fabric of thought and feeling. Departmental policy, which in the past has concentrated on the exclusion of the Maori language, reflected and to some extent still does reflect, a basic lack of understanding and insight into the particular aspects of the Polynesian problem.

Perhaps the worst aspect of present policy regarding language development, is that much of the school curriculum content presupposes a common and somewhat broad pattern of pre-school experiences; a basic level of competence in using and interpreting oral English as a means of communication and of thought; and a common socio-economic cultural background

²Richard A. Benton (1965); Ian H. Barham (1965); Byron W. Bender (1971) and Erik Schwimmer (1966) believe that language is essential to a feeling of personal belonging.

characteristic of the average European. The Polynesian is not simply a 'brown skinned' European. The cultural values, the home environment, the beliefs, the attitudes and the aspirations all differ from that of the European. Obviously the Polynesian is likely to encounter similar situations and similar challenges within the school environment. Yet the way in which these situations are evaluated and interpreted depends on the cultural background, and the variety of differing systems which can be competently employed to satisfactorily overcome them. These systems coupled with the means to make effective use of them are often vastly different, if not completely lacking. Why then, if these systems, particularly intellectual capability (Watson, 1967; Bender, 1971) and determination (Ausubel, 1961; Harker, 1970) are present, can the Polynesian not make effective use of them?

The main lines of argument employed to answer this question generally follow some line of linguistic deprivation even though Barham, (1965:1) assumes that there is "no authoritative body of Knowledge" existing to give substance to this argument. Probably Barham did not consider the work of Deutsch (1967:214) when he made this statement. Deutsch set out in his investigation to test and produce some conclusive results on the following problem:

If language is a mediator of intellectual and academic development as well as a consequence of mental growth, then the limited language development of disadvantaged pupils impedes school learning. Results from an elaborate testing program of 127 first graders and 165 fifth graders, stratified by race and by class, found each of these stratification factors significantly related to linguistic competence.

Without language, adequate communication cannot take place, and without adequate communication learning is impeded. Polynesian children today, particularly the newly immigrated Island Polynesian, often have a severe language deficiency at the point of entry to school. This deficiency in verbal fluency is the cause of, or at best a severe handicap to educational success. Holst, (1969) in an address to a course at Lopdell House, stated that "repeated lack of success at school coupled with the initial handicaps of language

deficiency and circumscribed experiences, acting together or separately have a damaging effect on the child's self esteem and this in turn reduces his ability to overcome the initial handicap. This creates a failure cycle".

The failure cycle is further aggravated and extended when the teachers of Polynesian students assume that the language spoken by them is basically the same as that of their pupils. The belief that merely limiting the extent and limits of their vocabulary will lead to understanding and adequate effective communication between them and their pupils does not necessarily follow. As words have many and varied meanings a teacher may use words which are familiar to the pupil but in a way which he does not understand. Bernstein (1967:239) exemplifies this when he distinguishes between the 'public language' of the minority group and the 'formal language' of the dominant culture. He suggests that to ask a child to use a language with which he is not familiar is to call upon him "to make responses to which he is neither oriented nor sensitised. His natural responses are unacceptable. It is a bewildering, perplexing, isolated, and utterly defenseless position, which ensures almost certain failure unless the teacher is very sensitive to the child's fundamental predicament".

As far as the Polynesian student is concerned, perhaps the most damaging effect is caused not so much by the indigenous language spoken, but by the lack of wider and prolonged experiences of the language used by the school.

Mitchell (1968:7) states:

English is still the greatest bar to Maori academic success. Until this can be overcome many jobs will remain unavailable to Maoris in any significant quantity . . . The failure is due to an over-cautious, ultra-squeamish attempt to put our racial heads in the sand - and refuse to recognise a strong reality - the linguistic and cultural differences of Polynesian and Pakeha.

The National Advisory Committee (1971:17) in recognising the linguistic deficiency problem emphasised and made explicit

a recommendation which called for a:

Compulsory sub-course within the English and/or Education courses concerned with developing an appreciation by the teacher of the variation in the language spoken by children, pakeha as well as Maori, at the point of entry to school.

That this recommendation could be advanced is, by implication, slighting the present education system. It is not catering for the student who is in any way divergent. Teachers need to build on the strengths that Maori pupils have or may procure easily, rather than attempting to change these into what may seem to be acceptable European norms at the time. According to Ausubel (1964:315), this discouraging picture in the linguistically deprived child has a least three clear implications for education:

In the first place it seems credible that most of the language retardation and its grim consequences for school learning could be prevented by an enriched program of preschool education that would emphasise perceptual discrimination and language acquisition. In addition to the usual preschool activities, much time would be spent in reading and talking to children, in furnishing an acceptable model of speech, in supplying corrective feedback with respect to grammar and pronunciation, in developing listening, memory, and attentivity skills, and in providing appropriate reading readiness, reading, and writing instruction. Concomitantly, of course, an attempt could be made to raise the cultural and intellectual level of the home through a long-range program of involvement in adult education.

In addition, Deutsch (1965:215) strongly emphasises the point that abundant evidence is available to support the assumption "that it is the active verbal engagement of people who surround him which is the operative influence in the child's language development". Surely, if this assumption can be substantiated, there is also strong evidence to support the corollary that the Maori language should be actively taught in schools. The Polynesian child is acutely aware and sensitive to the rejection of his natural language by the teachers with whom he is in contact. Since he is unskilled and often inexperienced in using standard informal English,

especially upon first entering school, his means of oral expression is effectively blocked. There is little or no possibility of communication in depth; sentence structures are invariably of the simplest type, and often fragmentary or incomplete. Vocabulary too is limited and often of the simplest type. The degree to which the Polynesian child can switch from low levels of generality to higher levels of specificity in language is also limited. The necessary vocabulary is absent.

In a report from the Bay of Plenty it was stated that for a school with a total roll of one hundred and twenty pupils "the total number of words and variants is a mere 1,132". (Anderson & Aitken 1965:116). This type of deprivation, it can be shown, is almost entirely environmental. What then is the solution? Edwards (1969:30) believes the solution might be to actively encourage bilingualism. "If all Maori children were, in fact, bilingual, the problem would be somewhat lessened, as the Maori language would provide the children with a wide variety of verbal experience which would transfer fairly readily to an English speaking situation".

Studies carried out on bilingualism (Ervin & Osgood, 1959; Bender, 1971) show that bilingualism is of two kinds; 'compound' and 'co-ordinate'. A compound bilingual is one who has learned and mastered both languages simultaneously and in the same context. This means that the parents must be well versed and able to switch from one language to the other at will. The co-ordinate bilingual is one who learns his two languages in separate contexts, for example, the first within the home and then another language at school. The 'co-ordinate' bilingual thus tends to keep his language for the different contexts. The Polynesian, and more particularly the Island Polynesian, is a 'co-ordinate' bilingual; thus the difficulty in expressing himself and communicating to others in the second language learned at school. If the Maori language were to be heard more frequently at school, instead of the sole use of English, then the Maori might be able to compete on more favourable terms within the European's academically oriented curriculum.

Generally, there have been four principal reasons advanced against such universal inclusion of the Maori language within the state school system.

Firstly, advocates of rapid assimilation reason that by preserving the Maori language it fosters 'racial consciousness' which in turn encourages the formation of viable pressure groups, and as a consequence racial tension. This then impedes the process of integration. However, evidence from overseas would seem to suggest that it is a continuing cultural identity which serves to preserve cultural unity, enhance self confidence and self respect, promote successful integration and improve race relations. (Ausubel, 1964).

Secondly, it is argued that attempts to preserve as the 'official' language such languages as Welsh, Gaelic and Latin have in part failed, and that Maori is no different. However, Maori is different (Ausubel, 1964). It is a more vigorous, functional, dynamic and living language than those mentioned, thus weakening the argument against its exclusion from the curriculum as a possible second language in secondary schools. In addition, no suggestion that the Maori language become the official language has ever been advanced.

