DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 377 691 FL 022 650

AUTHOR McPherson, Jan
TITLE Making Changes: Action Research for Developing Maori-Language Policies in Mainstream Schools.
INSTITUTION New Zealand Council for Educational Research, Wellington.
REPORT NO ISBN-0-908916-72-8
PUB DATE 94
NOTE 103p.
AVAILABLE FROM NZCER Distribution Services, P.O. Box 3237, Wellington, New Zealand.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC05 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Action Research; Case Studies; Change Strategies; Educational Change; *Educational Policy; Elementary Education; Foreign Countries; *Indigenous Populations; Program Descriptions; Program Development; Program Effectiveness; Public Policy; Research Problems; Uncommonly Taught Languages
IDENTIFIERS *Maori (Language); New Zealand

ABSTRACT

A study looked at ways in which two New Zealand elementary schools responded to the interests of their multicultural communities through language programs. The schools developed Maori language instruction programs in response to community interest and recently-established national policy. The study's report begins with an overview of the major language issues facing schools in New Zealand, in the context of major change within the educational system. It then describes the principles of action research and this study's approach, of which action research is an integral part. The case studies of the two schools are then presented. They describe the schools and their communities and document the research process over the course of a year of program evolution. A separate chapter is devoted to discussion of difficulties in accommodating culturally sensitive language instruction in a traditional curriculum structure. The final chapter reflects on the formative/action research process and the different experiences of the two schools. It is concluded that the Maori language teaching issue is an urgent one and should not be left to Maori teachers to resolve without support. Contains 70 references. (MSE)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 377 691

FL

JAN McPHERSON

MAKING CHANGES

ACTION RESEARCH FOR DEVELOPING MĀORI-LANGUAGE POLICIES IN MAINSTREAM SCHOOLS

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

J. F. Swann

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)"

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality

- Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

022 650

NEW ZEALAND COUNCIL FOR EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH

MAKING CHANGES

ACTION RESEARCH FOR DEVELOPING MĀORI-LANGUAGE POLICIES IN MAINSTREAM SCHOOLS

Jan McPherson

NEW ZEALAND COUNCIL
FOR EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH
WELLINGTON
1994

New Zealand Council for Educational Research
PO Box 3237
Wellington
New Zealand

©NZCER 1994

ISBN 0-908916-72-8

Cover design by Jennifer Lautusi

Distributed by NZCER Distribution Services
PO Box 3237
Wellington
New Zealand

ABSTRACT

THE study looks at ways in which 2 primary schools responded to the interests of their bicultural and multicultural communities through their language programmes. A feature of the project is the use of an action-research approach which involved the researcher as an active participant in the changes. The directions for change in each school followed priorities identified by the school communities as part of the action-research process. As a major aim of the research was to be responsive to the specific context of each school, the research has evolved quite differently in each school. The project demonstrates the difficulties of trying to establish set formulas for change and development in schools; it also points to some of the problems - and advantages - of using an action-research approach.

Acknowledgments

Nga mihi nui ki a koutou e te whanui mo tō koutou tautoko, awhi me tō kaha hoki. I mahi tahi mātou ki te hapai te kaupapa mo tā tātou tamariki mo apōpō mai.

This report rests so much on the work and ideas of others, that claiming authorship is problematic. Having said that, responsibility for flaws in interpretation and explanation are, I'm afraid, entirely mine.

The time, energy, commitment, and expertise of the participants in the research cannot be measured, and their willingness to share their insights and concerns honestly and openly provided the backbone to this research. In order to preserve confidentiality, however, it is not possible to acknowledge these people by name.

In writing up the research, I have received considerable support from the people that I work with, and they too have shared their ideas and knowledge generously. In particular I would like to thank: Bill, Frances, Teresa, Kath, Peti, Pat, Brian, and Debi.

The project was sponsored by the J R McKenzie Trust and overseen and administered by NZCER. The wisdom, support, and patience of Val Podmore, Anne Meade, and Richard Benton have been more than could have been asked. Thanks also to Fay Swann and Sonia Tamasese for editorial and formatting work on the manuscript.

Finally, thanks go to my friends, especially Lisa, who proofread the report, and Sally, for putting up with me; and, even more to my family: Paul, Clem, Grace, and Freya (who was born during the latter part of the research, and attended meetings with remarkable equanimity!).

J R McKenzie Trust

This research project was made possible by the generosity of the J R McKenzie Trust which has enabled the New Zealand Council for Educational Research to offer a fellowship in educational research since 1962. The award was offered annually until 1978 at which time its value was increased but it was offered only every 2 years. The award then became known as the J R McKenzie Senior Fellowship. Twenty-six fellowships have been awarded since 1962. In 1991/1992 the fellowship was awarded to Jan McPherson.

CONTENTS

Page

Abstract iii

Acknowledgments iv

J R McKenzie Trust iv

Introduction 1

Background to the Research 1
The Purpose of the Research 2
The Report 2
Conclusion 3

Chapter 1: Key Issues in Language and Education in Aotearoa/New Zealand 5

Language and Languages - General Issues 6
  The Framework: The Best Model for Language in Education? 6
  Language and Discrimination 7
  Language or English? 8
English and ESL 9
  English - What English? 9
  English as a Second Language 10
Te Reo Māori 12
Languages Other Than English or Māori - LOTEM 16
  Community Languages 16
  International Languages 18
Summary 19

Chapter 2: Putting Research into Practice 21

Action Research: Purposes and Principles 21
  The Fundamentals of Action Research 21
  The Action-research Spiral 22
  The Emancipatory Intent 23
Implementing This Action-research Project 24
  The Research Schedule 25

Chapter 3: Te Maha School 29

School and Community 29
School Development - Teacher Development 33
  Creating a Learning Environment 34
  Going Beyond Monoculturalism 35

The Research 38
- Stage 1: Getting Started 38
- Stage 2: Interviews and Emergent Concerns 40
- Stage 3: Reporting Back and Taking Action 40

Conclusion 47

Chapter 4: Rimuroa School 49

School and Community 49
Staff and School Development 51
- The Bilingual Classes 52
- Other Areas of Development 53

The Research 54
- Stage 1: Getting Started 54
- Stage 2: Interviews and Policy Issues 57
- Stage 3: Reporting Back and Taking Action 62

Conclusion 66

Chapter 5: Bilingual classes in Mainstream Schools 69

Language and Discourse 70
- What is Bilingual Education? 70
- Talking About Bilingual Education 71
- The "Dangers" of Bilingual Education 73

Activities and Practices: Who Does What? 75
- Extra Pressures on Māori Staff in Bilingual Classes 75
- Wider Responsibility for Te Reo and Tikanga Māori in Schools 76

Social Relationships and Organisation 77
Balancing Unity and Autonomy 78
Summary 78

Chapter 6: Reflecting on the Research Process 81

Research Procedures 81
- Keeping Records 81
- Giving Feedback 83
- Confidentiality 84
- Involvement 85

The Research Context 86
- Whose Agenda Does the Research Address? 86
- Making Time Available 87

What Is the Role of the Researcher in Action Research? 88
Conclusion 89

References 91

Glossary 97

INTRODUCTION

The New Zealand Curriculum Framework situates languages and language at the heart of the curriculum spiral, and this placing underscores the very central role that language plays in our lives and in our learning. Children's success in the education system is tied inextricably to their language: to the ways that they express themselves; and to their ability to engage with the "language" of the school. However, the "language" of the school and the language practices that are generally valued in schools tend to reflect the language practices of those with most power in society. In Aotearoa/New Zealand most classrooms are shaped by middle class Pākehā conventions and language practices, and it is those children whose language differs from "standard New Zealand English" who are least likely to enjoy educational success.

What can teachers and schools do about this? What changes to the language practices and policies of schools might ensure that children from non-dominant groups are not being disadvantaged by schooling? How can we ensure that all children are able to participate fully in a fair and just education?

This report describes what happened over the period of a year in 2 schools faced with these challenges. The report discusses some of the issues that influenced the actions taken in each context, and considers the contribution that an action research-approach was able to make to the changes that were undertaken during this time.

Background to the Research

This research project grew out of an earlier project in which teachers in 8 schools were involved in working on school language policy (McPherson and Corson, 1989). That project tracked the process of policy development in the schools and identified the focus and purposes of the policies that were developed. Within the research, the ways in which school language policies could or should contribute to more equitable educational practice emerged as perhaps the most contentious and difficult area of policy concern. Although there was no follow-up research to evaluate policy implementation, a study of the policies themselves indicated that their potential to contribute to establishing a basis for more equitable schooling was severely limited (McPherson, 1992).

It was evident within that project that there were many teachers who were dedicated to providing the very best possible education for *all* children; they were also concerned that school practices did little to alter patterns of disadvantage and underachievement. It was also apparent that teachers were actively exploring possibilities for change, both in their own classrooms and in the school as a whole. However, despite the fact that these teachers were committed to teaching, open to ideas, and willing to make changes, it seemed that this energy was not necessarily being used effectively in terms of really making a difference to what was happening at the schools in terms of equity. This was frustrating and disheartening for those involved.

The research approach used in the earlier project documented the process of policy development in the schools, but did not take a directly active role in the process. It seemed that a systematic research approach that *did* take an active role in encouraging and supporting critical self-reflection and collaboration might be more useful in making a contribution to the sorts of change that teachers were exploring. *Action research* provides such an approach.

The current research project stemmed, then, from:

- a recognition of the critical role that language plays in education;
- an acknowledgment of the commitment that the majority of teachers have towards providing a fair and just education;
- a belief that improvement in education is best achieved through collaborative decision making by those who are involved in practice (and this point also underscores the belief that those who are involved have the expertise and ability to make the best decisions within their own context); and
- a belief that action research can provide a basis for collaborative, democratic, and reasoned improvement in educational practice.

The Purpose of the Research

The central purpose of the project was to work with 2 schools, within which the need to address language issues had already been identified as crucial to the schools' commitment to equity. Working together with teachers and others in the school community, the research purpose was to:

- look systematically and critically at current language practices;
- identify possibilities for change and improvement; and
- monitor and evaluate the actions taken as the basis for continuing development.

The research was therefore concerned with *improvement* and *involvement*, and these are fundamental to the action-research approach that was used in the project.

The Report

The primary "audience" for action research is the group who are actually participating in the research itself. This report, however, is for a wider audience. It attempts to capture the story of what was done in these schools, not as an example of what other schools or researchers should do, but as a basis for stimulating ideas about what might be done.

Chapter 1 provides an outline of the major language issues facing schools in Aotearoa/New Zealand. The research was undertaken against a background of massive upheaval in education, and although there have been significant developments since (especially in terms of national curriculum statements, and the continued development of Māori-language initiatives) the issues themselves are of enduring relevance.

Chapter 2 describes the purpose and principles of the action-research approach and provides an outline of the research schedule that was followed.

Chapters 3 and 4 comprise the case-study reports. These describe the schools and their communities, and document the research process as it unfolded in each setting. The studies provide a summary of the concerns that teachers identified as important. In recounting the process of the research, they provide examples of how action research might develop in different circumstances.

The case studies provide a picture of what was happening in the schools *then*, and in this respect they are already "out of date". However, although the broader educational scene has developed and changed, the issues that schools faced then remain relevant to current circumstances. I hope that the studies are "recognisable" to those involved in practice, so that they can be used to shed light on or stimulate thinking about what is happening in different, but not necessarily totally unrelated, settings.

Chapter 5 highlights an issue that emerged as important in both schools. Both had established classes within which te reo Māori and tikanga Māori were given particular emphasis. The schools were committed to the success of these classes. However, in both schools there was an uneasy balance between achieving a structure which maintained school unity and networks of support, but at the same time managed to provide the autonomy needed to accommodate different content and forms of delivery.

The flourishing of Māori-language classes and units in schools has continued since the time that the research was undertaken: within schools, Māori education has become more established, and teachers and communities have grown in terms of their competence in te reo. However, these classes continue to face a dearth of Māori-language resources, as well as ongoing shortages in terms of experienced teachers who are fluent in te reo. If these classes are to be successful, schools need to ensure that they are sensitively supported by the school community as a whole.

Currently, schools have had little help in working out how this might best be achieved.

Chapter 6 discusses aspects of the research process. The case studies provide quite different examples of success in terms of improvement and involvement. This highlights some of the limits to action research in particular circumstances, as well as those aspects of the situation which are important if the research model is to be successful in terms of bringing about change based on collective and self-reflective decision making.

Conclusion

A recurrent theme through this report is the urgency of Māori-language issues in education. If there is one main tentative conclusion, or suggestion, that comes from my interpretation of the literature and what was happening in the 2 schools involved with the research, it is that:

> If Māori education is to succeed, then it requires considerable support in terms of funding, pre- and in-service teacher training, resourcing, research, and collegial and professional support from *all* teachers and educators.

Support is obviously required at a national level, but it is also imperative that schools too play an active role in supporting Māori-language initiatives, and that this requires that they go well beyond merely "making the space available".

Given the obvious difference in political, economic, and social power between Māori and Pākehā in society, it is up to Pākehā at both national and local levels to seek opportunities that support, but do not control or interfere with, Māori-language initiatives in education.

In schools in which there is a common commitment to promoting Māori-language initiatives, action research may provide a useful approach to determining appropriate strategies of support. The danger is that such research becomes yet another task which is seen as the responsibility of Māori teachers, and a further drain on Māori resources.

The challenge is to those who hold the power and the purse strings.

CHAPTER 1

Key Issues in Language and Education in Aotearoa/New Zealand

In general, English has been assumed to be the first language of the education system in this country, and state education has been dominated almost exclusively by English as the medium of delivery. This monopoly has, however, been challenged in recent years. Through the development of kōhanga reo, kura kaupapa Māori, and total immersion or bilingual classrooms, Māori have established the opportunity for at least some children to learn through te reo. Pacific Island groups have also established language nests in early childhood education, and it is likely that there are other groups with similar programmes. Community groups have also set up a variety of non-state-funded programmes that support the use of languages other than English. However, the development of school and early childhood programmes for learners whose first language is not English and the provision of programmes for the teaching of languages other than English has been piecemeal. Such provision has been more dependent on local resources and commitment than any clear national guidelines.

This lack of a coherent approach to language in education reflects wider uncertainty and lack of agreement regarding language priorities for Aotearoa/New Zealand. The need for a clear and comprehensive languages policy has been recognised and promoted for the last 20 years (Peddie, 1991). Although there is still currently no such policy available, *Aoteareo: Speaking for ourselves*, a discussion document on the development of such a languages policy, was published by the Ministry of Education in 1992 (Waite, 1992a, 1992b).

This report acknowledges the need for all New Zealanders to have a sound knowledge of standard New Zealand English, but strongly advocates the benefits of bilingualism, and proposes 6 ranked priorities for public policy:

1. Revitalisation of the Māori language;
2. Second-chance adult literacy;
3. Children's ESL (English as a second language) and first language maintenance;
4. Adult ESL;
5. National capabilities in international languages; and
6. Provision of services in languages other than English.

(Waite, 1992a, pp. 18-22)

This ranking reflects the emphasis that the report gives to social justice issues. However, as Peddie (1993) points out, these issues are balanced, somewhat uneasily, by "economically desirable proposals" (p. 32), and it would seem that it is this second agenda which has achieved greater emphasis in current language planning in education as outlined in the draft document *Education for the 21st Century* (Ministry of Education, 1993a).

To date (June, 1994) there has been no published follow up to the *Aoteareo*. However, the report provides an overview of the key language issues facing Aotearoa/New Zealand, and as it is likely to provide at least a foundation for future policy (Peddie, 1993), it is useful to consider its recommendations in relation to recent developments in education. The following sections of this chapter outline these key issues in language and education in Aotearoa/New Zealand with specific reference to the new curriculum documents for schools. These documents provide evidence of the Government's current priorities for language policy and development, and highlight the issues that those working in education will face as we move towards the 21st century.

Language and Languages - General Issues

The Framework: The Best Model for Language in Education?

The *New Zealand Curriculum Framework* identifies "Language and Languages" as the first of 7 interrelated essential learning areas that together provide the basis for a "broad and balanced education" (Ministry of Education, 1993c). The document emphasises the importance of language to:

- intellectual growth;
- the transmission of values and culture;
- self-esteem;
- a sense of identity; and
- achievement throughout life (p.10).

The general aims of the curriculum in this area are both broad and vague: stating for example that students need to develop confidence in using and interpreting a wide range of oral, written, and visual language (including television, computers, and other visual media). These 3 "strands" of language - oral, written, and visual - have been used to structure the English curriculum, and the draft curriculum statement establishes the desired outcomes of learning in each of these strands within a framework of 8 levels (though some of the proposed outcomes stretch across these levels).

Whether the 8-level/3-strand, outcomes-driven approach to structuring language curriculum statements will provide a model that will really improve the quality of language programmes in schools is open to debate. Elley (1994) criticises the concept of a set sequence of levels as being inconsistent with the way children learn language, which he characterises as both idiosyncratic and individual. He points out that there is little evidence to suggest that an "outcomes" model is more effective than an interest-driven approach to instruction. He also suggests the level objectives are largely common to all levels, and that, for example, difficulties in reading or listening are more a function of text complexity, familiarity, and interests of the student than a function of a particular set of skills that the student either has, or does not have.

The Education Forum (1994) criticises the division of language into 3 strands from a different philosophical perspective. It suggests that the creation of an "arbitrary" third strand to accommodate visual language (media which combine words, either spoken or written, with non-verbal information - such as film, television, comics, and so on) distracts attention from what should be the proper focus of language learning: a syllabus that emphasises reading, writing, spelling, punctuation, grammar, and literature, and restores the kudos of English as "an academic, even demanding subject" (p. 31).

Clearly, a key issue facing teachers over the coming years will be how best to implement the new curriculum statements and use the levels of learning outcomes to sensitively inform balanced language programmes. It is also likely that the debate over (declining) standards, returning to the basics, and the use of "proper" English will continue to stir strong feelings amongst the wider public as well as those directly involved in education.

Language and Discrimination

Waite points out that language can be used:

> overtly, or in more subtle ways to stigmatise, trivialise, exclude or render invisible individuals on the basis of a range of attributes that include gender, age, ethnicity, sexual orientation, and disability. (1992b, p. 8)

The *Curriculum Framework* acknowledges this aspect of language and states that the curriculum "will promote the use of language that does not discriminate against particular groups of people" (Ministry of Education, 1993c, p. 10). Obviously this requires more than the avoidance of overtly racist, sexist, or homophobic language. A critical awareness of the relationship between language and power would seem to be an essential aspect of a language programme that claims to promote the use of non-discriminatory language.

Unfortunately, there is very little in the draft English curriculum that provides guidance for the ways in which teachers might achieve this. The section on "meeting individual needs" suggests that:

> teachers could help students analyse the language of a range of texts to find out what they may reveal about attitudes towards sex roles and gender [and that] it is particularly important to help students examine the part played by the media in constructing notions of appropriate male and female roles and behaviour. (Ministry of Education, 1993b, p. 12)

Although such activities could presumably be incorporated within the curriculum objectives that involve "thinking critically", the absence of objectives that relate specifically to a critical awareness of the ways in which language can be used to discriminate against groups of people would seem to leave this area of learning dependent on the commitment of individual teachers and schools.

Within this general concern that language programmes be non-discriminatory, the *Curriculum Framework* acknowledges that the language curriculum must make provision for students who have special learning needs in the area of communication. Making the curriculum accessible to, and worthwhile for, all learners is obviously an important issue for teachers (and those who provide teacher education). However, teaching must happen within a context of adequate support. As Waite points out:

> it is crucial that the various types of support (e.g., speech-language therapy) and accommodation (e.g., alternative communication systems) be made available for people with disabilities, to enable them to achieve one of the most basic of human functions: communication. (Waite, 1992b, p. 15)

Language or English?

The *Curriculum Framework* places English within the wider context of languages and language. However, having established a model which stresses the importance of "language" to intellectual, social, emotional, and cultural growth and wellbeing, curriculum development has focused on statements that apply to specific languages rather than to "language" in a more holistic sense. Despite this, the greater part of the draft English curriculum, released in late 1993, is relevant to the language curriculum in general, rather than specifically to English, and in fact tends to use the words "English" and "language" interchangeably throughout the document. Thus, the curriculum document tends to re-establish a sense in which the implicit message would seem to be that the language curriculum is, unless specified, an English curriculum. This, in turn, carries a further implicit message about the relative (lack of) value accorded to languages other than English.

This blurring together of "language" and "English" has also been criticised by the Education Forum. This group states adamantly that "*English* [italics added] is at the core of the whole educational process . . . the means of communication and understanding on which all else is constructed" (Educational Forum, 1994, p. 1), and suggests that the draft fosters "social accommodation and amelioration rather than excellence" (p. 1).

It may be that in trying to achieve a balance between language and English, the draft English curriculum fails to do real justice to either.

The debate about whether the curriculum should be anchored in language, rather than specifically in English, is also reflected in the (rough) division of perspectives of those teaching in the early childhood-primary sectors and those teaching in the secondary sector. In general, those in the early childhood and primary sectors have described this area of curriculum as "language", and have emphasised the importance of language in all learning throughout the curriculum. In secondary schools, the subject area is usually described as "English", and here there has been less acknowledgment of the role that language plays across different curriculum areas.

Middleton (1993, 1994) argues that the *Framework* and the curriculum are important in establishing the place of English within the broader language landscape. He suggests that the term "language education" in fact better describes the kinds of endeavour that most English teachers are engaged in, and that it would be wrong to assume that this either diminishes the role of English, or denies the value of other languages:

> We want to be an English speaking country in which the language of the tāngata whenua is strong and central and affirmed as critical to our identity as a nation. We want it to be an English speaking country in which community languages are strong and used and learnt with pride and confidence. But neither of these demand that we should be in any way reticent about wanting all New Zealand children to be elegant and effective users of the English language. (Middleton. 1993, p. 41)

Although this approach would seem to provide an opportunity for balance, it again assumes that Aotearoa/New Zealand is, and should be, an "English-speaking country" rather than questioning whether and how it might also become a Māori-speaking country again.

However, given that English is both the majority and dominant language in Aotearoa/New Zealand, it is neither realistic nor possible to devise a language programme, other than one that is fully bilingual, or one that provides full immersion in a language other than English, that does not act to implicitly support the status quo. Given this, and the fact that English is the only compulsory language in the curriculum, it would appear that we have some way to go before te reo Māori really is strong, central, and critical to our national identity. This issue is explored further in the section on te reo Māori included in this chapter.

English and ESL

> Because English is the language of most New Zealanders and the major language of national and international communication, all students will need to develop the ability and confidence to communicate competently in English, in both its spoken and written forms. Provision will be made for students whose first language is not English. (Ministry of Education, 1993c, p. 10)

Aotearoa/New Zealand is undeniably a predominantly English-speaking country. It is, in fact, one of the most monolingual countries in the world, with approximately 90 to 95 percent of the population able to speak only English (Bell, 1991). As the majority language and the dominant language in most public domains, English is economically, politically, and socially powerful. For these reasons, it is clear that education must provide all students with the opportunities to "develop the skills that will enable them to participate fully and confidently in all aspects of life where English is used, both in New Zealand and in the international community" (Ministry of Education, 1993b, p. 6).

English - What English?

Although the place of English as the main language of education is assured, what constitutes "English" is still problematic. There are 2 issues at stake here.

- First, New Zealand English is different from English as it is spoken in other countries. It has a distinctive accent, and is marked in particular by a vocabulary which includes a significant element of items borrowed from Māori. The draft English curriculum states that "attention should be given to the distinctive New Zealand variety of English and New Zealand's own literature (Ministry of Education, 1993b, p. 11).

While there are signs that New Zealand English is becoming more acceptable in a variety of public domains, including the media, business, politics, and education (Bell, 1991, p. 74), there is ongoing debate about the standards that should be set for New Zealand English. The Education Forum, for example, suggests that education should "curb the worst excesses of demotic New Zealand speech - such as the pronunciation of 'Alps' as 'elps'", and that New Zealand English should not be used as an excuse for "slovenly speech" (The Education Forum, 1994, p. 16). Having supposedly accepted a New Zealand "dialect" as valid, it is interesting that the Forum objects to a characteristic feature of vowel use. Bell (1991) describes such prescriptive approaches to language as "linguistic colonialism". Models of good language are located at a distance - either geographically (i.e., in Britain), or in time (e.g., Dickens or Shakespeare).

- Second, the label "New Zealand English" includes a range of language varieties. Standard New Zealand English is that form of English which enjoys the greatest prestige in education, and is associated with the variety of English that is used by those who exercise most social, political, and economic power. Non-standard varieties of English are most commonly used by those who are in disadvantaged sectors of society, and the varieties of English that they use are frequently devalued by users of the standard variety as "bad", "poor", or "lazy" English, and therefore, "rightly" excluded from education. As Bell (1991) notes, such attitudes and judgments are arbitrary and "have nothing to do with the intrinsic value or beauty of the (varieties) in question, and everything to do with the social position of those who use them" (p. 73). On these grounds, it could be argued that non-standard varieties of language have a claim to be recognised as educationally valid. Waite provides a clear description of the challenges that this situation creates for education:

> One is to recognise the validity of non-standard varieties that students use at home and at school, and to encourage them to develop as learners, with their own variety of language as the starting point. The other is to enable all students to learn to use the standard variety, in addition to the non-standard variety they may use, given that it is through the standard varieties that people have access to opportunities in the labour market and elsewhere in society. (Waite, 1992b, p. 23)

This approach acknowledges the unequal status of standard and non-standard varieties but accepts that, realistically, education has an obligation to equip learners to deal with their world through the standard variety as well as their own variety of English. It would seem important that such an approach be taken within a context in which the processes of power and control which shape the politics of language variety are not accepted unquestioningly, but are made transparent, discussed, and challenged.

The draft English curriculum offers little guidance on this issue. It suggests that "an inclusive curriculum which is responsive to a wide diversity of perspectives and linguistic backgrounds, can enrich English education for all students" (Ministry of Education, 1993b, p. 12). It also emphasises the need to include Māori perspectives in approaches to teaching and learning and in selecting spoken, written, and visual texts for use. Given that Māori-accented English is one of the most clearly defined and growing non-standard varieties of English in this country, and a very powerful marker of group identity (Gordon, 1991), it might be appropriate to see that it makes its way into classrooms with greater frequency, and with more status than at present.

English as a Second Language

ESL provision in New Zealand schools has been haphazard and underfunded. Peddie (1991) emphasises the urgent need for far more substantial and structured provision, and points out that while initial costs may be high, they should be regarded as an investment. He claims that the benefits that result from ensuring that all children develop the English-language skills necessary for further education and full participation in the economy far outweigh the costs of ensuring adequate ESL provision. Internationally, language-minority students are not served well by education and are likely to leave school "as an undereducated underclass with minimal prospects for jobs or social opportunity" (Skutnabb-Kangas and Cummins, 1988, p. 1). A recent OECD survey of reading literacy highlights the severity of this issue in Aotearoa/New Zealand: while overall results indicate that Aotearoa/New Zealand was among the highest-scoring countries in reading achievement, they also show that Aotearoa/New

Zealand had the largest average difference between language-majority and language-minority students (Wagemaker, 1993, p. 51).

Although ESOL (English as a second or other language) funding was increased in the 1993 budget, it still appears to fall far short of what is required. According to Ministry of Education data gathered over the past 3 years, the number of children from non-English-speaking backgrounds (NESB) entering schools has grown rapidly (Atkinson, 1992; Preddey, 1994). There are now approximately 46,000 NESB students in New Zealand schools. Of these, approximately 13,000 are judged as not in need of additional ESL support (Ministry of Education, 1993d). The Ministry's discretionary ESOL funding is targeted towards short-term English support for approximately 2000 children in standards 1 to 4; 3000 children in forms 1 and 2; and 8000 secondary students. These figures indicate that schools are faced with an additional 20,000 students who have been identified as in need of additional support, but for whom no extra resources are available.

The majority of NESB children needing but not receiving support are in primary schools. The weighting of support towards older students is based on the assumption that "most primary school children, whatever their linguistic background, acquire language rapidly, without extra assistance" (Preddey, 1994, p. 4). However, research indicates that this is not the case. While minority-language children may well pick up everyday language with relative ease, this facility may hide the fact that it may take considerably longer for them to approach class-level norms in more complex uses of the majority language (Cummins, 1981). Research would also indicate that, unless children learn the majority language within a context in which their home language and culture are incorporated and valued in the curriculum, they are likely to be "disabled" by an education which will effectively limit their potential to develop fully either their home language or their English language (Cummins, 1988; Baker, 1993). A programme which incorporates the home language and culture requires considerable community participation, and teaching and assessment procedures which are sensitive to growth in both the home language and English, so that English learning may build on the child's abilities in the home language. It is unrealistic to suggest that such provision is possible without additional support. Waite (1992b) recommends that:

> the ideal situation is one where all teachers are ESL teachers - early childhood, primary and secondary teachers alike - who receive additional support from ESL specialists in the areas of assessment and transmission (p. 27).

The lack of adequate resourcing tends to be especially pressing in particular schools because NESB students are not evenly spread through the system. Approximately 70 percent of NESB students attend schools in the Auckland region, with the second largest group (17 percent) enrolled at schools in the Lower Hutt area (Central South). In addition, the spread of NESB students across schools in these areas is very uneven.

Finally, provision is complex because there are a number of different groups, with quite different needs, who require ESL support in mainstream schools:

- *New settlers*. The fastest growing section of this group are from Chinese-speaking backgrounds whose families have moved to this country as business migrants. In 1991, 13 percent of NESB students were classed as children of business migrants, whereas only

7.5 percent were from families coming to Aotearoa/New Zealand under the refugee/reunification scheme. Some of these latter students, however, have had little or no experience of formal schooling, and are therefore in particular need of extra support (Cochrane, Lee, and Lees, 1993).

- *New Zealand-born children*. This includes children whose home language is a language other than English. There are also increasing numbers of children entering English-medium schools from kōhanga reo, and more recently there are those who have attended Pacific Island language nests before coming to school. These children may have some experience of English but it cannot be assumed that they are not in need of ESL support.

- *Fee-paying students from other countries*. An increasing number of secondary schools are encouraging overseas enrolments in an effort to subsidise Government funding (Rivers, 1994). In 1992 there were a total of 2259 fee-paying students in New Zealand schools, 1269 of them from Asian countries (Ministry of Education, 1993d). It would appear that these students are receiving considerably more support than students in other categories, and that, because funding is specifically targeted, there has been very little "sharing" of available resources with other groups (O'Connor, personal communication, May, 1994).

The Ministry has signalled its intention to focus on ESL policy (Peddie, 1993), and in the draft planning document *Education for the 21st Century* the need for more adequate planning in the area of ESL is acknowledged. The report suggests that:

> information will be gathered on the need within the education system for English language programmes for New Zealanders from non-English speaking backgrounds. By 1995, targets will be set to enable this need to be met. (Ministry of Education, 1993a, p. 35)

Given the competing demands of different groups and the complex and changing nature of the ESL "map", deciding how best to allocate ESL resources is likely to be complicated. The increasing tendency for members of the Government to stress our future as an Asian country, rather than as a Pacific country, raises concern that the interests of some Asian groups may be met at the expense of other groups (including Pacific Island groups) who currently hold little economic and political power in this country, thus further entrenching lines of disadvantage.