Thirdly, that an indigenous language is not necessary to retain or preserve a cultural heritage. For example, it is stated that the Welsh, Irish and Scots have retained their cultural identity but not their language. But this too is untenable because these races are more highly acculturated and they dwell in their own national territories where they remain the majority culture.

Finally, it is asserted that bilingualism impedes the educational and vocational achievement of the Maori by retarding his language development and by confusing word-idea relationships in the mind. Any instruction in the Maori language, therefore, would compound this damage as well as distract Maori children from the task of overcoming their handicap. Ausubel (1964:93) however, maintains that although research on the effects of bilingualism on language development and verbal

intelligence, have in part supported this view, they did not take into account such important factors as:

- (a) the special intellectual impoverishment characterising the home and community environments of an acculturating ethnic group;
- (b) the social stigma commonly attached to speaking a minority language; and
- (c) whether children are exposed to the second language before the first one is thoroughly consolidated.

Guilford, (1967) in summarising the literature, would tend to substantiate this. He states "it must not be assumed that all cases of bilingual status are alike, or that the variable of bilingualism is the only determinor of lower I.Q. Cultural and socio-economic conditions may accompany the language condition." It would seem that from the available research (Lambert, 1963; Peal and Lambert, 1962) that any handicap the bilingual child has disappears by the time he reaches high school. In a home where Maori is often spoken partial bilingualism is obviously present and any instruction in the language would help rather than hinder development.

In the past, Departmental policy on the exclusion of the Maori language reflected a lack of understanding and insight of the Maori problem. If psychologists are correct in suggesting that the development of linguistic skills is important not only as the basis of the child's scholastic learning but also as a factor in the development of his personality, then if the native tongue is wholly abandoned outside the home environment irreparable damage to the child's scholastic advancement can occur.

The last decade has seen radical changes in attitude and policy concerning the teaching of English as the basic medium of instruction. It has been realised that the problems of language and thought must be given closer consideration if

improvement in Polynesian education is to be sought and achieved. The N.Z.C.E.R. Council pointed out that "dialectal and area differences in the English used by Maoris and in the Maori language itself are much less or at least of much less importance than is often assumed to be the case." This may, or may not be true. What is of importance is that language is necessary for communication and that educators are transmitting cultural values and mores of a foreign culture merely by using the predominant language. As Christian (1965:164) points out "we fail to realise that these specialised aspects of culture have no meaning apart from the value system, social system, and communications system which makes them transmissible."

However, a significant step was taken in 1969 when the School Certificate Examination was reconstituted so that English was no longer a compulsory pre-requisite. This represented a major change in Departmental policy. In practice, though, no change took place. English is still effectively a compulsory subject at secondary schools throughout New Zealand. The principals of the individual schools still determine the subjects that will be taken in the fifth and sixth form years. For most Polynesian students then, English is still compulsory and as far as University Entrance is concerned official policy is summed up in a statement by the Commission: "it would be false kindness to Maoris to remove English as a pre-requisite, in view of the nature of the University education for which the University Entrance examination would be preparing". The implications which can be taken from this statement are numerous. Some of these are: 'that a pass in an external exam represents the functional use of that language; that a pass in four subjects aggregating to 180 marks represents that criterion of educational achievement; that preparation in English for the School Certificate and University Entrance examination is an education of the right sort'.

It is beyond the scope of this thesis to discuss the ramifications of such presuppositions but it is hoped that by mentioning them, they will, by implication, focus on some of the contemporary pseudo-idealistic attitudes inherent in the

curriculum structure of the educational system today. Also they could serve to highlight the proposition that the education offered the Polynesian may not be as soundly based as educators would like to believe it is. A complete restructuring, reappraisal and revaluation of the Polynesian education system is inevitable, for the 'education gap' (as it is known) between Maori and Pakeha will continue to widen unless radical change necessary to retard the process is imminent.

The introduction of the Maori language to a few selected schools does not constitute effective remedial action. Authorities and educators responsible for policy still assume that the bilingual child is at a definite disadvantage and therefore the re-introduction of the Maori language must be proceeded with slowly. However, Lambert, (1963) concludes that "our results clearly show that the bilingual students are far superior to monolinguals on both verbal and non-verbal tests of intelligence. We concluded that the bilinguals may have an advantage in tests requiring 'cognitive flexibility' due perhaps to their being bilingual". However, although the available evidence on bilingualism is at variance on this point, it does seem apparent that teachers need only have a positive evaluation and understanding of the Maori language and the Polynesian child's difficulties to fully appreciate that meanings which have been given to him in one culture do not necessarily exist in other cultures.

Barham (1965:8) maintains that "it is probable that the majority of Maori children no longer have the opportunity to become bilingual". This could well be so but one must still ascertain whether the language that is being spoken by the child is in fact English. Could the language in fact be: Maori? Maori-English? Pidgin-Maori? Pidgin-English? These are valid questions. Many Maori children speak neither good Maori nor good English. McCreary (1966:49) showed that a difference in the language performance of Maori and European children did exist. This surely is an obvious conclusion. Language and experience are inseparable.† Therefore, the English spoken by the Polynesian must be different from that

spoken by the European, if the home environment has not been fully 'Europeanised'. As a consequence both cultural and environmental factors operate to lower the linguistic achievement of Maori children in an English speaking situation.

In retrospect, it would appear that many of the under-achievement behaviour and environmental problems could have been avoided had the Department of Education and those responsible for policy-making decisions:

- (1) not enforced a ban on the Maori language in the earlier part of this century;
- (2) actively encouraged the Maori language to be spoken at school and as a consequence would not have divorced the home from the school environment;
- (3) had the teachers received training in the type and extent of the problems that they could have expected to encounter when teaching Polynesian children.

For example, Watson (1967:16) believes that "there appears to have been no exploration . . . of the possibility that child-rearing patterns of Maori homes may produce alternative skills of auditory discrimination, some of which may be ineffective or out of tune with those being required in present-day teaching practices".

From evidence available, it seems obvious that the widely held assumption 'that the English language was the best and most suitable medium of instruction and communication for the Polynesian child' may not have been as well founded as it could have been. This could well be one reason why the Maori language is now being re-introduced in some schools at the present time. Its introduction is either an admission of the intrinsic value of the Maori language or it is a realisation that Maori culture and 'Maoritanga' cannot be taught and appreciated without an understanding of the Maori language as

well. To state that the re-introduction of the Maori language is admitting failure with the English language as the most suitable means of instruction for the Polynesian student could well be an overstatement of fact. However, why is it that the private Maori secondary schools since 1935 have been the only schools where the Maori language has been a compulsory subject? The basic contentions of this writer are: firstly, there is a definite correlation between schools which have taught the Maori language and academic success;³ (namely that the majority of University graduates have come from private schools). (Harker, 1970); secondly, the fact that academic success is correlated with private school education can be ascertained from Education Department Statistics;⁴ yet that this could be the result of a greater appreciation of the difficulties and peculiar idiosyncracies of the Polynesian student is not taken into account. Therefore, if language is the basis of thought and feeling an active participation in the language of the minority group would lead to greater understanding of the inherent problems and to academic success. As Gabrielle Maxwell (1962:16) reports "it may not be possible to counteract home and community influences entirely, but it is important to discover the extent of the influence that the school can exert".

A corollary to understanding and appreciating the Polynesian problem is the widely held assumption 'that the French language should be the appropriate option at the secondary school level for all students Polynesian or European.'

The fact that French has been taken as the appropriate second language for students at secondary schools has done little to advance the Polynesian student academically. He was neither able to cope linguistically with the language, nor was he

³Academic success being measured as a pass at the School Certificate level.

⁴See Table 5. Numbers of Maori pupils in the sixth form at private schools as a percentage of the total.

proficient enough in either Maori or English to learn yet another language. Research has shown that in general the Polynesian student will experience difficulty in learning to read, in extending his vocabulary and in learning to use a wide range of formal possibilities for the organisation of verbal meaning. His reading and writing will be slower than that of the European's, and will tend to be associated with a concrete, actively-dominated content. His powers of verbal comprehension, grammar, and syntax will be limited, as will the number of new language relationships. This being so, how could the inclusion of French as a second language, have been fully justified?