Te Reo Māori

> Māori is the language of the tāngata whenua of New Zealand. It is a taonga under the terms of the Treaty of Waitangi and is an official language of New Zealand. Students will have the opportunity to become proficient in Māori. (Ministry of Education, 1993c, p. 10)

Waite identified the revitalisation of the Māori language as the first of priority for any language policy for Aotearoa/New Zealand. Although te reo has had official status as a national language since 1987, its survival as a living language is precarious. As the language of the tāngata whenua, as a language that is spoken only in Aotearoa/New Zealand, and as a taonga protected under the Treaty of Waitangi, it is clear that the responsibility for safeguarding the language must be shared by both Māori and the Government.

However, whilst there is significant support for action to revitalise te reo Māori, there are also those who express considerable hostility towards attempts to revive it. For example, one columnist, well-known for his reactionary and provocative views on a range of topics, claimed recently in a national newspaper that money spent on the revival of te reo was:

> wasted, because trying to revive a discarded, unnecessary language is lost cause [sic] . . . Nobody will ever use Māori apart from a few dedicated culture freaks speaking among themselves. The rest of us, Māori included, already have a language, thanks. (Haden, June 5, 1994, p. C7)

He contrasts "anachronistic" languages such as Māori with English, which he describes as "the most expressive, flexible, vocabulary-rich and internationally-necessary language that the world has ever known, with a vast treasury of prose and poetry" (ibid.). Bell (1991) describes such attitudes as mirroring Pākehā attitudes towards Māori people, and emphasises that it is these attitudes that have effectively brought te reo Māori to the brink of extinction. He warns that "in Aotearoa we face the possibility of linguicide of the Māori language by English" (Bell, 1991, p. 67).

Clearly, the education system has played a major role in contributing to the decline in te reo. The early missionary schools used te reo Māori as the medium of instruction, and although this facilitated the speed with which Māori acquired literacy skills, the focus on literacy, the Bible, and European values also marginalised traditional Māori culture and values. In teaching only in Māori, the missionary schools also effectively restricted access to the English skills that Māori needed to be able to deal with the settlers and Government administrators, and this contributed to the decline in Māori participation in these schools. By 1880, the Native Schools Code, while making some concession to the use of te reo Māori in helping children make the transition from home to schooling in English, had established English as the language of education for all children; and by 1903, te reo Māori was forbidden in schools. Although support for the teaching of English in schools came from Māori leaders at the time, there is no evidence that they could possibly have foreseen the role that this would ultimately play in undermining te reo. Māori saw education as a means to surviving in a Pākehā-dominated world. The Government, on the other hand, saw education as a means of Europeanising Māori, and providing industrial and agricultural training to serve Pākehā interests (Simon, 1992).

However, te reo Māori has slowly crept back into the education system: first, as a subject of study in Māori secondary schools in the 1930s; and later with wider secondary school provision of Māori language courses as Māori schools were phased out. Optional courses in te reo Māori had been established at teachers' colleges by the late 1960s; and in 1974, official endorsement was given to the inclusion of te reo in the primary curriculum, though it was not until 1984 that a primary Māori language syllabus was made available for trialling in schools.

Some schools were quick to develop and implement programmes in te reo. However, in other schools, particularly in areas in which there are fewer Māori students, such programmes have sometimes met with apathy and resistance from teachers, parents, and community members. In these areas Māori language and culture are often typified as a form of cultural imposition, irrelevant to the needs of the majority and the demands of the twentieth century (Spoonley, 1988; McPherson, 1991; Jefferies, 1993).

In other instances, the development of Māori language and culture programmes has been motivated by an essentially utilitarian rationale rather than any commitment to the language and culture. The Picot Report for example states:

> It is clear that the revival of the Māori language and culture is seen not as an end in itself, but as the key to lifting the educational performance of Māori children. (Department of Education, 1988a; p. 65)

In this situation, the implicit message effectively serves to devalue Māori language and culture, and patronise Māori students. Sometimes, such programmes are built on the premise that students' self-esteem will be enhanced, and that this will contribute to improvement in their attitudes towards school and school knowledge. At other times, programmes may be based on even more cynical motives: such as the need for the schools to be seen to be making an effort, or to keep Māori people quiet (Mitchell and Mitchell, 1993). Once again, the intent of the education system would seem to be more concerned with Europeanising and subordinating Māori, rather than working towards a bilingual and bicultural society.

Obviously, not all programmes are driven by such motives and Tomorrow's Schools has provided a context within which Māori have been able to have a much greater say, both in terms of developing programmes in mainstream schools and in developing kura kaupapa Māori. The aims of these initiatives stem from a different philosophy. As Benton points out:

> [while] there is no evidence that Māori people would wish 'educational performance' to be lowered . . . the major motivating force behind the cultural revival has been an assertion of Māoritanga as relevant to Māori people because they are Māori not because they want to do well in a Pākehā system. (Benton, 1988; p. 4)

Kōhanga reo and subsequently kura kaupapa Māori stand as the most dramatic and potentially far reaching developments in Māori efforts to re-establish Māori as a living language. In kōhanga reo and kura kaupapa Māori, children are fully immersed in te reo and nga tikanga Māori: te reo is the principal language of communication and instruction; and the principal curriculum is taught entirely in Māori (Ministry of Education, 1994). The first kōhanga reo was opened in April 1982, and the movement has grown rapidly since then with 719 kōhanga reo in operation by 1992, with 12,617 children enrolled (Ministry of Education, 1993d). The kōhanga reo movement has played a leading role in fostering the participation of Māori adults as well as Māori children in early childhood education because local administration and operation of the kōhanga are the collective responsibility of the whānau (Davies and Nicholl, 1993). This experience has been important in encouraging Māori to take a much more active role in their children's education when they leave kōhanga reo and reach school.

The movement of kōhanga reo graduates into primary schools has created a demand for Māori-medium education in the primary sector; and this will inevitably also be felt at the secondary level over the coming years as greater numbers of children with kōhanga reo and some form of Māori-medium primary experience enter secondary schools. Certainly, Māori-medium education is expanding at a rapid rate: in 1992, there were 13 kura kaupapa Māori catering for 510 students; and 250 primary schools offering some form of Māori-medium education for another 13,843 children. At secondary level, 40 schools offered some form of

Māori-medium education for 2278 students, and 15 area schools involved 795 students in Māori-medium education (Ministry of Education, 1993d).

The level of immersion across schools providing Māori-medium education varies widely. The most recent figures available indicate that, as at July 1993, 13 percent of schools (358 out of 2772) offered some form of Māori-medium education. Of these:

- 4.98 percent are *maintenance programmes*. Te reo Māori is the principal language, and is used between 81-100 percent of the time. All students are expected to be able to interact freely in Māori.
- 3.07 percent are *development programmes*. Te reo Māori is used for most of the time (51-80 percent), but English is accepted as a temporary language. Whānau and school agree to achieve a particular level of immersion over time. It is likely that not all students in the programme will be able to interact in Māori fluently.
- 2.74 percent are *emerging programmes*. Māori is used between 31-50 percent of the time, and English is the main language of communication and instruction. A kaiarahi reo is usually the only fluent speaker in the programme.
- 2.13 percent of schools offered *immersion programmes* at less than the level of the emerging programmes.
- 87.09 percent schools had no immersion programme.
(Ministry of Education, 1994)

Studies overseas indicate that full immersion programmes are the most effective in educating children to become fluent in both the minority language (Māori) and the dominant language (English) (Waite, 1992b, pp. 35-36). Therefore it is these programmes that will be the most powerful means of supporting the revitalisation and maintenance of te reo. Currently Māori-language funding is distributed to schools on the basis of the number of Māori students at the school, regardless of the type of Māori-language programme which is being run. An internal review established by the Ministers of Education and Māori Affairs (Ministry of Education, 1994) however, proposed, as did Waite (1992b), that funding should be targeted to those programmes most likely to produce fluent Māori speakers. These would probably include maintenance and development programmes. The Ministry acknowledges the concern that this may limit support for those Māori children in schools which do not run immersion programmes. However, it suggests that the proposed policy:

> aims to encourage schools to extend existing Māori language programmes or establish new ones. This would assist in the revitalisation, retention, and maintenance of te reo Māori, strengthen links between iwi and schools, and help support the full participation and success of Māori in the education system. (Ministry of Education, 1994, p. 6)

Clearly, if schools are going to extend existing Māori language programmes, or establish new ones, the resources must be available for them to achieve this. In particular, the resources to increase the number of kura kaupapa Māori must be made available. Pre- and in-service teacher education is obviously crucial: as is the ongoing development of curriculum documents and materials. Given that, at the present time, kura kaupapa Māori are only accessible to a very small minority of children, mainstream schools also have an important role to play in the revitalisation of te reo. There is a need to continue to develop successful ways of working with the Māori community. Of particular concern is the need for schools to acknowledge and support the work done by Māori teachers in mainstream schools. Mitchell and Mitchell's (1993) report on *Māori Teachers Who Leave the Classroom* highlights the enormous pressures, the racism, and the lack of support that teachers working in bilingual and total immersion classes face.

If change is to succeed it requires the commitment and support of Government policy and must be reflected in curriculum development. *Te Whāriki* (Ministry of Education, 1993e), the draft curriculum for early childhood centres, consciously embraces a culturally and linguistically inclusive approach to the curriculum for all early childhood centres, and specifically discusses the special context of kōhanga reo. In contrast, the *Curriculum Framework's* statement that "students will have the opportunity to become proficient in Māori" (Ministry of Education, 1993c, p. 10) seems rather weak in its support for Māori. Similarly, within the targets for school improvement set for the year 2001 in *Education for the 21st Century*, Māori is grouped with "other languages", rather than maintaining a separate, and presumably special, status as is done for English. Benton (1991) clearly states the challenge that the revitalisation of te reo poses:

> if the survival of Māori is to mean more than being able to count to ten and exchange a brief greeting in what the early writers called 'the New Zealand language', the efforts of those who care about the language will have to be as strenuous in the 1990s as they were in the 1970s and 1980s, and far more will be required from those who control the resources needed to enable such efforts to prosper. (pp. 17-18)

Languages Other than English or Māori - LOTEM

Community Languages

Students whose mother tongue is a Pacific Islands language or another community language will have the opportunity to develop and use their own language as an integral part of their schooling. The nature of mother tongue programmes will be decided by schools in response to their local community needs and initiatives.

There is a very large body of literature dealing with the advantages of supporting bilingualism for children whose home language is not the majority language (Baker, 1993; Skutnabb-Kangas and Cummins, 1988). The case for bilingualism stems from a variety of concerns:

- Support for the home language is an issue of social justice.
- The inclusion of the children's home languages in the curriculum contributes to their educational achievement.
- Having a pool of bilingual speakers contributes to the country's language diversity and richness.

- Language diversity may contribute to the country's ability to participate in international trade.

Community LOTEMs spoken by New Zealanders include Cook Island Māori, Samoan, Tongan, Niuean, Tokelauan, Greek, Dutch, Chinese, German, Polish, Yugoslav, Indian languages (such as Gujerati), and Sinhalese (Holmes, 1991). However, comprehensive data detailing what languages are spoken, by whom, and to what extent communities require support in maintaining these languages is not available.

Certainly there has been very little support for community languages in formal education. The exception has been the development of Pacific Island language nests in the early childhood sector; by 1992, there were 170 such groups catering for 3682 children. It is also noticeable that *Te Whāriki* provides specific examples of how the curriculum relates to Tagata Pasefika programmes in each of its learning goals. It suggests that this will also "demonstrate possible models for other ethnic groups who wish to support their cultural heritage within the early childhood curriculum" (Ministry of Education, 1993e, p. 12).

However, at school level there are very few language-maintenance programmes in operation, and most maintenance initiatives are organised by communities themselves as "after-hours" classes, and are sometimes associated with some other marker of cultural identity such as a religion. These after-hours classes receive no direct Government funding, and often face difficulties in securing appropriate accommodation, adequate teaching resources, and adequately qualified teachers.

Waite (1992b) suggests that, while there are advantages to running such programmes outside the mainstream schools because community control of programmes is maintained, the:

> ideal situation . . . is the integration of language maintenance classes into selected local schools that draw on the expertise of fully trained bilingual teachers and depend on input from the relevant ethnic community in matters relating to cultural and linguistic appropriateness. (p. 59)

In this situation the importance of the children's home language is validated and the role of language development in learning is appropriately acknowledged. Whether programmes are school or community based, they should receive a positive response from the Government in the form of financial assistance; the development of relevant, high quality resources; and support for teacher education.

Obviously community support for bilingual education is essential if change is going to occur in our education institutions. However, this is not always a clear-cut issue. Families are often concerned that maintenance of children's first language in school will hinder the acquisition of the English skills necessary for survival in New Zealand society. There is a need for community education, and support for those parents who do choose to educate their children to be bilingual (Peddie, 1991; Holmes, 1993).

Despite all the evidence of the cognitive, social, and cultural benefits that bilingualism holds for individuals, for minority communities, and for the wider community, monolingualism is still generally held to be the desirable norm by the majority Pākehā community. Unless this view is successfully challenged, it is unlikely that Government policy will change to provide adequate support for the maintenance of community languages in this country. However, the fact that the *Curriculum Framework* makes a commitment to the provision of mother tongue programmes provides a good base from which community groups may be able to work for change at the school level.

As the preferred language of the deaf community, Waite (1992b) also identifies New Zealand Sign Language (NZSL) as a community language. He stresses the importance of providing education for students in NZSL, and notes that this may raise conflict in cases in which hearing parents choose an educational approach which does not emphasise NZSL. He suggests that in this case the parents' right to make decisions about their children's education must be balanced by the recognition of the need for the child to be able to communicate most effectively with their own community: that is, the deaf community.

Within education there are also tensions involved in mainstreaming students into situation in which they are not able to communicate in their first language (NZSL), and may face real difficulties in developing communicative competence and ease in their second language (spoken and written English). Waite argues that deaf students are most likely to gain access to the majority (hearing) culture through a sound knowledge of their own language and culture, and suggests that this might best be attained through the provision of separate education. He compares this with schooling for Māori students for whom learning to be fully fluent in both Māori and English is most viable in autonomous Māori-medium schools.

International Languages

It is perhaps in this area of language and education that there appears to be the greatest likelihood of Ministry-initiated and -funded change in the near future, both in terms of an increase in the numbers of students learning LOTEMs, and in the languages that are taught. The *Framework* states that:

> all students benefit from learning another language from the earliest possible age. Such learning broadens students' general language abilities and brings their own language into sharper focus. It enriches them intellectually, socially, and culturally, offers an understanding of the ways in which other people think and behave, and furthers international relations and trade. Students will be able to choose from a range of Pacific, Asian, and European languages, all of which are important to New Zealand's regional and international interests. (1993c, p. 10)

This statement would indicate that there is likely to be an expansion in the teaching of LOTEMs at the primary and intermediate levels as well as at the secondary level. This is consistent with subsequent statements by the Minister for Education. Currently, there are very few primary or intermediate schools which teach LOTEMs, in part because languages have not traditionally been available in pre-service primary teacher education. However, if languages are seen as desirable for employment then it is likely that both pre-service and in-service courses for teachers will become available.

The drive to increase the numbers of students studying LOTEMs is clearly highlighted in *Education for the 21st Century,* which states that:

> while all learning areas are important, one indicator of the school system's ability to provide the skills needed by New Zealand's economy is the numbe of students who study other languages. . . . Growth is desirable in this area. (Ministry of Education, 1993a, p. 26)

The document proposes that by the year 2001, by the time students reach the end of the fourth form, 50 percent will be able "to converse with and write to a native speaker of a language other than English or Māori about simple, every day matters". Early in 1994, the Minister of Education went so far as to state that the Ministry was considering making second-language study compulsory; though he more recently indicated that he had been advised that this was not feasible because of insufficient numbers of skilled language teachers and resources ("Language plan dropped", May 1994).

The economic imperative behind expansion in this area is openly acknowledged. *Education for the 21st Century* stresses the particular importance of developing curriculum statements in the languages of New Zealand's trading partners, and the first 2 draft curriculum documents in languages other than English are Chinese and Spanish:

> chosen for curriculum development because China is likely to become New Zealand's largest export market in the future, while trade with Latin American countries was also increasing ("Spanish and Chinese get the nod", 1994).

This emphasis on trading significance is likely to change the pattern of language study in schools. In 1990, French was still the most widely studied language in secondary schools, though numbers were declining (13 percent of all secondary pupils), and the most rapid increase was in the number studying Japanese (5.5 percent) (Peddie, 1992). Peddie also notes that the perception that French and German are not trading languages is somewhat false and that "closer analysis of the data shows that . . . they are among the top group of languages spoken in countries with whom New Zealand trades" (p. 46). However, Aotearoa/New Zealand is following a broader international pattern in encouraging the study of languages other than those traditionally taught in schools. In the United States, for example, Japanese, Chinese, Russian, Arabic, and Korean have been designated as "critical languages" and federal support for the teaching of these languages has been made available because they will "best serve the economic and security interest of the United States" (U.S. Department of Education, 1992, p. 3690). However, this utilitarian emphasis is likely to receive some resistance on the part of those who believe that more emphasis should be placed on the cultural and literary significance of language learning.

Summary

Over all, it is apparent that language education in Aotearoa/New Zealand is currently undergoing considerable challenge and change. Although there is still no language policy for the country, the curriculum documents and statements of educational aims that have been released over the last few years give some indication of the Government's language priorities and directions. The *Curriculum Framework* establishes a basis for curriculum development which recognises the central role that language plays in our lives, and gives value and importance to Māori, English, and community and international languages. Subsequent documents seem to indicate that priorities in curriculum development and resource provision are in danger of being driven by economic considerations, without due regard for issues of social justice and equity. With respect to this, there is particular concern about -

- the need for continuing support for te reo Māori as a living language that is central to our national identity, and
- the need for adequate ESL support for *all* children in our schools to be provided in a context within which children's bilingual skills are valued, supported, and developed.

CHAPTER 2

Putting Research Into Practice

Action Research: Purposes and Principles

As the name indicates, action research is primarily concerned with action. Its fundamental aim is to improve practice, and it seeks to achieve this by actively involving practitioners in making decisions about how to bring about these improvements. In this sense it is not research that is done on other people - it involves people working together, analysing, and changing their own situations and practices.

Throughout the planning and implementation of the research, Kemmis and McTaggart's *Action Research Planner* (1988) was used as a key reference. The *Planner* was invaluable both in helping clarify the purposes and principles of the research, and in terms of working out the practical steps of the research process. These are outlined in the sections that follow.

The Fundamentals of Action Research

Carr and Kemmis (1986) stress 2 essential aims of all action research - *improvement* and *involvement*. They suggest that action research should aim at improvement in 3 areas:

- the improvement of practice;
- the improvement of the understanding of practice by its practitioners; and
- the improvement of the situation in which practice takes place (p. 165).

Fundamental to improvement is the understanding that the research must involve practitioners at each stage of the research process and that, as the project develops, this circle of involvement will widen to include others who are affected by practice.

Involvement in action research is characterised by:

- *Democratic relationships between participants and collaborative decision making*: This requires equal and honest relationships between participants in the research process; this can be problematic because school communities are seldom democratic, and are generally characterised by hierarchies in which the views of particular participants are privileged. Schools are also often driven by conflicting, and sometimes hidden, agendas, and this can severely limit opportunities for honest and open communication. However, if the research group can establish a *shared commitment* to improving certain aspects of practice, then it is possible to go beyond the constraints of the institution, and indeed the contradictions and constraints of the institution are likely to become part of the focus of change in the research process. Ultimately action research aims:

> to involve all these participants in communication aimed at mutual understanding and consensus, in just and democratic decision-making, and common action towards achieving fulfilment for all (Carr and Kemmis, p. 199).

Based on this democratic and collaborative relationship between participants, action research seeks to improve practice through:

- *Strategic planning and action*: Action research is based on systematic investigation of a situation and methodical planning, implementation, monitoring, and evaluation. Therefore, action is taken on the basis of carefully marshalled evidence, and it is carefully considered and deliberate. Plans for change also take into consideration the limits to change, so that reforms proceed at a rate which is practically achievable.

- *Critical self-reflection*: McTaggart (1991) suggests that reflection in action research "involves re-thinking the theories and values that inform actions, particularly unexamined, traditional, customary, habitual and intuitive and impulsive ways of behaving" (p. 57). It involves specifically recognising the ways in which practice is shaped by the social, political, cultural, and moral contexts within which we teach. Therefore, it involves questioning and challenging what is "taken for granted" in education and requires us to ask "whose interests are served" by specific educational practices and structures.

Action research, then, aims for critically informed, committed action, undertaken by a group of people working collaboratively to achieve improvement in a situation in which they are involved.

The Action-research Spiral

The action research process is usually described as a spiral composed of 4 interrelated "moments": planning, acting, observing, and reflecting. There is a sense in which these constitute "steps" in the research process, in which planning is followed by action and observation, and then by reflection, which in turn provides the basis for the next round of planning. However, the moments are not discrete, and once the process has been initiated, reflection, for example, will almost inevitably become a continuous process. Nevertheless, it is also important to ensure that each moment is given adequate time and resources. Prior to initiating the research spiral, it is obviously necessary to identify the general area for the research process, and to gather information about the current situation. Thus, as a general outline, action research will usually involve:

1. *Identifying the research concern*: Research is often driven by questions which are formulated outside the context of practice, and may or may not reflect what is of real concern to the practitioners involved. In action research, the focus of the research must be relevant and important to those involved. The group participating in the research need to agree on a broad educational issue or question which is perceived to be problematic within their particular context. This constitutes the "thematic concern" for the research (Kemmis and McTaggart, 1988).

2. *Reconnaissance*: Reconnaissance involves reflection and data gathering on what is currently happening in the general area of thematic concern. Kemmis and McTaggart (1988) suggest that reconnaissance should provide an initial, and detailed, analysis of -

- language and discourse;
- activities and practices; and
- social relationships and organisation -

as they relate to the thematic concern. This will help sharpen the focus of the research, and will ensure that planning the research is based on evidence which goes beyond intuitive or individual interpretations of the situation.

3. *Planning*: This "moment" involves working out what needs to be done. It will encompass:

- identifying general goals as well as long- and short-term objectives;
- clarifying the rationale for change (possibly through reference to relevant educational literature);
- working out the most effective ways of achieving change;
- deciding on details of the proposed action; and
- formulating ideas about how the process will be monitored and evaluated.

4. *Acting and observing*: These 2 "moments" are carried out at the same time. Careful and sensitive monitoring of what is happening is obviously important, as this will provide the basis for reflection, and further decision making. It is also important that what is done is well documented. In situations in which further action may involve persuading other groups for support, documentation gives substance to claims that might otherwise be dismissed as unimportant or insubstantial.

5. *Reflection*: Reflection research requires careful analysis and interpretation of what has happened by those who are involved. This will clearly necessitate discussion amongst participants, and may also entail reference to relevant literature. Future action will rest on the conclusions that are drawn about the actions already taken.

One of the aspects of action research that makes it attractive is that in many ways the spiral that it follows is familiar in that it is closely related to the planning cycles that many teachers either consciously or intuitively use in planning, implementing, and evaluating school programmes. Action research builds on these processes. However, action research goes beyond "the usual thing teachers do when they think about their teaching" (Kemmis and McTaggart, 1988). Kemmis and McTaggart state that action research "is more systematic and collaborative in collecting evidence on which to base rigorous group reflection"(p. 21). As outlined above, action research also goes beyond practice and concerns itself with the organisational structures and social relations which make up the situation within which practice takes place.

The Emancipatory Intent

The term "empowerment" is used frequently in social science, and the meanings attached to the word vary from context to context - to the extent that businesses will even talk of "empowering" employees to work better for the company. Given that "empowerment" and "emancipation" are central tenets in action research, it is important to clarify the ways in which these terms are conceptualised in the literature associated with action research. It is also important to acknowledge that just because empowerment and emancipation may be the political purposes of critical research it may not be possible to achieve this in all contexts - "an emancipatory intent is no guarantee of an emancipatory outcome" (Acker *et al.*, 1983, p. 431).

Carr and Kemmis (1986) argue that "in emancipatory action research, the practitioner group itself takes responsibility for its own emancipation from the dictates of irrationality, injustice, alienation and unfulfillment" (p. 204). The group explore those aspects of their own situation which are contradictory; recognise the role that they too play in perpetuating practices which need to be changed; and take responsibility for creating change where it is possible. Emancipatory action research is therefore essentially a political process and is likely to challenge the status quo, and involve participants working collaboratively to achieve change at an institutional level, as well as achieving change in terms of individual understanding and practice.

Smith (1993) argues that action research provides the potential for empowerment because of its "emancipatory intent":

> prominent . . . recognition [is] given to the social and political determinants of inequality, irrationality and injustice in our world. Moreover, it is the unmasking and transformation of these determinants through strategic political action that is the essence of emancipatory intent (Smith, 1993, p. 77).

In this sense "empowerment" involves participants in taking control of their own political consciousness and collective action. Smith points out, however, that while participation and intervention (action) are necessary conditions for achieving emancipatory goals, they may not be sufficient to transform "relations of domination" (p. 90). Grundy (1987) suggests that:

> It is unlikely . . . given the ascendant technical interest in our society, that the emancipatory potential of action research will ever be fully realised in any one situation. Nevertheless action research offers a programme for strategic action which opens the possibility of working systematically in ways that foster freedom, equality and justice in learning environments and interactions. (p. 159)

Implementing This Action-research Project

The general research plan for the current project was based on the ideas outlined above. However, it is obvious that in action research exactly what happens, the precise nature of the research emphasis and direction, timing, extent of involvement, and size of the project will depend on those who participate in the project and the situations in which they are working. The general steps of the research schedule summarised below, were those that were tentatively proposed by the author at the outset of this project.

The following table shows the links between the project's schedule and Kemmis and McTaggart's (1988) moments of action research:

Making contact with schools (that had already established language/equity as a pressing area of shared concern). Putting the proposal to staff.	Choosing a thematic concern.
Visiting the schools. Interviews.	Reconnaissance.
Reporting back. Decisions and development.	Planning.
Some aspects of development, but plans for major changes were only just being finalised at the time that my formal involvement with the schools came to an end.	Acting and observing.
Final reflection on the actions taken came some time after I had left the schools. However, towards the end of my direct involvement in the research, we reviewed and evaluated the research up to that point. This written report also represents another side of reflection, considering both the actions planned in the schools and the research itself.	Reflection.

The Research Schedule

From the beginning the research schedule needed to be as flexible as possible. Not only would this be important in terms of fitting in with the 2 schools' existing schedule of meetings and commitments, but also in terms of being open and responsive to the decisions made by the participants in the research.

(a) Making Contact With the Schools: January-February 1992

The original research proposal had suggested working with a specific school that had participated in the language-policy research that had been undertaken in 1988-1989. However, the fellowship committee recommended that rather than focus on 1 school, the research might yield more if it were undertaken in 2 schools. To allow as much flexibility as possible, it seemed important that the schools be within relatively easy travelling distance, so this was an important practical consideration in deciding which schools to approach with the research proposal.

It was also important that the research built on what was already happening in the schools. In line with the commitment of action research to the principles of democracy and participation, the direction and processes of the research would necessarily have to be negotiated and determined by those involved, rather than imposed by an outside research agenda. There were 3 main points which needed to be considered in terms of deciding whether there would be a "goodness of fit" between schools and research:

- It was important that those who would be involved in the research felt that the values and processes of the research approach were appropriate to the school context, and the ways in which members of the school community preferred to work together.
- The language/equity focus of the research needed to have been already established as an area of shared concern within the school.
- The schools' year plans for school and staff development needed to be able to accommodate the research.

Within reasonable travelling distance there were a number of schools which had implemented initiatives which indicated that they were concerned with bicultural and multicultural issues. These included bilingual and language-enrichment Māori/English classes, and a range of other programmes specifically aimed for children from non-English-speaking backgrounds. One school in the area had plans to develop a total immersion class. Before I approached any school, I also consulted with school advisers and a variety of other people working in education who had specific interests in Māori education and multicultural education. On the basis of their recommendations, and with their help, I then contacted and met with 4 primary school principals during the early part of the first term. Of these 4 principals, 2 indicated that they felt that the research would be both relevant and, just as importantly, timely, in terms of the intended programme of staff and school for the forthcoming year. Both also expressed a personal commitment to development within the area of research, and both felt that the principles and methods of the research approach suggested were appropriate to their schools. It was agreed I should meet with staff in both schools, outline the proposed research to them, and allow them to decide whether or not to participate in the project. Both principals said that they believed that agreement of the boards of trustees to participation would not be an issue, should teaching staff be keen to be involved.

(b) Putting the Proposal to Staff: March 1992

It was essential that the participant groups within the schools were keen to be involved in the research and that they saw the research as relevant, useful, and important, not only in terms of the focus of the research, but also in terms of the processes that would be employed within an action-research approach. It was also important that they felt that I was going to be someone they wanted to have working within their schools!

At each school the initial meeting with staff was at a whole school staff meeting. In one school it was possible to discuss the research fully during this meeting; in the other school, I attended syndicate meetings later in the week to allow staff fuller opportunities to ask questions or raise issues of concern. In both schools staff were "careful" about becoming involved in the research, and concerned to clarify the intentions, aims, and intended outcomes of the research, and to establish expectations regarding their involvement and commitment in terms of time and effort. While it was clear that the boundaries of the research were open to negotiation, it was also important to indicate that participation in the research would require a commitment to action and involvement on their part.

I asked staff at both schools to take time to discuss the project and arranged that if they wished to participate in the research they should contact me within the next fortnight. In each case staff agreed, reportedly unanimously, to take part in the project.

(c) School Visits: April-May 1992

Over a period of about 4 weeks I spent time getting to know the schools, and allowing the schools to get to know me. Visits to the schools involved attending meetings (staff, syndicate, whānau); talking informally to parents, staff, and children; and observing and participating in classes and other school activities.

(d) Interviews: May-July 1992

In both schools, I had suggested in the initial meeting that interviews with members of the school community were one way of gathering information about what was actually happening in the school, and identifying the concerns that were central, important, or problematic in some way. Towards the end of the first term, both staffs agreed that this would be an appropriate next step, and that it would provide a general overview on which further decisions and planning could be based.

Teachers indicated that they believed that it would be most useful to concentrate on interviewing themselves as a group in this initial phase. They acknowledged that there might be a role for wider involvement, but felt that this would be more appropriate when they had had time to reflect on where they themselves were.

Written information about the general focus of the interviews was given to teachers before the interviews took place, and we agreed that the interviews should be carried out individually, in pairs, or in small groups, depending on what staff felt most comfortable with. Most interviews were recorded with a small portable cassette recorder and, although there was sometimes some initial unease with this, most teachers said they were "comfortable" with being recorded on tape. In one instance where a teacher felt particularly ill at ease with this, we abandoned the cassette recorder, and both made notes following the interview.