Therefore, it is contended that the 'Maori language should be extended as an optional subject for all post-primary schools', and that courses in Maori language be made compulsory at all Teachers' Colleges.' This is a step further than the National Advisory Committee (1971) was prepared to take when it stated in 'recommendation 9.c.' that the "Maori language be taught in secondary schools as an optional subject where there is sufficient community demand". This surely is taking the easy way out. The recommendation, worded as it is, does not obviate or alleviate the problem. For example, what constitutes 'sufficient community demand'? The recommendation lacks the impact and forcefulness that is required at this time to raise the educational level of the Polynesian to anything like that of the European. Of importance is the fact that in 1965, students at Auckland Post-Primary Teachers' College received a total of only a single one hour lecture on current Maori problems, and further, no provision was made even to discuss methods of teaching English as a second language^{to} Polynesian children. (Mitchell, 1967:6). The long term aim at this stage should obviously be towards making the Maori language a 'core' subject for all pupils at the third and fourth form levels and to have English taught as a second language and not to fallaciously believe that English is already understood by the Polynesian student.' As the results from the introduction of the Maori language at the forms I and II level begin to become apparent at the secondary school level this aim could be achieved with little difficulty. In November 1971 there were fifty-one secondary

schools incorporating the Maori language as part of the curriculum, with a total of 3,974 studying the language. This compares with 2,294 pupils the year before.⁵ The interest, motivation and machinery is present; all that is required now is the determination to ensure that the Polynesian student does not continue to be disadvantaged linguistically when compared with his European counterpart.

In summary, the widely held presupposition "that the English language is the appropriate and best medium for instruction and communication" is one which has recently been recognised but which is still the basic assumption on which New Zealand schools are based. Some effort has been made to re-introduce the Maori language at the forms I to IV levels, but little, if anything, has been done to lessen the extreme linguistic disadvantage which is apparent at the pre-school and infant school levels. The real difficulty lies not so much at the forms I to IV level, where the 'educational gap' has already manifested itself to such an extent that Polynesian children are generally grouped in the lower streamed classes, but at the new-entrant level. Rather than commenting on the polemics of the problem what is required is a more penetrating pedagogical and linguistic analysis of the specific intellectual, verbal and bilingual skills that are insufficiently developed at particular ages and in particular communities and families. More penetrating research is needed into levels of experiential deprivation because this leads not only to under-achievement but also and more importantly to language communication deficiencies.

The crux of the problem is that language, apart from being a basic tool for communication, is a vehicle for thought and is fundamental to the development of concepts. Although there can be thought without language, many kinds of thought are intimately linked with, and dependent upon language. Of vital importance then is to ensure that teachers have adequate training and

⁵Department of Education "A Review of Recent Developments in the Education of Maori Children" November, 1971 p.4.

practice in the linguistic difficulties that are more common, and more often than not peculiar to the Polynesian ethnic group. Training, however, is only one aspect. The teacher above all must be sympathetic, as well as aware. He must provide the appropriate experiences which will enrich the child's language and provide the cornerstone for successful participation and success in a school environment catering for, and geared to, the European. He must be at least conversant with the Maori language, so that he can communicate effectively with the new-entrant child if this is required. Therefore, it is important that 'recommendation 37' of the National Advisory Committee's Report (1971) is instituted on a national scale without delay, namely:

That in-service courses on the teaching of Maori language, and other courses designed to assist teachers working with Maori children be increased and be made available by the Teachers' Refresher Course Committee, by the Department of Education through in-service centres and by University Extension Departments. Whenever possible these courses should include teachers in independent schools.

Deutsch, (1965); Bernstein, (1961); Bender, (1971); and Christian, (1965) have all shown that although evidence conflicts to a certain degree on the effects of bilingualism on intellectual and academic pursuits, the results "can equally be taken as constituting a case against using, as the medium of instruction in school, a language other than that native to children". *(Bender, 1971:30). As a consequence, this writer advocates that the Maori language be recognised as an option in the first instance from forms I to IV with a view to making it a compulsory core subject as soon as this is practical; namely, as soon as sufficient teachers have entered the service capable of teaching Maori as a language. This, according to the New Zealand Educational Institute, is not impossible now. The presupposition "that French be the appropriate second language option in full post-primary schools" is one which must now be examined much more thoroughly in the light of evidence that, according to Fishman, (1965:154), is of vital importance to the successful acculturation of the bilingual child:

On the basis of data obtained by the Language Resources Project and on the basis of impressions gained in the pursuit and analysis of these data it would seem that there are still good prospects of maintaining or attaining cultural bilingualism among many different carefully selected sub-groups of ethnic background . . . Thus the problem is rather less whether or not this can be done than it is one of whether or not it should be done.

CHAPTER 8.

THE ATTITUDINAL BARRIER

BASIC PRESUPPOSITION NO. 5. THAT THE POLYNESIAN STUDENT WILL PROBABLY FAIL ANYWAY.

Perhaps one of the greatest factors militating against Polynesian advancement educationally and vocationally in New Zealand is the European's latent, perhaps unconscious bias and prejudice which is only too obvious in society. Ausubel (1960) detected much bias and discrimination, the Commission (1962) hints at attitudinal prejudice and Mitchell (1968) notes "that we may be two people not one". That prejudice is present in New Zealand society is beyond doubt. It would seem that the only solution is that New Zealanders reassess their priorities and objectives concerning Polynesian advancement within the European society.

That education has failed in many of its objectives is only one cause in a chain of possible causes one of which must be the over-all failure of society. One has only to read current reports on delinquency, on the development of gangs, and on unemployment to realise that a large percentage of those referred to are Polynesians. Education cannot be held entirely responsible. It has been used as a scapegoat and the rationale for most Polynesian failure for too long. Society must now face the fact that it too is at fault. The European's prejudicial and discriminatory actions involving those of 'brown skin' heighten racial tension and bitterness.

One current negativistic attitude prevalent among secondary school teachers is that the Maori will fail anyway. Staff room conversation would confirm this, but only in private for when questioned on such an attitude any prejudice is vehemently denied.

The argument to follow will be in five parts:

- (1) That the attitudes which are publicly denied by the European sector and by educators are those which are the most damaging to Polynesian educational advancement.
- (2) That as a result of the unconscious transmission of these prejudicial attitudes the Polynesian introjects and inculcates within himself a negativistic attitude toward European society and educational achievement.
- (3) That the act of assimilating these attitudes is so complete that the consequent failure or educational under-achievement becomes a 'self-fulfilling prophecy'. The Polynesian student believes that the level he has attained is all that he could have hoped for anyway.
- (4) That compensatory education programmes will not succeed unless they incorporate the whole spectrum of Polynesian education from the home through pre-school and school and back to the home.
- (5) That the mere labelling of the Polynesian student as 'culturally deprived' is expressing a prejudicial attitude.

Any examination of the presupposition 'that the Polynesian will fail anyway' could be regarded as an indictment of the present education system. Yet, that this presupposition does exist bears witness that innovation in the area of Polynesian education is long overdue not only for serious consideration and attention, but more importantly, for action, both independently from the minority racial group point of view and collectively from the perspective of the total society.

As has been implied, perhaps one of the more important obstacles that must be surmounted before any direct educational change can be implemented is the European's

inculcated and deeply entrenched prejudicial attitude toward Polynesian advancement in New Zealand. Ausubel (1960) detected this European bias and discrimination when he drew attention to the fact that "many Pakehas not only regard Polynesians as a morally intellectually and socially inferior species of humanity, but also practice flagrant forms of racial discrimination at variance with their professed ideals". The Commission in 1962 suggests in various places of their Report, that an attitudinal prejudice might exist, while Watson (1967) also stresses the dangers of prejudicial bias and discrimination as a barrier to the furtherance of Polynesian education.