In order to be able to review the material as quickly as possible, I did not transcribe all of the taped material. In general, I tried to listen to the tapes either in the evening of the interview, or the following day. On the basis of this, I made notes of the main points, and transcribed those sections of the interview which I judged to be particularly relevant.

(e) Reporting Back: June-July 1992

I reported back to the schools as soon as possible after having completed the interviews. To facilitate a reasonably quick turn-around of the information, I reported back orally, with a very brief written summary of key points. Oral feedback also seemed more appropriate, in that it made it possible for staff to ask questions, comment, and clarify issues immediately. In both schools it was also apparent that written documents were quite likely to be skimmed and "filed", unless there was some urgent and immediate reason for responding, and senior staff had agreed that verbal feedback was much more likely to be effective than a written report.

(f) Decisions and Development: August-December 1992

The directions of the research in each school diverged considerably from this point, and rather than describe this here the relevant information is most appropriately included in the case studies themselves. These make up the following 2 chapters of this report.

(g) The Written Case Studies

The case studies were written during the following year and initial drafts were given to the principals of both schools for comment and distribution to other members of staff in the third term of 1993. One principal commented verbally on the first draft, and a second draft, incorporating a number of changes, was made available to the school for further comment. The case study was put in the staffroom, but was not read in detail by staff. The principal, however, read it closely and made a number of written comments on those areas and ideas which were felt to be unclear or "not quite right". Over all, this principal felt that the report accurately and fairly captured the detail and flavour of the research process and what the school had done.

In the other school, the first draft of the case study was commented on very briefly by the principal, but at the time of writing there has been no detailed feedback on the second draft of the study. The principal has, however, given permission for the case study to be published.

The case studies provide one account of what happened in the schools during the research project. I have attempted to write them so that they are fair and accurate, and relevant to the thematic concern that had been established. However, it is important to acknowledge the limitations of the case studies.

Primarily, the studies are characterised as much by what has been left out as has been put in. In part this is due to the need to respect confidentiality. Often, participants would explicitly ask that what they had said not be revealed in any public forum, including a written report. As well as this, behind the case studies, there is a web of interpersonal relationships, friendships, loyalties, and tensions which had an enormous influence on what happened in the schools. In this sense the case studies tell only a very small and incomplete part of the story.

There is no easy resolution to this problem, and it might reasonably be argued that the inclusion of the "personal" in reporting research has been undervalued. However, ethically, in terms of protecting the lives of participants, discretion and trust are paramount.

CHAPTER 3

Te Maha School

Te Maha School is in a predominantly residential suburb with a small shopping centre not far from the school. Housing in the area varies greatly: state housing built in the postwar era is mixed with private homes, and there are some newer private residential developments on the fringes of the school's zone. Some of the state housing appears to be in very poor condition, and contrasts markedly with the private homes, some of which have been renovated and extended.

In 1992, the school roll went from 192 in January to 220 in December, and was divided into 7 classes ranging in size between 26 and 35. For planning and organisation the school was divided into 2 teams, Junior and Senior, with 1 class from each team working in a "Māori-language enrichment" class. These 2 enrichment classes placed particular emphasis on encouraging Māori language and ways of working. Extra staffing made available in 1992 was used to provide for:

- .4 Reading Recovery;
- 15 hours of Māori-language support, which was used across all classes;
- one full-time non-certificated kaiāwhina, who worked with the Māori-language enrichment classes;
- 10 hours per week of teacher aide support, used across all classes; and
- a half-time teaching position which was used to provide:
    - daily "extension" classes for children identified as having particular academic ability or potential; and
    - a special needs programme, including social development programmes on topics such as anger management.

The school was built in the 1950s and, although the buildings were in reasonable condition, there had been little recent work done in the way of redecoration or upgrading of facilities. At the same time, the school numbers reflected a falling roll, and this meant that there was ample classroom and playground space. A particular characteristic of the school was its accessibility to a variety of other groups from its community: in addition to using extra classroom space for group work and special activities, one extra classroom was used by a Sione Uesiliana, a Samoan preschool, and other extra space was used by members of the school community for meetings on a regular basis.

School and Community

Although the residential area around the school is mixed, both in terms of socioeconomic status, and ethnic and cultural background, there was a higher percentage of children from non-Pākehā and low socioeconomic backgrounds than might be expected: in 1992, 65 percent of the children came from families which were either unemployed or in groups 5 or 6 on the Elley-Irving scale (fathers' occupation semiskilled or unskilled); 35 percent of the children were Māori; and 16 percent were of Pacific Island or South-east Asian descent.

Many of the families moving into the area are in short-term rental or shared accommodation and there is a relatively high roll turnover at the school: in the year to July 1992 there were 82 enrolments and 39 withdrawals (excluding standard 4, 1991). There is also a relatively high proportion (31 percent in 1992) of children from single-parent families.

Teachers at the school suggested that the social and economic pressures that faced the school's community were reflected in a number of ways. In particular, there were a high number of children who were identified as having special needs: in 1992, there were 15 children requiring special individual programmes in specific areas; 14 children with behavioural or social problems requiring intervention programmes; and 26 children from non-English-speaking backgrounds needing extra support for language development.

As a result of the high number of special needs children within the school, and in response to its socioeconomic and ethnic make-up, there had been a tendency for the school to be labelled as "rough" by outsiders, and for children who attended the school to be stereotyped as "difficult". This reputation had contributed to a situation which was, in effect, an example of "white flight", and some groups, particularly middle-class, Pākehā families, had tended to avoid sending their children to Te Maha. As one teacher pointed out: "There are children who even walk through our playground to get to other schools!" This labelling of the school and children was a source of concern to teachers and parents, who felt that it was both undeserved and unfair.

During the last 3 years there has been a concerted effort on the part of the staff of the school to develop stronger relationships with its community. Staff recognised that a major proportion of the school community had very little contact with the school: few parents came into the school at the start or end of the school day, and attendance at parent-teacher interviews was low. Staff said that for many parents schooling had been an unhappy and alienating experience and that not only were they reluctant to become involved with the school but, because they were unfamiliar or uncertain of the school's expectations, they were not able adequately to support their children's learning. One staff member described the situation in this way:

> They didn't come into the classrooms, and they didn't speak to us. I think a lot of the parents felt that they couldn't help their children, even though they wanted to, but they felt that they weren't good enough, and didn't know enough.

In working towards changing this situation, the first move involved making a specific effort to contact and meet with all families in the school, and in 1990 this resulted in over 250 home contacts and 53 home visits. The principal initiated this process, but it has since become very much part of the way that all teachers work with families.

In 1990, a whānau support group was also established, on the instigation of one of the Māori teachers in the school who contacted all Māori parents to suggest that a group be formed to provide support for the one Māori parent elected to the board of trustees. This group was instrumental in setting up the language enrichment classes, and now meets regularly to discuss Māori issues in the school and provide guidance in this area.

The existence of the enrichment classes appears to have been especially important in establishing an atmosphere at the school which was less alienating to the school's Māori community. One teacher, for example, said:

> Many of them [the parents] did not have good experiences of school, and you can understand why they have been hesitant about having anything much to do with their children's school. But the fact that we've got the classes has really changed [that]. Parents now come much more often into the school, and they talk to me, and they talk to [the principal], and often it's very personal things that have not got a lot to do with what's happening in the class today, but might have a lot to do with why that child is behaving in a certain way. That woman who came in the other day . . . she spoke about really personal things. That's the first time in 2 years that she has come in. It must mean that she feels really secure, and that security is associated with the class being a group. So that the children are, in those classes, not a minority. And I don't think that security and that feeling would happen if the children were still in other classes.

As parent and community contact with the school had grown, parents had increasingly looked to the school for support and assistance in behaviour management, advice regarding health and social needs, as well as advice regarding ways in which they could support their children's intellectual and social development. In response, the school had implemented a variety of programmes. Some were aimed specifically at helping parents support their children's learning. A "Parents as Tutors" programme was run during 1991. This involved parents working in classrooms on a regular basis; it was felt, however, that this was limited in terms of wider parental participation, as few were able to commit themselves to the time demands of the programme.

A more successful programme, initiated in 1992, focused on helping parents of new entrant children assist them in preparatory reading skills. The programme runs for 6 weeks before children enter school and parents work with children at home with simple pre-reading materials which are provided by the school. A full evaluation of this project had not been undertaken, but those teachers involved said that they believed that the programme had been valuable in a number of ways. Not only did the preparation appear to have helped children's readiness to read, it had also prepared them for the type of learning that they would meet at school, within the more secure environment of the home. This was important in terms of the children's confidence. The programme also had positive spin-offs in terms of:

- persuading parents that they had a continuing and positive role to play in their children's learning;
- providing parents with an opportunity to become familiar with the school; and,
- providing an opportunity for the new entrant teacher to get to know both parent and child.

Those teachers involved with the setting up and implementation of the programme suggested that the one-to-one nature of the programme, together with its focus on something very practical but relatively undemanding in terms of time commitment, had contributed to its success.

Other initiatives included a Cambodian parents' group which focused on both parenting and curriculum issues; and a parent support group facilitated by a local minister. Both these groups met weekly during 1992 and were attended regularly by groups of between 10 and

15 parents. The school also held regular meetings to discuss specific curriculum and learning issues, but these seemed to be less successful than the ongoing group meetings, and received limited support from parents and community.

An interesting extension of these programmes was the growing concept of the school as a community resource that could become "a centre of learning and action for all members of the community" (Butler, 1992). The principal of the school expressed a particular commitment to this idea, and suggested that the school should be able to support adult learning opportunities through the provision of:

- physical space,
- resources where applicable,
- access to established methods of informing the community,
- guidance regarding programmes and teaching strategies,
- access to other agencies,
- encouragement and support of programmes, and
- guidance in accessing community funding.

(Butler, 1992)

A particular example of such a programme was the organisation of te reo Māori classes for adult learners in 1992. These classes ran weekly during terms 2 and 3, and were established in response to interest expressed by members of the whānau, who wanted to develop skills in te reo for themselves, as well as seeing this as essential if they were to be able to support their children's development. Classes were organised by the whānau in liaison with the school principal, and were attended by a group which included both Māori and Pākehā parents and other members of the school's wider community, including some ex-pupils of the school who had since left secondary school and were currently unemployed.

In addition to the existence of groups, community presence in the school was also apparent on a less formal basis. Parents, particularly whānau members, met almost daily in the staffroom, and often participated in classroom activities. Parents and carers also looked to the school for specific advice and help in dealing with a range of social, behavioural, and health issues. This was often very demanding of teachers', and in particular the principal's, time. For example, on one occasion during the course of the research it was necessary for the principal, by using the position of principal, and "official" language, to organise appropriate counselling and medical care for a family who had been consistently overlooked by other relevant support agencies. As one member of staff commented, during what seemed to be a particularly stressful period, this meant that:

> [the principal] has to spend half [the] time doing work that should be done by a social worker, and that means that that is time taken away from focusing on instructional leadership. And that's not fair on [the principal], or on us.

In general, however, teachers and parents indicated that the effort that had been put into improving contact between school and community had been instrumental in dealing with behavioural and discipline problems at the school, and had been essential in establishing an environment in which children's learning could best be encouraged. It was, however, a process which needed time, and teachers saw a need for ongoing development in involving parents and community in school decision-making processes. As one member of staff said:

> Step 1 for parents is actually coming into the school, step 2 is feeling a little bit more comfortable, and step 3 is them saying 'Well, what can I do?' So that's why it's really important to allow time for change and growth. So, for example, in the [te reo] class for adults, a lot of parents who want it for their children aren't there - the more confident ones are. . . . But, you're not going to take someone who's just at the point of feeling that they can come into the school into taking a full role in terms of curriculum direction.

School Development - Teacher Development

The current principal was appointed in 1990, and the school has undergone considerable change since then. The principal has very high expectations of staff professionalism, and within the school there was a strong statement of commitment to excellence and the provision of the best possible learning environment for all children. In accomplishing this, school and teacher development were given a high priority and were seen as going hand in hand.

Teachers described staff development as part of the school philosophy, and commented on how much they felt that they had learnt during the time that they had been teaching at the school. They said that they were constantly being challenged by the principal and other members of staff, but that this was balanced by support, so that, as one teacher commented: "We train and support each other so that we are never left floundering - there's a lot of expertise in this school".

Staff development was built into the ways in which the school worked. Staff and team meetings always focused on particular issues, and teachers were encouraged to organise sessions for other staff in areas in which they had a particular interest or expertise. Outsiders were also invited into the school regularly to provide sessions on particular issues.

On an individual level the principal met with each teacher every term to discuss their concerns, class plans and evaluations, and aspects of their own development. A variety of ways were used to provide feedback for teachers on their work. For example, during the period of the research the principal had completed a number of very brief "data-gathering checks" on classroom activities (e.g., teacher talking to class as a whole; teacher working with individual; class working in small groups; and so on) over a period of 2 weeks. Individual data were given to each teacher, and these were discussed at team level, where teachers used the information to identify patterns of teaching behaviour within their classrooms. Overall feedback indicated 3 significant changes since the last round of observations completed in 1990: children were almost always on task; every teacher was in the room; and teachers appeared well prepared - there was little "on the job" preparation.

Teachers were also encouraged (with financial support if appropriate) to participate in a variety of in-service courses, and were then generally expected to share what they had learnt with the rest of the staff. On one occasion, the staff as a whole had attended a weekend training course, and they said that this had been especially effective as they had been able to work on implementing new ideas together following the course, and had been able to encourage each other in putting what they had learnt into action. The principal was also actively involved in professional development and during 1992 was completing an M.Ed.Admin. at university.

There was a co-operative approach to school development, and in interviews teachers said that they felt that they were able to take an active role in bringing about change; that they "owned" the changes that had been made at the school; and, that decisions were not made top-down. One teacher described the situation as follows:

> I think we're doing well. If there is a need for development, we tend to meet it head on. So, if there's a problem, we get on to changing it. We don't have to wait for things to happen in this school. If you have a concern, all you have to do is say to someone that I've noticed this or whatever, and you can normally do something about it, to get cracking and get the ball rolling. . . . And most people seem to feel like that, that they can get on with it. It is a school that is open to change.

At the same time, she added that "if you actually track back ideas that seem to belong to everyone, they've almost always come from the principal in the beginning". The key role that the principal was able to play in providing professional leadership, while supporting a democratic approach to decision making, was commented on by a number of the teachers at the school. There was one instance during the period of the research in which teachers did feel that "an issue had been decided on at the level above and then just dumped on us . . ." They made this very clear to the principal and the matter was quickly renegotiated.

Creating a Learning Environment

In describing aspects of school development, the principal said that initially the major concern of staff had been children's behaviour. Staff had felt that far too much of their energy and time was spent on classroom control and discipline. Consequently staff morale was very low, and stress levels were very high. Although these problems in dealing with children's behaviour were the original focus of staff concern, the principal said that:

> The focus quite quickly moved on to learning, which was really at the heart of the issue - What could these children do? Why were we getting the children to do these things? What could they already do? I mean, there's not a lot of point in teaching children to do things that they can already do, or don't need, or don't want, is there? . . . So that's what made us start saying that teaching obviously has a lot to do with empowering the child, and it's got a lot to do with helping the child determine what they're going to learn; children should know what's there [in the scheme] because they've got to learn it. So we started playing around with a lot of strategies for empowering the learner: children started setting their own objectives; peer evaluation; self-evaluation . . . and so on.