When discriminatory and racial prejudice exist in any form this, in itself, militates against Polynesian educational advancement. Furthermore, by implication, the existence of discrimination and prejudice supports the assumption 'that the Polynesian will fail anyway'.

Mitchell (1970) suggests that for the Polynesian, educational failure is a self-fulfilling prophecy; it would appear that what the Polynesian believes he is, or his race is, at any particular time, is what he will become. "With the publicity given to the educational problems of their race, I consider that many Maori parents under-rate the ability of Maoris per se to achieve educational success. This opinion is communicated to their children, generating in them feelings of inferiority which often lead to the very behaviours the parents had predicted in the first place."

On the one hand there has been arbitrarily set for the Polynesian a minimum standard of educational achievement (a pass in the School Certificate examination), while on the other hand the idea that he will be an educational failure anyway and therefore any study at school or home is a waste of time is continually being instilled in him from birth, and finally becomes self-fulfilling. This becomes apparent not only from what the parents say and do but also to a greater degree than ever before from the mass media.

Earlier it was pointed out that the New Zealand Post

Primary Teachers' Association (1970) showed that the Polynesian student's chances are only one in twelve of ever gaining School Certificate or its equivalent and that if he is a male then his chances are one in three of appearing before a court, and one in eleven of receiving borstal training before the age of sixteen. Educational success, in the eyes of the Polynesian, can and does, become an unobtainable goal. The probable result usually is that he will withdraw either psychologically or physically from the educational setting, at a much earlier age than his European contemporary.

This high probability of failure or withdrawal is often taken as the major justification for improving the various aspects of Polynesian education in New Zealand. Although this must be one of the major reasons for such action, principally because it is the most obvious and noticeable, it is no justification. In fact, the high probability of failure is in itself the reason for conducting an investigation but it cannot be upheld as the justification. Justification is a consequence of empirical findings and therefore innovation incorporates other pertinent factors besides the probability of failure.

It would appear that if change is to be instituted then a re-education programme is necessary at the level of the Maori and European attitudes to education in general. Amelioration of prejudice and discrimination must be prerequisite to educational change. In other words, it is a societal change at the community level and not an isolated change by any one culture whether Maori or European.

Whether it is possible to change existing attitudes sufficiently to ensure a noticeable improvement in educational achievement cannot be answered until it is attempted. The machinery exists to enable institution of a successful and complete re-education programme, not only at the school and pre-school levels, but more importantly at the adult education level. However, the fact that it is possible, does not, nor should not, preclude an initial investigation being conducted into the various alternatives which could be employed to implement this

programme. The important point is that there is a need for remedial action at the attitudinal level.

Latent prejudicial and discriminatory attitudes do exist in New Zealand society. Ausubel (1960:179) maintains that although at Teachers' Colleges the Maori is accepted as an equal and generally achieves an acceptable standard, at university the situation is reversed. "Because the Maori constitutes a tiny minority patronising attitudes are very prevalent, the Maori faces the virtual impossibility of obtaining room and board with Pakeha families . . . He is socially avoided and given the 'silent treatment' from Pakeha students. He is generally responded to as if he were simple minded or incapable of understanding English". The existence of this type of prejudice led to the 1970 New Zealand Universities Students' Association Conference devoting a large percentage of the time at the conference to the problems of Maori education and to a general criticism of the education system in general.

If the academic attainment level is taken as a criterion of how successful the education system has been, then it has failed.¹

Even though the numbers of Maoris obtaining School Certificate has doubled over the five years from 1963 to 1968, the percentage is only a little higher. The higher the academic level the smaller the percentage of Maori students who attain it. Harker (1970:145) notes:

The disparity between Maori and non-Maori is considerable. Almost one in eight non-Maori school leavers planned to go on to full-time university study, while only one in seventy-seven Maori school leavers planned to do so . . . Perhaps most significantly, the disparity between the proportion of Maori and non-Maori school leavers planning to go to university has been increasing.

This disparity could be the result of any number of

¹ See Tables 2, page 62 and 3, page 63. Attainments and Destinations of School leavers, 1969. And Table 4B page 64 Percentage of State Secondary School Leavers by Attainment 1955 and 1960.

factors. Taken cumulatively, the subsequent results of the educational presuppositions thus far discussed would have played a major part in this disparity. As far as the presupposition "that the Polynesian will fail anyway" is concerned, it would appear that during the years of education at secondary school the Polynesian is relegated to the 'lower stream' classes where changes in the teaching staff are frequent and where the will to achieve is lessened. These children are often viewed by many of the staff, and eventually come to see themselves as, educational 'drop outs'. Statistics suggest that the Polynesians have reached a point demographically where they can no longer be classified as a predominantly rural community. The Polynesian community has 50.33 per cent living in urban centres which compares with 77.3 per cent for the total New Zealand community. It is apparent that this increase will continue and the question remains: what has been done in the urban centres where the Polynesian population is increasing rapidly to accommodate and to alleviate the obvious educational deficiencies for this ethnic minority in the existing State school system?

It would appear, on the available evidence, that it would be more desirable and would have a greater impact in improving the educational attainment of Polynesians if they were educated in an environment where they were members of an unstreamed class. Here there is less likelihood that a negative self concept would develop. Evidence suggests (Ausubel, 1969) that the element of competition is motivation in itself and thus improvement in the level of retardation becomes more probable. The low academic and intellectual standard of the low streamed classes, however, offers little academic stimulation and little that could be taken as a criterion of success. The Report of the Curriculum Review Group (1969:16-17) states that:

age and ability grouping is almost universally accepted in New Zealand Secondary schools as the most efficient method of organising children for class work. This system of grouping has been questioned in some countries on the grounds that it inhibits growth and develops undesirable attitudes and values. Where experiments have been conducted with other forms of class grouping, it has been shown that both the attitudes and performance of children are likely to be superior to those in streamed classes . . . Where children are streamed their

performance is pre-judged and they become conditioned by their teachers' expectations.

If educators were genuinely concerned, then these Polynesian students would not be classified as educational failures. (A label which they may carry throughout their secondary schooling once streamed into the lower classes.) On the one hand, the 'public' rationale justifying streaming appears laudable. Children are able to work at their own level. Presumably this means in a class with others at their own academic attainment level. However, the ultimate effect of streaming does not always justify the means.

Allied with this policy of streaming in New Zealand secondary schools is the intra-school policy of placing the newer, or less efficient teachers² on the staff with the less able pupils. Here the teacher concerned teaches in the class not by choice but because it is imposed upon him. As he is often unwilling to teach in the lower streams his effectiveness as a teacher may not be as high as it possibly could have been if the coercion to teach in such a class were lifted. What is more distressing, however, is that the whole practice presupposes that those who have been teaching for only a short time or who have a personal grading which is low, are the better equipped to teach the less able pupils. This does not follow. Willingness on the part of the individual teacher to participate in advancing the effective academic level of any class or individual must be a major contributing factor. (Havighurst and Neugarten, 1967).

Because such practices are rife in the education system, the Polynesian student is not obtaining an education which even approximates that of the European. The Polynesian begins to accept that he cannot expect to receive the same as his European counterpart and a general state of apathy can often be the result. It is apathy not only on the part of the Polynesian

²Classified according to the New Zealand Secondary School personal grading system.

but also on the part of the European. The European is apathetic because little to remedy the situation is being instituted, even though numerous recommendations have been put forward. It is obvious that much of what could be done is promulgated yet little is put into practice. This is borne out when it is realised that there is still a dearth of pre-school education in rural areas of predominantly Maori population. Coupled with this is the general apathy on the part of the Polynesian parent to send his children to pre-school centres when they are available. However, there appears to be a marked change occurring in recent years in the attitude shown to pre-school education by Polynesian parents. For example, there are more than 3,031 Maori children attending recognised play centres and kindergartens and this represents an over-all increase of more than 50 per cent in two years. (Department of Statistics 1969). The twenty per cent proportion of Maori children now attending pre-school institutions, corresponds closely with that of all children attending (26.5 per cent). In 1962 there were fewer than 500 Maori children attending pre-school institutions. But as Ball (1969) states "while the progress made is gratifying, the fact cannot be ignored that eighty per cent of this age group has not yet been reached . . . For these and other reasons, Maori children have had to struggle in the classroom, more often than not unsuccessfully". However, the Report of the Commission on Pre-school education currently being investigated under the chairmanship of Professor C.G.N. Hill will undoubtedly highlight many of these deficiencies.