A consistent thread that ran through staff discussion was a concern that they should be able clearly to identify their own purposes in teaching. The principal said that all too often they found that the lessons that they were "doing" were "activity-based . . . they were only really interested in occupying the children all day, or doing an activity for something to do . . . it had nothing to do with the fact that they needed to learn this". Staff decided that they needed a school-wide document which clearly set out common goals and identified those things which staff agreed needed to be learnt by all children. Collectively they rewrote the school scheme with the intention that it be used as a working document that could provide a basis for identifying learning objectives, which could in turn be used as the basis of planning, assessment, and evaluation. The principal said that a priority in writing the scheme was that "it was designed to save time, to speed up planning and assessment, to make things easier for staff so that they can get on with the actual job of teaching".

The scheme itself provided overall aims, brief suggestions regarding appropriate methods and activities, and also more specific lists of objectives in different subject areas. For example, under "Comprehension Strategies in Emergent Reading" are listed:

> sequencing events/ finding main idea/ recalling significant events/ classifying information/ seeing relationships between events/ dramatising stories heard or read/ reasoning: how, why, when/ anticipating outcomes/ distinguishing between real and imaginary stories and events/ making comparisons/ determining character traits.

These lists were used to generate more specific objectives at team and class level, and where appropriate, objectives for particular children were also identified. The objectives provided the basis for evaluating classroom programmes, and assessing individual children. Team and classroom plans were drawn up every 6 weeks; and copies were kept by team leaders and the principal. The principal provided feedback to teachers on the plans, so they were also able to be used as part of the teacher development sessions that were run individually with all members of staff. In interviews, teachers stressed how useful they had found working within this system, although one teacher said that she had initially found it very difficult, and very time consuming. Teachers said that in terms of planning, the scheme laid the grounds for achieving a clear and balanced programme, and in terms of assessment it provided the basis for focusing on ". . . what children could do, and moving on from there, rather than concentrating on what children can't do". Over all, it was apparent that teachers believed that using the scheme had been important in helping them develop as teachers, because it required them to plan rigorously and think carefully about their teaching. Using this approach to organising learning was also something that all teachers felt that the school as a whole did exceptionally well, and there was an evident sense of pride in this.

Discipline problems did not magically disappear as a result of changes in the approach to learning, and in interviews teachers said that they felt that while things had improved dramatically over the last 3 years, discipline was still an area that caused them considerable concern. In addition to working more closely with parents and community, children were given clear guidelines as to what was, and was not, regarded as acceptable behaviour. The principal played an important role in discipline, ensuring that dealing with individual children did not take the classroom teacher's time away from teaching the rest of the class. An anger management programme was initiated in 1990, and this aimed at helping children themselves develop strategies to deal with behaviour that was likely to disrupt classroom activities and their own and others' learning.

Going Beyond Monoculturalism

A further focus of development since the current principal's appointment had been in challenging and changing the school's monoculturalism. Integral to this had been moves to open up the school to different groups such as the Samoan preschool, the Cambodian parents' group, and the whānau group. In terms of curriculum development, the primary commitment had been to the inclusion of Māori culture, and there had been 2 main areas of change in the school:

- the organisation of the 2 language-enrichment classes, and

- school-wide development in the teaching of te reo and tikanga Māori.

(1) The Māori-language Enrichment Classes

These classes were established in 1991, in response to whānau requests for more support for their children's learning of te reo. It was therefore a community-directed initiative, but was welcomed and supported by teachers. It was decided that there should be 2 classes, a junior and a senior class, and that these classes should remain part of the main junior and senior team groups. One of the reasons for deciding that these 2 classes should not function as a separate unit was for administrative purposes: one of the class teachers was assistant principal and responsible for leadership of the junior team; she was also Pākehā, and therefore it was felt that it would be inappropriate for her to assume leadership within the enrichment classes. The other teacher was Māori, though te reo was not her first language, and she was a beginning teacher. It was felt that these teachers would best be supported by others within the school if they were part of the junior and senior teams.

From the beginning, entry to the language-enrichment classes has been on the basis of parent request. Initially entry had to be restricted, with priority being given to Māori children. However, this condition was relaxed in 1992, and although the majority of children in these classes identified as Māori, there were 2 Pākehā children.

The purpose of the classes at the outset was to encourage and support children's development in te reo and tikanga; to provide a learning situation in which Māori protocol was observed; and to provide opportunities to explore different, possibly more culturally inclusive, ways of learning and teaching. Although some members of the whānau felt that the classes should function fully bilingually and biculturally from the beginning, staff recognised that this was unrealistic, as neither of the teachers working with the classes had te reo as their first language, and neither they, nor the children coming into the classes, were ready for this. In discussing the development of the classes during a staff meeting teachers said:

> Community expectations of the classes have, in some instances, been very high - possibly too high.
>
> But . . . the community couldn't just direct things, it just doesn't work that way. The teachers needed to work together. As a school we needed to grow in terms of our knowledge, and working out where we were going and what we were doing.
>
> We also had a problem in that we didn't have people in the community that could provide us with role models either in the language or in the tikanga, because they themselves didn't have the knowledge - that's why they're so anxious for their children to learn. They had pockets of knowledge. But none of them had actually grown up in it . . . so they didn't have a lot of knowledge about marae protocol and kawa, and some families had only just started going back into it themselves, and going back to find out where their marae was.

Initially, some teachers reported that concern had been expressed by other teachers and some non-Māori parents that the existence of the 2 classes would create a division in the school. However, this did not appear to have happened. One member of staff suggested that:

> The present structure really happened by accident, but I think that it has been very positive. One good thing is that it's not seen as a separate unit, a separate bit, because there's so much interaction at team

> level, and I see that as very positive. But that does mean that there is extra work for those teachers, because they also end up teaching other teachers. But it has been really good in terms of the development of the whole school. We need to make sure that it goes both ways. We need to be really supportive of those teachers. I think that this is the way that we work. Teams do support each other, that's the way that we all end up growing.

At the beginning some parents had also expressed some cynicism about the purpose and justification for setting up the classes. One teacher reported:

> There were some derogatory comments - and one of them was that if we take all the Māori children out and put them in 2 rooms, then we'll have no more problems in the other rooms - that was the perception that some people have of those children.

Staff said, however, that opposition to the classes was not widespread, and during the research it was very obvious that overall staff commitment to the future of the classes was high. Ongoing development of the classes emerged as one of the central issues of staff concern during the early stages of the research and, during the third term of 1992, became the prime focus of staff and school development.

(2) School-wide Teaching of Te Reo and Tikanga Māori

In addition to setting up the Māori-language enrichment classes, the principal and staff as a whole had seen it as important that the teaching of te reo and tikanga Māori be developed as a school-wide initiative. An important way of providing for this was through the school's cultural group which included about 80 children in 1992. The school was very proud of the high standards achieved by the group, and during 1992 the group performed locally on a number of occasions and were also the first group from the area to be invited to compete in the interschool competition in Hawke's Bay.

Te reo was also taught throughout the school. Prior to 1992 this had been the responsibility of class teachers, but staff as a whole felt that this had been limited in its success, primarily because some teachers felt that they themselves were not proficient enough in te reo to teach it confidently. It had also placed a heavy responsibility for staff and school development in this area on the Māori speakers in the school.

In 1991, a teacher of Māori was employed to work across the school for half an hour with each class. The classroom teacher was present during these times, and participated in the learning in these classes, and then reinforced what had been learnt by building the new language into other lessons throughout the week. Although the extent to which teachers were able to back up the learning in the te reo classes varied, in general this approach seemed to have been successful both in terms of the children's and teachers' learning. Staff said that the children were becoming more confident about using te reo, and there were examples of children themselves spontaneously using te reo outside the context of the Māori-language classes, or situations in which teachers had specifically cued the use of Māori.

Senior staff said that there had been a considerable change in teachers' willingness to use te reo in class over the past year. A number of staff commented on this themselves. One teacher said, for example, that:

> I always felt if they weren't going to teach me, why should I bother to learn it. I guess, I always

> avoided it. Here, it seems relevant - it's not isolated, and I guess it's become a natural part of what you do. You don't feel pressured.

This teacher and others also said that the presence of Māori speakers on the staff, and the fact that they were able to hear te reo being actively used by teachers, children, and parents had been important in changing their attitudes. Other staff said, however, that they still felt ill at ease in using te reo themselves, and that they often felt excluded in situations, particularly in the staffroom, in which te reo was being used by others.

Parents' attitudes towards the inclusion of te reo in the curriculum and teachers' perceptions of these attitudes appeared to be mixed. One teacher said:

> I think the parents in the community (are more supportive). We used to have a lot of negativeness about their children speaking Māori, but I think it's quite different now. Now I would say that most parents would see it as only beneficial.

Other teachers, however, said that although parents were generally less antipathetic towards the use of te reo in the classroom than had been the case in the past, there were still a number who said that they did not want their children learning Māori. Some parents complained to the principal and teachers. Children also often said that their parents "did not want them to learn Māori" or thought that "Māori was a waste of time". In responding to parents' complaints and concerns, the school made it clear that learning Māori was required by the national curriculum, and also explained why the school believed that it was important. One of the class teachers of the language-enrichment classes said that one of the best things about working within that structure meant that, because parents had opted into the classes, she had a mandate to use te reo, and to encourage children to use it, and did not have to justify this to parents.

The Research

Stage 1: Getting Started

From the outset it appeared that the research would "fit" well with the approaches to school and teacher development at Te Maha School. The principal was familiar with action research, and had worked very hard towards establishing an environment within which both teachers and principal were "self-reflective practitioners" able critically to evaluate their own practice, both at an individual level, and as a collaborative group. The principal felt that the research could provide an overall picture of the school that might be valuable in terms of highlighting concerns and indicating possible directions for development and change. There were advantages to be seen in the research being done by someone who was not part of the school: teachers might be able to speak more openly with an outsider than with another member of staff; and an outsider would also be able to provide a different perspective than was possible from the point of view of someone who was immersed within the school.

Although the principal was keen for the school to participate in the research, it was felt that staff should decide whether the research would be appropriate and useful. I met with staff at a full staff meeting, put the research proposal to them, and answered their questions. A concern that teachers had was the extent to which the research might involve them in "extra" work. As a staff they already put considerable energy, thought, and time into their work, and it was important to clarify that the research intention was to build into that process rather than exist as something separate. Their questions also raised issues associated with the ownership and control of the research, and the possible benefits and payoffs for the school were discussed in some detail.

Although teachers appeared to be very positive towards the research proposal at that meeting, we agreed that they should have the chance to discuss it further before committing themselves to participation. There was opportunity for this at team meetings later that week, and following these meetings the principal contacted me to let me know that the staff were keen to take part in the project.

It was agreed with staff that I should spend the next 3 to 4 weeks getting to know the school and teachers. I spent time in all classrooms, attended staff meetings, assemblies, and a whānau meeting and spent time talking to teachers, children, and members of the school community. The school as a whole was very welcoming. Teachers and children obviously felt comfortable having visitors in their classrooms, and I was included as an active participant rather than an "observer" in the classrooms (and on playground duty!). Parents and whānau were also very open and welcoming, and I was made to feel part of the school very quickly.

During this time, however, it was apparent that for a variety of reasons staff were feeling under considerable pressure. By the end of the first term I was really concerned that the research, and my presence, were in danger of adding extra sources of stress to an already pressured staff. I discussed these concerns with the principal during the school holidays, and with senior staff at a meeting early in the second term. They acknowledged my concerns but felt that it was worthwhile continuing with the research, even if changes made as a result of the research might be small scale, rather than necessarily directly involving all staff.

We agreed that I go ahead with interviews with teachers, and that these would aim at:

> Gaining an insight into what people think about what we do and what they believe themselves about what they do;
>
> [Identifying]
> - thinking and practices that enhance language development in a bi/multicultural situation
> - thinking and practices that inhibit, or run counter to, goals of language development
>
> and determining
> - practices to be changed
> - language and discourse needed to support the change
> - organisation and structures needed to support the change
>
> (Senior Staff Meeting, Minutes, 25 May 1992)

Stage 2: Interviews

The interviews were held over the following 4 weeks. There were 2 third-year college of education students doing their final teaching placements at the school at this time. One of these student teachers was working with the deputy principal, who, with the principal, provided cover for other teachers so that they could be interviewed during school time. Before starting the interviews, the intentions of the research were again discussed briefly at a full staff meeting, and the purpose and focus of the interviews, as outlined above, were discussed and agreed to by the teachers.

The interviews themselves were wide ranging and often went beyond the scope of the suggested areas of discussion. In general, a major emphasis of the interviews was that teachers felt very positive about working at Te Maha. They identified a number of specific factors that contributed to this, and these included:

- the commitment to staff development and ready support from each other and particularly from those in positions of responsibility;
- the school scheme, its usefulness in planning, evaluation, and assessment;
- high teacher expectations about children's learning and what they should accomplish;
- the excellent communication across teams and between classes, including the language-enrichment classes;
- the distribution of available funding for support services;
- the growing strength of te reo throughout the school; and
- the growth of a strong relationship with members of the school community.

It was clear that staff felt that they were working well, that they were "moving" and being challenged, and there was an overall sense of pride in what the school was accomplishing.

Emergent Concerns

There were also a number of areas that staff identified as needing further development, evaluation, and possible change. These included the role of the extension classes; behaviour-management issues; provision for children from non-English-speaking backgrounds; and the current role and future development of the language-enrichment classes. It was this last area which appeared to be of primary concern, both to teachers involved in teaching these classes, and for other classroom teachers.

The Extension Classes

Extension classes were run parallel to the general class programme on a daily basis and there was close liaison between the regular class teacher and the extension teacher regarding planning and the assessment of children. Children entered the classes primarily on the basis of academic ability or the classroom teacher's assessment of academic potential, and membership of the classes had been fairly stable during the year. This had been positive in that teachers felt that the classes had gone beyond providing a superficial "tack on" for the children involved, and had in fact provided a programme which was significantly different to that which would have been possible within the general classes. However, teachers questioned whether:

- An expanded or different concept of "giftedness" might be explored. For example, one teacher suggested that perhaps it might be worth looking at developing craft within the school, and possibly exploring different cultural definitions of being gifted.
- This in turn would allow for more flexible groupings, and it might be worthwhile being able to include different groups of children during the year, although this would counteract the value in having 1 group for the entire year.

Provision for Children from Non-English-speaking Backgrounds (NESB)

Support for children whose first language was not English or Māori focused on improving their English-language skills and developing closer relationships with the different groups within the school community. Links with the Cambodian community had been a special focus: 6 family/school evenings were held during 1991-1992; teachers undertook staff development in Samoan culture in 1991; and a Cambodian parents' support group was set up in 1992. Links with the Samoan community were being developed through Sione Uesiliana (the on-site Samoan early childhood centre).

Issues raised by teachers in relation to provision for NESB children included:

- In general, teachers indicated that this was an area in which there was a need for staff development, although it had not been identified as a priority. One member of staff stressed that she believed that Māori issues had clear precedence in terms of importance, though a number of other teachers suggested that, as children from the Samoan preschool moved into the school, it was likely that provision for these children and those from other groups would become a focus of attention for development.
- More specifically, some teachers suggested that there was a particular need to consider ways in which children's first languages could be supported in the school. In 1991, there had been 6 Spanish-speaking families at the school and extra Spanish classes for the children had been organised. There was no such provision for other groups. Some teachers suggested that these groups, and particularly the Cambodian parents, identified learning English as the priority for their children, and would not themselves support establishing first-language programmes at the school. Some teachers said that they tried to use a variety of greetings, and to encourage children to use their first languages between themselves. However, there was no general school policy on these issues, and teachers suggested there was a need to explore the implications of supporting other languages in terms of children's learning, as well as exploring ways in which such support might be organised.

Behaviour

Teachers said that they felt that there had been a vast improvement in children's overall behaviour during the last few years. They said that, in general, there was consistency throughout the school in defining standards of acceptability and ways of dealing with behaviour that was regarded as unacceptable. They also felt that children were generally clear about what was and was not appropriate. However, they still expressed concern that:

- a small number of children sometimes seemed to take up an inordinate amount of time;
- teachers found some classes in particular very difficult to work with; and
- some children were "almost impossible" for teachers other than their class teacher or the principal.

A number of teachers suggested that there was a need for a school-based counsellor, who could work with both children and families. It was also suggested that there possibly needed to be more options for moving children between classes, so that children who "set each other off" could be separated. During the period in which the research was being undertaken, the principal suggested that an important way of being able to counter difficulties in behaviour management in the playground and when working with children from different classes, was for all teachers to get to know children throughout the school better. A day was organised where children moved from room to room, doing a range of set activities with each teacher in the school. Although teachers expressed initial reservations about being involved in the scheme, an informal evaluation indicated that it had been useful in helping teachers get to know more children, and also get to know more about the "dynamics" that existed in different class groups.

The Language-enrichment Classes

All teachers interviewed stressed the importance of these classes to the school, and emphasised the very positive ways in which the classes had contributed to the school:

- Teachers said that they felt that the children in the classes were achieving more than they would have done in "normal" classes.
- The existence of the classes created a "space" for Māori at the school, and this was seen as having been really important in giving children a sense of belonging, and a sense of self-worth. These were seen as important in themselves, but also as contributing to children's potential for academic success.
- This existence of the classes was also seen as having been pivotal in strengthening the relationship with the community, and encouraging parents and whānau to come into the school.
- The classes were also regarded as important in terms of the school's identity. Staff, including those who were not teaching within the language-enrichment classes, were proud of the developments that had taken place, and keen to continue supporting and participating in further development.
- Within the language-enrichment classes there was a clear mandate to use Māori. For those teachers involved, this had been "very freeing" because it had meant that they did not have to justify the use of te reo or the emphasis on tikanga to parents or children.

While teachers spoke about the language-enrichment classes in such a positive way, it became apparent, through the interviews, that there was a general feeling that it was now time for the identity of the classes to be re-examined. Teachers raised a number of questions about the classes, their relationship to each other and the rest of the school, and the directions that should be taken as the classes and the school developed.

A problem which was identified by almost all teachers was lack of clarity about how to refer to the classes. There was no "name" for the 2 classes, and although officially they were termed "language-enrichment" classes, this description was rarely used in interviews. A variety of terms were used by staff, children, and whānau: the unit; the bilingual classes;

rooms 1 and 2; the Māori classes, and so on. However, none of these was felt to be entirely appropriate or satisfactory. To a great extent this problem of naming reflected uncertainty regarding the identity of the 2 classes.

Administratively, the 2 classes had remained within the junior/senior team structure of the school. Teachers acknowledged the value of this in maintaining closeness between the 2 enrichment classes and other classes. However, this structure provided poor support for the development of a different curriculum for the language-enrichment classes.

Increasingly, teachers perceived the need to develop a syllabus specifically for the 2 classes that recognised the need to go beyond merely "translating" the syllabus used in other classes. It was stressed by those teachers working in the enrichment classes that the classes were much more than a "Māori-language unit". They identified the importance of catering for different learning styles, as well as respecting and incorporating tikanga Māori at the centre of their programmes. However, there was no clear path or scheme set out for them to follow. Nor were the overall goals of the classes clearly identified.

For the teachers working with the enrichment classes, the absence of a specific scheme designed for their classes meant that they often needed to spend considerable extra time modifying the existing scheme to suit their classes. Added to this, they also needed to put extra work into the preparation of materials. These teachers commented on the lack of commercially produced material, pointing out that the implicit message to children from this was that Māori was not as important as English. For this reason it was especially important that the material that they produced be of high quality. These factors meant that teachers working with the enrichment classes were under extra pressures. This was recognised and commented on by other staff, who were clearly keen to support these teachers in any way that they could.

There was also concern that the present structure, which involved 2 separate classes, meant that there was almost no flexibility in placing children in classes. Some children moved from the senior class to the junior class for some activities, but there was some feeling that it might be better to group the children on the basis of how well they worked together, rather than on the basis of age. There was a particular problem in the senior class, in which there were a number of children who, as a group, tended to "clash" in terms of personality. This situation was of particular concern because it seemed to confirm the worst stereotypes that people held about the enrichment classes, and rather than being recognised as a "normally difficult" class, problems were attributed to the fact that the children were Māori. One teacher described the situation in this way:

> There is an expectation on the part of teachers who work here that those children, who are Māori, and in the unit, are badly behaved. They don't like going in there. They see them as not achieving academically. What we need is teachers who expect the best.

Stage 3: Reporting Back and Taking Action

Having interviewed all teachers during the first 4 weeks of the second term, I reported back at a staff meeting in the sixth week of the term, outlining the issues discussed above. There was some brief discussion of the points made at that meeting, but it was decided that there would need to be more follow-up discussion of issues at team meetings and that further discussion at a full staff meeting was important before making any decisions about the next step of the research.

Team discussions suggested that staff as a whole felt that the most pressing and important area for development at that point in time centred on the role of the language-enrichment classes. It was apparent from these team meetings that all staff, not just those currently teaching in the enrichment classes, were keen to contribute to, and support, development. On the basis of these meetings, senior staff compiled a list of questions for staff to consider at the following full staff meeting:

Staff review of the Māori-language enrichment units

Questions to consider:

- The purpose of the units.
- Who goes into them?
- Who decides entry?
- What differences are there from other classes within the school in terms of:
    - curriculum
    - classroom management
    - expectations
    - values and attitudes
    - parent involvement
    - learners' needs?
- What support is provided for teachers in terms of:
    - personnel
    - resources?
- Whom do teachers work with and is this the best organisational structure?
- Are there other possible organisational structures?
- What role can the rest of the staff play?
- What staff development is required for teachers concerned and for staff in general?
- What is the future of the units and what are the implications for planning?

Unavoidably, neither of the Māori members of the teaching staff was able to attend this meeting, so those present decided that the meeting should focus primarily on discussion and clarification of issues, rather than decision making. The absence of the 2 staff members, may, in retrospect, have been quite positive in some respects. Some teachers commented that it had been "easier to open up and ask questions". It also meant that there was more need for *all* staff to contribute to the discussion, rather than avoiding participation, either through deference to those with more experience or through lack of confidence.

The meeting reaffirmed the teachers' commitment to supporting, and where appropriate being able to contribute to, the development of these classes. It also reaffirmed the decision that the classes be the focus of school development in the third term. The meeting was useful in clarifying issues associated with the history of the classes - how and why they had been developed - and this in turn was useful in establishing a basis from which decisions about directions for the future might be discussed. Some tentative ideas for development were put forward, and the need for a name for the classes was re-emphasised.

However, despite the agreed need and support for change, it seemed that major changes to the classes, at least in the short term, were unlikely. Structural changes were considered unsuitable because of the need for the assistant principal to retain responsibility for the junior team, and there was a general feeling that the school was too small to incorporate a third team. It was also decided that the age range meant that keeping a junior and senior class was most appropriate. Thus, while the need for change was acknowledged, the meeting ended with few ideas about how it could be effected.

Although there were some points that had been raised in the interviews that I was able to clarify or expand on as they related to the issues discussed at this meeting, it was clear that the staff had really taken over responsibility for driving the research. This became even more evident during the next stage of the research process.

The deputy principal had not been at this meeting. However, in thinking through and discussing the issues with the principal and the teachers of the enrichment classes, the deputy principal came to believe that, unless there were major changes to the classes, then development would be superficial, and would not be able to address the real needs that had been identified. This response was obviously contrary to the response registered at that earlier meeting. However, the deputy principal prepared a proposal about the enrichment classes to put to staff at the next meeting. This was held during the first week of the third term, and at that meeting it was proposed that the primary objectives of school development during the third term should be:

- to provide a purpose and directional base for the unit classes;
- to ensure overall development of the *Tihē Mauri Ora!*[*] syllabus for both the unit classes and other classes in the school;
- to create and implement a scheme appropriate to the unit classes;
- to develop whānau grouping within these classes.

In support of these objectives, the deputy principal made the following points for staff discussion:

- Whānau grouping would offer more flexibility in terms of the placement of children, and should provide an opportunity to avoid difficult behaviour combinations.
- The use of the *Tihē Mauri Ora!* syllabus as a framework for the development of scheme content would provide controlled direction and ensure purposeful learning in all areas.
- Schemes for the unit should be linked to all subject areas, and objectives-based guidelines should be developed that could be used in conjunction with the existing school scheme.

---

[*] Māori language syllabus for primary schools.

- To ensure that the classes can work together would mean that there was, in a sense, a third team in the school.

Despite the fact that these suggestions were considerably different from those discussed at the earlier meeting, the overall response from all staff was very positive. There was a strong feeling that something could and would be done, and staff said that they felt excited and challenged by the suggested changes. During the meeting a name for the unit was settled on: Te Puāwaitanga. The name was based on the idea that the classes represented a blossoming, or flowering that followed on from the sense of kōhanga reo being a nest.

There were some concerns raised. Some staff still believed that the school was too small to support what was essentially a third team, although officially Te Puāwaitanga remained part of the senior team. However, it was recognised that in terms of planning and setting objectives it was much more appropriate that the unit classes worked together. At the same time, all staff acknowledged that it was important that the unit did not become a separate part of the school. It was felt that the implementation of *Tihē Mauri Ora!* in the unit would provide direction for the development of te reo in the rest of the school, and that overall planning for the implementation of the syllabus should continue to involve all staff.

In making the changes, it was suggested that there would be a need to draw more heavily on community support and involvement. It was also recognised that often the most well-resourced Māori families (in terms of te reo and Māori cultural affiliation) sent their children to early childhood centres, including kōhanga reo, that fed into the kura kaupapa Māori or other schools with longer established bilingual classes, and then moved on to other schools, even though they lived in the Te Maha area.

The time frame for interpreting the syllabus and developing a new scheme was acknowledged as being very tight. However, it was agreed that if the commitment was there, then the changes could be accomplished in time for reorganisation of Te Puāwaitanga at the beginning of 1993. It was decided that senior staff meeting times (fortnightly) would be given to development of the scheme for Te Puāwaitanga, and that this should involve all staff who were interested. This meant that there were 6 meeting times available before the end of the year.

The deputy principal took the leading role in providing the agenda for these sessions. The meetings that followed were well attended, with all staff actively participating in working on the new scheme. The process started with an overview of *Tihē Mauri Ora!*, and a consideration of the ways that it could be linked to current schemes used within the school. Groups then worked on the scheme documents and proposed ways in which they might be changed to take a Māori kaupapa into account. However, having adopted this approach, concern arose that what was being produced was, in fact, not a new scheme, but the old (Pākehā) scheme "Māorified". To go beyond this the staff agreed that it would be necessary to seek input from outside agencies to provide further knowledge and ngākau relating to structure and content.

On my last visit to the school in 1992 (the last week of term), the levels of energy and commitment to having the new scheme for Te Puāwaitanga in place for the beginning of 1993 were still high, and a meeting with a group with expertise and experience in developing a Māori curriculum had been organised (after school on the last day of term!). Staff were very optimistic about the developments that were taking place. They were confident that their competence in formulating scheme documents that incorporated clear, specific, and workable objectives, together with the knowledge base that others could bring, would provide the basis for a really exciting future for Te Puāwaitanga in the school.

It had been decided to use Matariki One[†] as the basis for teaching te reo in the rest of the school, and 2 teachers had taken on responsibility for organising staff development and support for this. Finally, an investigation of the viability of supporting a preschool set up by Te Whānau o Te Kura o Te Maha had been identified as a part of the strategic plan for 1993.

Conclusion

The developments that took place at Te Maha during 1992 provide a good example of the ways in which action research might contribute to change in the school. In many ways the success of the research reflects the fact that school development practices were essentially based on an action-research model, and that part of the school culture was centred on the idea of the teacher as a reflective practitioner. In this sense, research and practice at Te Maha were tied together anyway, and change and improvement were built into school processes. This meant that the teachers were able to make good use of the research process, particularly in terms of responding to the feedback from the interviews and establishing priorities for the next stage of the research process. This in turn made it relatively easy for me as researcher to withdraw from the process. Although I continued to participate in meetings and both formal and informal discussions, responsibility for providing direction for the research was taken over by staff very early on in the project. Staff were well able to plan for, and implement, the next stages of the research. As well, built into the developments that were planned for 1993, was an ongoing process of monitoring and evaluation, which would in turn provide the basis for subsequent development.

For me as a researcher, one of the exciting aspects of the research was the way in which the process of change sped up as the year progressed. For the teachers at this school, the involvement in positive change as a group appeared to be crucial to their job satisfaction and their sense of worth as teachers. This was something that they themselves had commented on in the original interviews, giving it as one of the very positive aspects of working at the school. In addition, as the research progressed and took off, it appeared that staff morale and enthusiasm were also boosted. One teacher, for example, earlier in the year, had indicated that she felt that it was time for her to move on to another job because there was little that she could contribute to the school. She subsequently became one of the key people involved in the research process as the year progressed, and the positive change in her enthusiasm towards, and enjoyment of, her work was evident.

However, it is difficult to evaluate exactly how much, and how directly, my presence as an outside researcher working with an action-research approach actually contributed to the changes that took place. On the last visit that I made to the school in 1992, one teacher commented that the interviews had allowed *everybody* to speak out, and had created a "clearer pathway for communication between staff". Others said that the results of the interviews had indicated that they were much more prepared to go ahead than they had realised, and that this had been important in providing the confidence and motivation to take action. Certainly the interviews appeared to have been useful in providing teachers with an opportunity to talk about the issues that really bothered them. This was important in helping them discuss and clarify their own concerns, as well as identifying those aspects of their own practice and the school's practice about which they felt positively. The clear emergence of the role of the bilingual classes as an area of common concern established a sense of shared commitment and responsibility. This was crucial to the energy that was generated, and to the willingness staff were able to bring to the considerable demands that the project they had undertaken required. At the end of the year, one teacher suggested that the changes that had occurred would probably have happened some time, but that the presence of the research had "been as if someone had turned on a video and switched on the fast forward".

[†] Guidelines for introducing Māori language in English-medium primary school classes.

CHAPTER 4

Rimuroa School

Rimuroa is a contributing primary school situated within a few minutes' walk of a busy shopping and commercial centre. The residential area that the school serves varies considerably, and includes a state housing area, and an area of large, well-established houses that clearly represent the more expensive end of the market.

The total roll in February 1992 stood at 252, and this had risen to 274 by July, with the average class size rising from 23 to 27, and the largest class having 32 pupils. The school is divided into 3 syndicate groups: a junior and a senior syndicate of 4 classes each, and a bilingual syndicate comprising 1 junior and 1 senior class. During 1992 the school had the benefit of having an above-establishment beginning teacher on the staff, and other "extra" staffing resources included:

- 90 hours' ESL provision,
- .2 reading recovery + 1 teacher in training, and
- .5 teacher-aide time targeted for support for a child with a disability.

The main administration area, library, and 5 classrooms are housed in 1 block, built in 1950. Three of the senior syndicate classes are based in an open-plan unit built in 1973, and the bilingual classes are housed in a separate 2-room block added in 1974. The school has 2 school halls which are used extensively by both the school and a variety of community groups. A speech and dental clinic are attached to the school, and a class at a nearby hospital is also funded, staffed, and administered through the school.