The Polynesian family, even when it would like to see its offspring achieve a higher status than its own, "cannot provide the model of attitudes and behaviours which underlie a perception of the world as open, and schooling as a means of moving out and up into the world". (Goldberg, 1967:440). As a consequence, the Polynesian child comes to see, and believes himself to be a failure. This intrinsic lack of motivation is cumulative. "The child who has an existing deficit in growth incurred from past deprivation is less able to profit developmentally from new and more advanced levels of environmental stimulation". (Ausubel, 1964). If a child is unable to benefit

fully from enrichment, then little can be said for so-called compensatory education programmes, because the child is unable to perceive himself in terms of educational success. As Goldberg (1963:50) stresses, "early difficulty in mastering the basic intellectual skills which the schools and thus the broader society demands leads to defeat and failure, a developing negative self-image, rebellion against the increasingly defeating school experiences, a search for status outside the school together with active resentment against the society which the school represents". What then can be done?

Five suggestions would seem to be appropriate in answer to the question:

- (1) It is of vital importance to design programmes which will provide the child with verbal and symbolic experiences thus laying the foundation for later academic achievement.
- (2) To postpone the introduction of formal school subjects as an extension of the methods employed in building up positive attitudes through a series of successful school experiences.
- (3) To present learning material which is not only at the pupil's academic level but is so structured that the Polynesian is able to identify with it. In other words he must have the learning material graded to both his experience and interest level.
- (4) To introduce tangible rewards instead of the universally accepted intangible reward of 'that's good' or 'well done'. Tangible rewards have been used successfully for many years in the education of the deaf.
- (5) To introduce a system of teacher re-education and specific teacher training programmes so as the teacher is able to cater for the Polynesian student

in the classroom with a programme designed to meet his needs and to encourage development of a positive self-concept.

CULTURAL DEPRIVATION AS A FACTOR IN POLYNESIAN FAILURE.

A reason advanced for the relative failure of the Polynesian in the State school system is that he is supposedly 'culturally deprived'. (Ausubel, 1964; Mitchell, 1970). The assumption is that by enriching the immediate home environment or by utilising compensatory education programmes within the confines of the school many of the effects directly attributed to cultural retardation can be alleviated. Mitchell (1970) would disagree. He argues that "although there is a disproportionately high incidence of cultural deprivation among the Maori population, it seems to me that the validity of this distinction between the problems of the culturally deprived and the problems of the Maori is open to serious question".

On any standard achievement test, for example, there would be many environmental, emotional and attitudinal factors which could account for both under-achievement and a low score on that test. Secondly, and more seriously, cultural disadvantage by definition includes the notion of intellectually superior and inferior races. Analysis of recent research data shows this to be false. Georghi F. Rebety, Chairman of a U.N.E.S.C.O. meeting of twenty-two scientists and biologists states that 'neither in the field of hereditary potentialities concerning the overall intelligence and the capacity for cultural development, nor in that of physical traits is there any justification for the concept of inferior and superior races'.³ Rather it would seem that underachievement and low attainment may not be attributable to any one cause but is likely to result from a variety of factors in interaction.

Jensen (1969) reaches a similar conclusion, although he

³In N.Z.P.P.T.A. "Maori Education" An Interim Report page 1.

argues more for the genetic determination of intelligence than for environmental influences. He believes that the most important environmental factors affecting intelligence occur pre-natally and in the first year of life, and are associated mainly with the nourishment of mother and child. He suggests that social class and racial variations in intelligence cannot be accounted for by differences in environment but must be attributed partially to genetic differences. To assume, then, that the school is an all important force contributing to the overall development of the phenotype is subject to serious question.

Finally, Jensen argues that many compensatory programmes based on the 'deprivation hypothesis' have failed to achieve any measure of success or to achieve significant gains in intelligence rating. This 'deprivation' hypothesis - according to which academic loss is mainly the result of social, economic and educational deprivation and discrimination, is only now being challenged.

School compensatory programmes have failed since they have been guided by two current beliefs. According to Jensen these are:

First, the average child concept - "the belief that all children except for a rare few born with severe neurological defects, are basically very much alike in their mental development and capabilities, and that their apparent differences in these characteristics as manifested in school are due to rather superficial differences in children's upbringing at home, their preschool and out-of-school experiences, motivations and interests, and the educational influences of their family background."

Second, the social deprivation hypothesis, the allied belief that those children of ethnic minorities and the economically poor who achieve below average in school do so mainly because they begin school lacking certain crucial experiences which are prerequisite for school learning, perceptual, attentional, and verbal skills, as well as the self-

direction and teacher-oriented attitudes conducive to achievement in the classroom. He maintains that compensatory programmes have failed because they aim at making up these environmental lacks as quickly as possible, by assumedly providing appropriate experiences, cultural enrichment and the training in basic skills. Consequently they are misdirected in their choice of goals and educational practices.

For the Polynesian, then, it would seem that greater academic success may well be realised by having a close connection between the home and some special school instituted specifically to meet the individual requirements of this minority group. Too often within the typical urban school environment, particularly at secondary school, little is constructively carried out to encourage or aid in the intellectual and academic achievement of the Polynesian child. He is placed in a slow stream of students who in many cases do not want to achieve academic success and thus the school functions negatively in regard to school achievement.

In summary, the presupposition that the Maori will fail anyway is not in question. The fact that such a presupposition does exist, whether conveniently disguised or not, is an indictment on the whole education system. *Methods to alleviate the problem have been outlined, but like all such suggestions they too must be subject to adequate research. Surprisingly little research has been conducted in the field of Polynesian education considering the mass of information that is currently available within this field.⁴ If educators and administrators were genuinely concerned for the Polynesian student and his educational advancement then marked improvement academically would by now have been the consequence, particularly if the Commission's (1961) proposals had been implemented. Delay and procrastination over Polynesian education points to the fact that educators, administrators and policy decision makers believe "the Polynesian will fail anyway."

⁴See appendix II for a summary of Researchers.

CHAPTER 9.

WHERE NOW?

That Polynesian education has become a major educational issue in New Zealand is beyond question since it has been the subject of much discussion and debate in recent months. The N.Z.P.P.T.A. has just published an interim report on Maori education in New Zealand, so too has the N.Z.E.I. However, a noticeable omission from three recent books (published specifically to analyse New Zealand Education in our present society) has been that of Polynesian education. Firstly, the P.P.T.A. has publically shown that it is genuinely concerned about Maori 'failure' but in publishing its book Education in Change the topic is mentioned only briefly. The Association explains that "the committee has been very much aware of these problems but has approached them through discussion of desirable practices for all children instead of by singling out these groups for special attention." Secondly, Bates' compilation of papers in Prospects in New Zealand Education displays an almost complete lack of an appreciation of the 'prospects' for Polynesian education in New Zealand. Papers on almost every aspect of New Zealand education are represented from 'Teacher Training' to the 'Education of Women' but not one paper is included on the 'Education of the Maori'. Thirdly, Mitchell's volume entitled New Zealand Education Today is little better. It, too, has no paper on Maori education but various authors do in fact mention the subject in passing, while Shallcrass and Ewing (1970) have merely put together in one volume a number of previously published papers with little attempt to expose the real problem of Polynesian under-achievement and the reasons for it. This publication, however, it is hoped, will be the embryonic forerunner to more carefully thought out and researched documents on Polynesian education.

Bray and Hill's forthcoming publication within the field

of Maori and Polynesian education will, it is hoped, be a valuable up-dating on current thinking and research. Stenhouse, (et al.), are in their volume attempting to expose and examine some of the attitudes that educators and those responsible for decision making have regarding Polynesian education. This it would appear from the current literature is what is required: provocative papers which will critically examine rather than merely describe.

The New Zealand Post Primary Teachers Association (P.P.T.A.) and the New Zealand Educational Institute (N.Z.E.I.) have been active in their attempt to bring about change in the system of Polynesian education. The P.P.T.A., for example, have already sent out to all New Zealand branches two interim reports on Maori Education which do have some far reaching proposals. If these two organisations were to co-ordinate their efforts to institute change, much more would be achieved and at an earlier date than might otherwise occur.

Finally the Report of the National Advisory Committee on Maori Education offers some concrete proposals, which, if implemented, could change the direction and thinking on Polynesian education in this country. These proposals must be given more than mere 'lip service' if the attainment level between Polynesian and European is to approximate each other. The next five years will be vitally important. Polynesian education in New Zealand must be important enough to be considered as an immediate educational problem. If not, the prospects for Polynesian educational advancement in New Zealand would appear to be bleak.

MAORI EDUCATION IN TERMS OF FORM 3 AND 4 LEAVERS, SCHOOL CERTIFICATE
PASSES, TEACHERS COLLEGE AND UNIVERSITY ENTRANTS, 1962-1966.

Maori figures taken from Table 9.3 Comparative total
N.Z. figures from 5.10, 5.9 and 5.8 (1962), Educ. Statistics of N.Z.

Year	Leavers from F.3 & 4.	% of Total Leavers	Leavers with S.C. of Better	% of Total Leavers	Total Leavers	No1 of Leavers to Tch's College	%	% of Leavers to University
N.Z. TOTAL FIGURES								
1962	13929	35.2	12235	30.9	39631	1724	4.3	6.5
1963	13379	31.0	14322	33.2	43202	1762	4.1	7.1
1964	12556	27.6	16582	36.5	45500	2026	4.5	8.4
1965	12158	26.2	17496	37.7	46379	2136	4.6	8.5
1966	11715	25.4	17810	38.6	46159	2166	4.7	9.3
MAORI PUPILS								
1962	1918	57.7	217	6.5	3326	62	1.9	0.9
1963	2017	55.5	234	6.4	3637	48	1.3	0.8
1964	1995	51.5	294	7.6	3878	65	1.7	1.0
1965	2137	48.8	364	8.3	4383	66	1.5	1.1
1966	2166	47.1	400	8.7	4597	82	1.8	1.1

APPENDIX II

SUMMARY OF RESEARCHERS IN POLYNESIAN
EDUCATION AND SOME OF THEIR SUGGESTED DETERMINANTS.

	Cultural							Social							Gene					
	Lower Intellectual	Different Cognitive Pattern	Rural Maori World	No Tradition of Professnl. Achievement.	Pattern of Child rearing	Different Cultural Background	Language Difficulties	Absenteeism Later Starting Age	Racial Prejudice	Lower Class Status	Large Families	Low Self-esteem	Low per capita Income	Rural Residence	Sub-standard, Overcrowded Housing	School & Career Ignorance of Parents	Low Level of Parent Child Interaction	Low Level of Parents Education	School System Inadequate	Lower Intellectual Functioning
	<div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 5px; width: fit-content;"> <p align="center">KEY</p> <p>Accepted as a causal factor X</p> <p>Rejected as a causal factor O</p> <p>Not Mentioned</p> </div>																			
Ausubel (1961)	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	O
Lovegrove (1965)				X		X	X					X	X	X			X	X	O	
McClew (1958)						X	X	X							X	X				
McCreary (1966)						X	X							X	X					
Benton (1965)							X				X					X				
Smith (1956)									X				X							
Watson (1967)		X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X		X		X	X		
Walker (1967)				X		X	X		X		X	X		X		X	X			
Ritchie (1956)					X	X	X	X						X	X	X			X	
Holst (1957)						X	X						X	X			X	X		
Kawharu (1965)						X											X			
Butterworth (1967)		X	X	X	X		X			X		X	X	X	X	X	X		O	
N.Z.E.I. (1967)				X	X	X	X						X				X	X		
Edwards (1969)						X	X			X		X				X		X	O	
Schwimmer (1964 & 1968)		X			X	X	X										X	X		
Ball (1969)					X		X				X					X	X	X		
1962 Commission									X	X				X	X	X				
Dept. Education (1962)							X								X	X	X		O	
N.Z.Govt. (G9) (1968)						X												X		
McQueen (1945)								X								X			O	
Hunn (1969)															X				O	
Dewes (1968)																		X		
N.D.C. (1969)							X													

Source: Harker, R.K. Maori Education & Research. Australia and New Zealand Journal of Sociology, Vol. 7, April, 1971.

REFERENCES

ARTICLES:

- Anderson, L., and Aitken, R. "A Study of the Speech Idiom of Maori Children in the Western Bay of Plenty," New Zealand Council of Educational Research, 1965. Mimeographed.
- Ausubel, D.P. "How Reversible are the Cognitive and Motivational Effects of Cultural Deprivation? Implications for Teaching the Culturally Deprived Child." Urban Education 1, 16-38, 1964.
- Barrington, J.M. "Maori Scholastic Achievement - A Symposium; A Historical Review of Policies and Provisions," New Zealand Journal of Educational Studies, Vol. 1. No. 1, May, 1966.
- Biggs, B. "Maori Affairs and the Hunn Report," Journal of the Polynesian Society, Vol. 70, No. 3, September, 1961.
- Borg, W.R. "Ability Grouping in Public Schools," Journal of Experimental Education, Vol. 34, 1965.
- Christian, C.C. "The Acculturation of the Bilingual Child," Modern Language Journal, Vol. 49, No. 3, March, 1965.
- Cohen, Rosalie A. "Conceptual Styles, Culture Conflict, and Non Verbal Tests of Intelligence," American Anthropologist, Vol. 71, October, 1969.
- Coleman, J.S. "The Concept of Equality of Opportunity," Harvard Educational Review, Harvard University Press, 1969.
- Corich, M.N. "Maori Secondary Education," New Zealand Monthly Review, No. 101, June, 1969.
- Curson, P.H. "Polynesians and Residence in Auckland," New Zealand Geographer, Vol. 26, No. 2, October, 1970.
- Davis, J. "Maori Education", Northland, April, 1963.
- Dawson, R.W.K., Brown, D.F., and Maurer, E. "Cultural Deprivation," Journal of the New Zealand Post Primary Teachers' Association, Oct/Nov, 1971.
- Deutsch, Martin. "Facilitating Development in the Pre-School Child: Social and Psychological Perspectives," Merrill-Palmer Quarterly, Vol. 10, No. 3, July, 1964.
- Edwards, S.R. "Have we a Maori Problem?" Journal of the Post Primary Teachers' Association, March/April, 1969.

- Ervin, S.M. and Osgood, C.M. "Second Language Learning and Bilingualism," Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 49:139-46, 1959.
- Fishman, Joshua A. "Status and Prospects of Bilingualism in the United States," Modern Language Journal, Vol. 49, No.3, March, 1965.
- Geddes, W.R. "Maori and Aboriginee: A Comparison of Attitudes and Policies," Australian Journal of Science, Vol. 24, No. 5, November, 1961.
- Hamill, E.F. "P.P.T.A. Stresses Need for Better Education," National Education, March 1, 1971.
- Harker, R.K. "Maori Enrolment at New Zealand Universities 1956-1968," New Zealand Journal of Educational Studies, Vol. 5, No. 2, 142-152 November, 1970.
- Harker, R.K. "Maori Education and Research," Australian and New Zealand Journal of Sociology, Vol. 7, April, 1971.
- Harker, R.K. "Socio Economic and Cultural Factors in Maori Academic Attainment," Journal of the Polynesian Society, Vol. 80, No. 1, 20-41, March, 1971.
- Hilliard, N. "Maoris in Board Schools," New Zealand Monthly Review, Vol. 2, No. 15, August, 1961.
- Holst, H.B. "The Maori Child's First Year at a Post Primary School," Education, No. 6, 1957.
- Holst, Halvor. "The Maori Schools in Rural Education: An Historical Survey," Education, Vol. 7, No. 1, March, 1958.
- Holst, Halvor B. "Understanding Maori and Island Children," Lopdell House Opening Address, December, 1969.
(Cyclostyled)
- Holst, H.B. "The Education of Maori Children: A Review," Education, No. 4, 1971.
- Hunn, J.K. "The Maori Education Foundation," Journal of the Polynesian Society, March, 1964.
- Irvine, Jean. "Some Basic Questions in Maori Education," Education, No. 9, November, 1960.
- Jensen, A.R. "How Much Can We Boost I.Q. and Scholastic Achievement?" Harvard Education Review, 39(1): 1-123, 1969.
- Katz, Irwin. "Review of Evidence Relating to Effects of Desegregation on the Intellectual Performance of Negroes," American Psychologist, Vol. 19, No. 6, 1964.

- Lambert, W.E. "Psychological Approaches to the Study of Language; on Second Language Learning and Bilingualism" Modern Language Journal, 47: 114-21, 1963
- Lovegrove, M.N. "Changing Attitudes to Maori Education," National Education, July, 1963.
- Lovegrove, M.N. "Maori Underachievement," Journal of the Polynesian Society, March, 1964.
- Lovegrove, M.N. "The Scholastic Achievements of Maori and European Pupils," New Zealand Journal of Educational Studies, Vol. I, No. I, 1966.
- McCreary, J.R. "Reading Tests with Maori Children," New Zealand Journal of Educational Studies, Vol. I, No. I, May, 1966.
- McKenzie, Douglas. "Maori Education Still Trailing Behind," Manawatu Evening Standard. July, 1970.
- Maurer, E. and Dawson, R.W.K. "Cultural Deprivation and Guidance Counselling," Journal of Post Primary Teachers' Association, New Zealand: Oct/Nov, 1971.
- Mitchell, Ian. "Maori Education," New Zealand Monthly Review, Vol. 8, No. 5, Dec/Jan., 1967-68.
- Mol, J.J. "Integration Versus Segregation in the New Zealand Churches," British Journal of Sociology, Vol. 16. 140-9, 1965.
- Parr, C.J. "Maori Literacy 1843-1867," Journal of the Polynesian Society, Vol. 72, 1963.
- Parsonage, W. "Education of Maoris in New Zealand," Journal of the Polynesian Society, Vol. 65, March, 1956.
- Parsons, Talcott. "Full Citizenship for the Negro American?" Daedalus, No. 94: 1,009-54, 1965.
- Pearson, J. "The Maori People," Landfall, Vol. 16, 1962.
- Peal, E., and Lambert, W.E. "The Relation of Bilingualism to Intelligence," Psychological Monographs, (American Psychological Association) Vol. 76, 1962.
- Pinfold, F.M. "Maori Children in Board Schools," National Education, July, 1957.
- Powell, Guy. "The Maori School - A Cultural Dynamic," Journal of the Polynesian Society, Vol. 64, No. 3, September, 1955.
- Ritchie, James. "Human Problems and Educational Change in a Maori Community," Journal of the Polynesian Society, Vol. 65, No. I, March, 1956.
- Ritchie, James. "Two People One Nation, But . . ." Association Study of Childhood Education, 1962.

- Rowland, D.T. "Maori Migration to Auckland," New Zealand Geographer, Vol. 27, No. 1, 21-37 April, 1971.
- Rowland, D.T. "Process of Maori Urbanisation," New Zealand Geographer, Vol. 28, No. 1, 1-22, April, 1972.
- Royal, T.K. "The Education of Non-European Children," Lopdell House Course for Forms I to IV, 1968. (cyclostyled)
- Schwimmer, Erik. "A Sense of Belonging," Education, Vol. 15, No. 1, 1966.
- Schwimmer, Erik. "The Mediator," Journal of the Polynesian Society, December, 1968.
- Stenhouse, David. "'Problems' or 'Philosophy' in Teacher Training," New Zealand Journal of Educational Studies, 4 (1): 1-14, 1969.
- Stenhouse, David. "Good Persons, Good Teachers and Language Games," Education Philosophy and Theory, Vol. 1, 1969.
- Stenhouse, David. "O'Connors Paradox and the Teaching of Educational Philosophy," British Journal of Educational Studies, 16 (3): 243-257, 1968.
- "Survey Upon Disadvantaged and Deprived Pupils in the Waikato, King Country and Thames Valley Areas, November, 1971," Post Primary Teachers' Association Journal, New Zealand: March, 1972.
- Swift, D.F. "Family Environment and Eleven Plus Success: Some Basic Predictors," Journal of Educational Psychology, Vol. 37, February, 1967.
- Tamahere. "Native Education," National Education, October, 1964.
- Tauroa, L. "The Hunn Report," Student, No. 2, April, 1961.
- Watson, J.E. "Studies of Maori Schooling," Education, May, 1960.
- Williams, W. Journal 1860, Alexander Turnbull Library, Wellington.

BOOKS

- Association For The Study of Childhood. Equality of Opportunity Through Education. 1971 lectures delivered to the Association, Wellington 1972.
- Ausubel, D.P. Maori Youth. Price Milburn, Wellington, 1964
- Ausubel, D.P. The Fern and The Tiki. Holt, Rinehart, Winston, New York: 1960.
- Ausubel, D.P., and Robinson, F.G. School Learning: An Introduction to Educational Psychology. Holt, Rinehart & Winston, New York: 1969.

- Barham, I.H. The English Vocabulary and Sentence Structure of Maori Children. New Zealand Council for Educational Research, Wellington: 1965.
- Beaglehole, E. and Beaglehole, P. Some Modern Maoris. New Zealand Council for Educational Research, Wellington: 1946.
- Bender, B.W. Linguistic Factors in Maori Education. New Zealand Council for Educational Research, Wellington: 1965.
- Benton, R.A. Research into the English Difficulties of Maori School Children. New Zealand Council for Educational Research, Wellington: 1965.
- Bernstein, Basil. Social Structure, Language, and Learning. in Harry A. Passow, Education of the Disadvantaged, Holt, Rinehart, Winston, New York: 1967.
- Booth, J.M., and Hunn, J.K. The Integration of the Maori and Pakeha. Department of Maori Affairs, Wellington, 1962.
- Brown, William. New Zealand and its Aborigines. Smith, Elder, and Co., 1845.
- Bruner, J.S. (et al.) ed. Studies in Cognitive Growth. John Wiley & Sons, New York: 1966.
- Buckley, Walter. Sociology and Modern Systems Theory. Prentice-Hall, New Jersey: 1967.
- Butterworth, G.V. The Maori in the New Zealand Economy. Department of Industries and Commerce, Wellington: 1967.
- Collingwood, R.G. in A Hundred Years of Philosophy. John Passmore, Gerald Duckworth, London, 1961.
- Department of Education. Some Educational Facilities for Maori People. Government Printer, Wellington: 1955.
- Deutsch, Martin. The Role of Social Class in Language Development. in Passow, A.H. (et al.) eds. Education of the Disadvantaged. Holt, Rinehart & Winston Inc., New York: 1967.
- Emmerij, L. (Ed) Equal Educational Opportunity. A Statement of the Problem with Reference to Recurrent Education, Centre for Educational Research and Innovation, 1971.
- Ewing, J., and Shalcrass, J. Introduction to Maori Education. Price-Milburn, Wellington: 1970.
- Fantini, S. & Weinstein, Gerald. The Disadvantaged: Challenge To Education. New York: 1968.
- Forster, J. (Ed) Social Process in New Zealand. Longman-Paul, Auckland: 1969.

- Forster, J., and Ramsay, P. Migration, Education and Occupation, The Maori Population 1936-1966. in Social Process in New Zealand. Forster, J. (ed) Longman-Paul, Auckland: 1969.
- Goldberg, Miriam L. Factors affecting Educational Attainment in Depressed Urban Areas, in A.H. Passow, (et al.) (Eds) Education of the Disadvantaged. Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1967.
- Guilford, J.P. The Nature of Human Intelligence. McGraw, Hill, New York: 1967.
- Havighurst, R.J., and Neugarten, B.L. Society and Education. Allyn and Bacon, Inc., Boston: 1967.
- Hirst, P.H. Educational Theory, in J.W. Tibble (Ed), The Study of Education. Routledge & Kegan Paul, London: 1966.
- Homans, G.C. The Human Group. Harcourt Brace, New York: 1961.
- Inhelder, Barbel. Operational Thought and Symbolic Imagery, in Mussen, P.H. (ed) European Research in Cognitive Development. Report of the International Conference on Cognitive Development. Monographs of the Society for Research in Child Development. Serial No. 100, Vol. 30, No. 2. 1965.
- Jackson, P.M. (ed) Maori and Education. Ferguson & Osborn, Wellington: 1931.
- Kuhn, Thomas. The Structure of Scientific Revolutions. University of Chicago Press, Chicago: 1962.
- McCreary, J.S. Achievements on the A.C.E.R. Tests of the Children Ruatahuna. School of Social Science, Wellington: 1958.
- McCreary, J.R. Population Growth and Urbanisation, in Erik Schwimmer, (Ed) The Maori People in the Nineteen Sixties. Blackwood and Janet Paul, 1968.
- McQueen, H.C., et al. The Background of Guidance. Wellington: 1941.
- Metge, Joan. The Maoris of New Zealand. Routledge & Kegan Paul, London: 1967.
- Metge, Joan. The New Maori Migration. Melbourne University Press, Victoria: 1964.
- Mitchell, D.R. Education and the Disadvantaged Child, in Richard Bates, (Ed) Prospects in New Zealand Education. Hodder & Stroughton, 1970.
- Mitchell, F.W. Some Underlying Assumptions, in F.W. Mitchell, New Zealand Education Today. A.H. & A.W. Reed, Wellington: 1968.
- Musgrave, P.W. The Sociology of Education. Methuen, London: 1965.

- O'Connor, D.J. An Introduction to the Philosophy of Education. Routledge & Kegan Paul, London: 1957.
- Passmore, J.E. A Hundred Years of Philosophy. Duckworth, London: 1966.
- Peters, R.S. Ethics and Education. George Allen & Unwin, London: 1966.
- Peters, R.S. The Concept of Education. Routledge & Kegan Paul, New York: 1967.
- Piddington, Ralph. Emergent Development and Integration, in Erik Schwimmer, (Ed) The Maori People in the Nineteen Sixties. Blackwood & Janet Paul, 1968.
- Reissman, F. The Culturally Deprived Child. Harper & Row, New York: 1962.
- Ritchie, James. The Making of a Maori. A.J. & A.H. Reed, Wellington: 1963.
- Ritchie, Jane, and Ritchie, James. Child Rearing Patterns in New Zealand. A.H. & A.W. Reed, Wellington: 1970.
- Schwimmer, Erik. The World of the Maori. A.H. & A.W. Reed, Wellington: 1966.
- Schwimmer, Erik. (Ed) The Maori People in the Nineteen Sixties. Blackwood & Janet Paul, 1968.
- Smyth, Patrick. The Problem of Educating the Maori, in Jackson, F.M. (ed) Maori and Education. Ferguson & Osborn, 1931.
- Stenhouse, David. Unstated Assumptions in Education. A Cross-Cultural Investigation. Hicks, Smith & Sons, Wellington: 1972.
- Sutch, W.B. The Maori Contribution: Yesterday, Today and Tomorrow. Department of Industries and Commerce, Wellington: 1964.
- Sutherland, I.L.G. (Ed) The Maori People Today. New Zealand Council of Educational Research, Wellington: 1940.
- Thompson, R. Race Relations in New Zealand. National Council of Churches, Christchurch: 1963.
- Travers, R.M.W. An Introduction to Educational Research. Macmillan, New York: 1964.
- U.N.E.S.C.O. Compulsory Education in New Zealand. United Nations, 1952.
- Waismann, Friedrich. The Principles of Linguistic Philosophy. London: 1965.

Watson, J.E. Horizons of Unknown Power; Some Issues of Maori Schooling. New Zealand Council of Educational Research, Wellington: 1967.

THESES:

Barrington, J.M. Maori Education and Society 1867-1940. Unpublished M.A. Thesis, Department of Education, Victoria University Wellington: 1965.

Beaglehole, T.H. Maori Schools 1816-1880. Unpublished M.A. Thesis, Department of History, Victoria University Wellington: 1955.

Kirk, P.E. The Effect of a Variety of Environmental Factors on Maori Children's Educational Performance. Victoria University Wellington: 1963.

Lovegrove, M.N. A Cross-Cultural Study of Scholastic Achievement and Selected Determiners. Unpublished Ph.D. Thesis, Auckland University: 1965.

McClew, A. A Comparative Study of the Reading Achievement of Maori and European Children in an Urban School. Unpublished M.A. Thesis, Auckland University: 1958.

Ramsay, P.D.K. Historical Survey of Maori Education 1940-1965. Unpublished M.A. Thesis, Department of Education, Victoria University: 1969.

Rowland, D.T. The Maori Population of the Auckland Area. M.A. Thesis, University of Auckland: 1969.

Smith, Leone. Educational Assessments of Maori Children. Unpublished M.A. Thesis, Auckland University: 1956.

Spragg, H.W. Government Policy and Native Education 1858-1879. Unpublished M.A. Thesis, Department of History, Auckland University: 1942.

OFFICIAL REPORTS, YEARBOOKS, ETC.

Ashwell, B.Y. Letters and Journals: 200-202, 1846.

Ball, D.G. Chairman's Statement for The Sixth Annual Report of the Maori Education Foundation. Government Printer: 1967.

Ball, D.G. Chairman's Statement for the Eighth Annual Report of the Maori Education Foundation. Garratt Printing Co., Wellington: 1969

Department of Education. A Review of Recent Developments in the Education of Maori Children. 1970. (Cyclostyled).

- Department of Industries and Commerce. The Maori in the New Economy. Wellington: 1967.
- Department of Statistics. Population Census Reports, 1961, 1966, 1967, 1970.
- Department of Education. Education Statistics of New Zealand. Part I. 1971, Wellington
- Hunn, J.K. Report on the Department of Maori Affairs. Government Printer, 1960.
- Maori Education Foundation Annual Reports. Ball, D.G. (Chairman) 1961 to 1970 inclusive, Government Printer, Wellington.
- New Zealand Educational Institute. Report and Recommendations on Maori Education. Wellington: 1967.
- New Zealand Post Primary Teachers' Association. Conference Report South Auckland Region. 1969 (Cyclostyled)
- New Zealand Post Primary Teachers' Association. Maori Education: An Interim Report. 1970. (Cyclostyled)
- New Zealand Council for Education Research. Research Needed In the Education of Maori Children. N.Z.C.E.R. Wellington: 1962.
- New Zealand Council for Educational Research. Educational Reconstruction of the Maori Schools. 1944. (Cyclostyled)
- New Zealand Year Books 1961 to 1971. Department of Statistics, Government Printer, Wellington.
- Report of the Curriculum Review Group. Education in Change. New Zealand Post Primary Teachers' Association, Longman-Paul, 1969.
- Report of the National Advisory Committee on Maori Education. Maori Education. 1971.
- Report of the Department of Education for the Period ended 1972. Government Printer, Wellington: 1972.
- Report of the Commission on Education in New Zealand. Government Printer, Wellington: 1962.
- Selwyn, C.J. & L.F. Annals of the Diocese of New Zealand. London: 1847.
- Shorter Oxford English Dictionary. Oxford University Press, 3rd Edition, 1959.