School and Community

The school community is diverse in terms of socioeconomic, cultural, and ethnic background. While the school has a small proportion of families in which either one or both parents are in professional or semiprofessional employment, in 1992, 73 percent of the children were identified as coming from homes in which the main income earner was in either category 5 or 6 on the Elley-Irving index (fathers' occupation either semiskilled or unskilled), on a benefit, or not in receipt of regular income.

The majority of the children at the school are Pākehā: 58 percent in 1992; with approximately 28 percent Māori; 6 percent Samoan; 6 percent Cambodian; 1.5 percent Iranian; and there were also 2 Chinese and 1 Fijian-Indian child enrolled in the school. Thirty-four (12.4 percent) of the children at the school spoke languages other than English or Māori as their first or home language. While the majority of the staff are also Pākehā, there are 3 Māori teachers, and 1 Cook Island teacher at the school.

Within the school's catchment area there is an emergency accommodation centre run by the Salvation Army, a women's refuge, and a hostel for families of cancer patients. The principal suggested that children in these situations often had particular needs that it was important for the school to recognise: they were very frequently under considerable emotional stress, which was also often compounded by financial strain and uncertainty for their families and caregivers. Children from families using these facilities also contribute to the relatively high roll turnover at the school: in the year to July 1992, there were 123 admissions and 63 withdrawals (excluding standard 4, 1991).

A special aspect of the school is the commitment that is shown by the principal, the staff, and the board of trustees to making the school a welcoming place for families and members of the wider community. This was commented on both by parents and staff and was summed up by the whānau representative on the board of trustees in her annual report:

> The main things for me that have come out of all these [school activities] is the feeling that the whole school comes together as a caring, sharing family, there is much parental support and I see this in all of my involvements.

The school has an open-door policy and parents and members of the community are encouraged to come into the school and participate in school and classroom programmes and activities. Morning tea times in the staffroom almost always include at least 3 or 4 parents and usually other visitors as well. To some extent these occasions are a feature of the school, and highlight the concern that parents and whānau should feel comfortable, welcome, and part of the school.

Communication between staff and parents is seen as a high priority, and parental involvement in children's learning and the day-to-day life of the school is encouraged. Parents are regularly employed as teacher aides, and a small group of parents spend a considerable amount of time helping in school on a voluntary basis, with one parent working on a full-time basis. This situation worked to the benefit of both the school and the parent. The parent hoped that evidence of his commitment to working and the skills that he was able to use and develop at the school would be useful in helping him obtain paid employment. Regular communication between class teachers and parents is kept up through weekly class newsletters that are sent home to parents, twice-yearly interviews, and an open-door policy in which parents are encouraged to come into the school and talk to teachers at any time if they feel that it is important. At the end of 1991, a questionnaire was sent to parents, seeking their comments on current reporting and interview processes and asking for suggestions for ways in which information sharing might be improved. Eighty-nine parents responded to the questionnaire and although there were a wide range of responses some clear patterns emerged. Over all, parents indicated they felt that the current system worked well, but that interviews were generally more useful than written reports, and that they should be held every term rather than only twice a year. Ten-minute interviews were generally regarded as too short, and a small number of parents suggested that interviews should take place at home rather than at school. Comments by 8 parents specified the importance of parents/whānau knowing about children's behaviour, attitudes, and social skills as well as academic progress. One parent suggested that children should be included in interviews; another suggested that a notebook, for comments by both teacher and parents, be kept by the child. Finally, 2 responses indicated the need for childcare facilities to be available during meeting or interview times.

The principal identified 2 groups that had been particularly influential in consolidating the links between the school and whānau/parents. A small group of parents had been very active in the running of a local playcentre before their children had gone on to school. These parents had been keen to continue this close involvement and participation in their children's education, and had quickly established themselves as active members of the school community. These parents had also been very supportive of the suggestion that the bilingual classes be developed and had been keen for their children to go into these classes.

Links between the school, Māori parents, and the wider Māori community had also been an area of considerable development. The presence of the bilingual classes had been especially important in providing a bridge between the school, and the Māori community, and the links between parents, school, and community had been further strengthened by the school kaumātua and nanny.

Finally, links between these 2 groups (the playcentre parents and the Māori parents) had been established through the whānau support group for the bilingual classes which involved both the Māori and Pākehā parents of children in these classes. One teacher commented that this relationship had been empowering for both groups of parents in terms of "the Pākehā parents learning to feel more comfortable and confident in the Māori world, and the Māori parents learning to feel more comfortable and confident in the Pākehā world".

The school maintains a relationship with the wider community in a number of ways. For example, a school newspaper, published once a year, not only goes out to the community, but also involves children in obtaining sponsorship for the paper from local businesses. The children are also regularly involved in project work which takes them out into the community. There is a close relationship with the local community constable, who makes regular visits to the school, and finally, school facilities such as the halls and swimming pool are used by a variety of community groups. In particular, the hall complex is used in the afternoons and holidays for a privately run, after-school and holiday programme.

Staff and School Development

The current principal was appointed to the school in 1989, and a major focus of school development since then had been establishing the close relationship with parents and community that had become a feature of the way the school operated. The principal saw this as an important component in creating a school environment which was warm, friendly, and safe, in which children felt valued and happy, and in which learning was fun. In providing for this, the principal saw it as important that staff too felt valued and "were able to get on with the job of working with the kids".

Staff said that they were encouraged to undertake their own professional development, and that the board of trustees was very ready to provide financial support for extra studies. During 1992, staff were involved in a variety of courses offered through university, college of education, and the Ministry of Education, and the principal was involved in a principals' development project run by the university.

In addition to encouraging staff to attend courses, money was available in the school to provide release time for teachers to enable them to undertake a variety of other opportunities for professional development, such as visiting other schools and spending time observing or working with other teachers at Rimuroa. During 1992, very little of this release time was actually used. The principal suggested that this reflected the teachers' commitment to actually being with their classes, and a reluctance to disrupt the children's programmes:

> We've got all the resources, all the opportunities, we're ready to go. But it doesn't happen, because the teachers' prime direction is with the kids in the class. That's where they want to be. . . . They're good teachers, they want to be with the kids, and I can't argue with that.

However, the principal said that despite this, a key way to support staff development was to encourage teachers to take the time to observe each other, and to engage in a more structured schedule of team or pair evaluations.

The Bilingual Classes

The major structural change to the school in recent years had been the establishment of the 2 bilingual classes. The deputy principal had had a long-standing interest in, and commitment to, developing bilingual education at the school, and in 1983 had taken a year off to work at establishing a kōhanga reo. However, it was not until the current principal's appointment, and the opportunities that became available through the changes in administrative procedures that were established under Tomorrow's Schools, that it was possible for the deputy principal to realise this "dream":

> It's taken us a long time to get our bilingual classes off the ground. I've been here for ages, and I've been trying for a long time - and it only happened 3 years ago. Because you couldn't bully people. You've got to have people who are interested.
>
> . . . And I said to a lot of people 'Well, wouldn't it be good . . .', and 'What do you think?' But without the principal's support, we would never have got started. And the board of trustees, it was their first year coming in, and they gave us their full-hearted support. If we didn't have that support at the top, it couldn't have started.
>
> . . . When [the principal] came I said 'I've got this dream', and then [the principal] says 'Let's hear it' . . . and we said 'Who are we going to get to come in?' So we got the resource teachers from the local board, we had people who had experience in this from the university, from college. We got all these people to have a kōrero to the parents, and from there it started. But if it weren't for the way the principal handles people it wouldn't have happened: [the principal] makes people feel comfortable, and is a blooming good listener.

Within the current bilingual classes, the deputy principal said that there were only 4 children who could be described as truly bilingual. For the other children, English was the language that they spoke at home and for this reason, at this time, the main language used in the bilingual classes was English:

> English is the focus, because they need it. They need to improve their English, (as well as learn Māori). If they have Māori too, then they have 2 lovely things side by side. They are writing stories in Māori - they are becoming bilingual. But English is still their first language. You've got to teach them how to read in English, then they can use those skills in Māori. But this situation might change - if they come in with good Māori, then maybe we can teach them to read in Māori. They need to feel comfortable in both worlds, not only the Māori world, but also the Pākehā world.

Both teachers working in the bilingual classes stressed the importance of tikanga as well as the reo, and indicated that this had been central in making a difference for the children who were in those classes:

> The classes are about whanaungatanga, attitudes and values, and its made a lot of difference, especially for the older ones. As they get old - many of our children used to get into a lot of trouble. They didn't learn. They didn't want to learn. They used to fall behind. I think it's just a system that they didn't understand. It's hard to understand coming from a Māori background. . . . [But now] they're doing well. Their self-esteem has just . . . gone right up, and now they are able to stand tall.

As indicated in the section above dealing with the relationships between the school and its community, the establishment of bilingual classes had played an important role in developing a closer relationship with Māori parents. The bilingual teachers stressed the importance of the whānau support group, and the difference that this had made in terms of parents and whānau feeling that they could come and participate in what was happening in the school. The teachers also pointed out that the fact that the whānau support group included both Māori and Pākehā parents had been really positive. They explained that:

> The bilingual classes have been important for the children, but also really important for the parents. Often the parents are very shy about coming into school, but our whānau group has become quite tight and strong. About 75 percent of the parents come along to meetings. . . . Pot-luck dinners have been a good way to break down barriers.
> . . . And it is important that the parents can bring children to meetings, and that childcare is available. Because it's too expensive for our parents to get babysitters.
> . . . Because parents *choose* the bilingual classes for their children, they are already involved, and that makes them much more supportive.
> . . . The other important thing is that the whānau is controlled and run by the parents and that's been important in making the group feel confident.
> . . . The other thing that has been good is that there are both Māori and Pākehā in the whānau. The whānau can use the skills of both. Some of the Pākehā parents were more at home with the school and this helps the whānau feel that they are equal partners, rather than the teachers up here and the parents down here.

Other Areas of Development

During the first term of 1992, the focus of school development had been the introduction of a staff-training package in assertive discipline, and although there were some mixed reactions to the programme it had been adjusted to suit the needs of the school as a whole and the styles and approaches of individual teachers. At the time of the research, implementation of the package was still in its early stages and an evaluation of the approach was not undertaken during the time span of the research.

The school was reviewed by the Education Review Office (ERO) early in 1992, and the report back to the school made a number of recommendations for school development. To some extent these recommendations meant that the school was required to "fit" its plans for development into the framework that had been established by the review office. There was some resentment towards the report on the part of staff and board, and a feeling that the review had "failed to acknowledge many of the positive aspects of our school" (Chairperson, Board of Trustees, 1992). Many of the recommendations focused on the documentation of policy, and staff indicated that they felt that this reflected more interest in pieces of paper than what was actually happening. Key recommendations of ERO's report included the need to:

- prioritise the review of curriculum learning areas in the school scheme;
- develop systems for programme evaluation; and
- agree on a school-wide assessment procedure.

Thus, the ERO report effectively set an agenda for development, which was not necessarily in line with the priorities of staff, the principal, or the board of trustees. This was subsequently to have a considerable impact on the process of the research.

The Research

Stage 1: Getting Started

When I first contacted the principal at the beginning of the first term about working with Rimuroa, the school was just about to undergo its first review by an ERO team. As part of the school plan for 1992, an outside agency had also already been contracted to provide training in assertive discipline for all staff during the first term. We decided that I should wait until later that term before putting the research proposal to staff. At that stage, however, the principal believed that the proposed research would fit well with the plan for the year, and that it would be appropriate for the research to provide the focus for school and staff development during the second term. A review of assessment and evaluation procedures had been planned for the third term.

I put the research proposal to teachers at a full staff meeting halfway through the first term. Although there seemed to be a general agreement amongst teachers that they were keen to participate, there was a limited amount of time to discuss the possibilities for the research during that meeting. We decided that I should attend syndicate meetings the next week to answer questions and to talk with teachers about how the research might proceed, before they made a final decision about whether to go ahead with the proposal.

I went to all 3 syndicate meetings the following week. It was possible to talk in some detail with members of the junior syndicate, who appeared to be very enthusiastic about participation in the research. At that meeting they particularly identified concerns about how adequate their programmes were in terms of catering for children from non-English-speaking backgrounds. They were also keen to establish a way of ensuring that there was a coherent progression of development in language through the school. Unfortunately the leaders of both other syndicate groups were absent on that day, so although I spoke briefly to other members of these two groups, there was really only a limited opportunity to talk about the research with them. However, at the next full staff meeting, staff as a whole agreed that the research focus on language and equity issues was relevant to the needs and interests of the school, and that the research would be useful in terms of contributing to school development in these areas.

During the next 4 weeks until the end of the term, I spent time in the school, attending meetings, talking informally to parents, observing and participating in all classes, going to assemblies, attending a school concert, and generally becoming familiar with the school and its community. As with Te Maha, the teachers made me feel very welcome and were quick to involve me in working with children when I was in their classrooms.

During this period, one staff meeting was used by staff to discuss the ERO report on the school. Although the overall tone of the report was quite positive, the review indicated that the school was required to undertake considerable work in terms of documenting the details of a number of procedures and policies relating to administration, management, curriculum, assessment, and evaluation. To meet these recommendations would obviously require a huge amount of paper work, and it was apparent that the time frame for writing these policies, plans, and procedures would limit opportunities for participation and discussion. In this situation it seemed that while such documents might satisfy the requirements of ERO, there would be little opportunity to develop them in such a way that they would have very much impact on what was actually happening in the school.

There were some aspects of the review's recommendations which were in line with areas that had already been identified as requiring development in the school. It had, for example, already been decided by staff that a review of assessment and evaluation, together with record-keeping procedures, would be the focus of school development in the third term. However, the report was very critical of the school scheme, using the principal's words, in commenting that it was "out of date and irrelevant" and that "urgent steps should be taken to upgrade its contents", adding that the school should not wait for the publication of the National Education Guidelines[‡] before doing this. The scheme, in fact, considerably predated the appointment of the current principal, and curriculum development at the school had long since meant that the scheme was, as ERO suggested, irrelevant. However, rather than a full-scale rewriting of the scheme, the principal had believed that the writing of the scheme should be linked to school and staff development, and should be undertaken over a more extended period. In view of the ERO report, the principal proposed, and staff agreed, that the research should be used to help establish an appropriate policy in language that would both meet ERO's requirements and contribute to staff and programme development in this area as well.

It was agreed by staff that, early in the second term, I should interview all teachers in order to:

- provide an opportunity for teachers to reflect and comment on the current language programmes;
- identify those issues that staff believed should be addressed by a language policy for the school;
- gain an overall picture of the staff's priorities in terms of possible areas for change and development.

It was intended that this information could be used as a basis for developing a policy which would really be relevant to the special context of the school and its community, and that the policy in turn would provide the basis for developing a school scheme in language that was relevant, informative, and useful.

[‡] Published on 30 April 1993, the Guidelines contain a statement of 10 goals for education in New Zealand and 6 main curriculum and administrative requirements for schools.

I agreed to provide a written outline of the sorts of questions that might be covered in interviews and make this available to staff for comment at the next staff meeting at the beginning of the second term. These were set out as follows:

The following ideas are intended as a general guideline to the types of issues which might be covered in the interviews about language; the ways in which it is learnt and taught; and the ways in which it is used in learning and teaching at Rimuroa School.

The general aim of the interview is to provide a basis for further discussion by:

- raising suggestions regarding the general issues that should be addressed by a language policy and scheme at Rimuroa School; and
- clarifying the goals and priorities for the development of a policy and scheme.

Sample Questions

☐ Are there any special aspects of the children and their prior learning experiences that should be considered in drawing up a language policy and scheme?
☐ What current thinking and practices do you feel enhance language development or are especially helpful/useful in language teaching and learning at this school?
☐ Are there any attitudes or practices which make language teaching and learning difficult?
☐ What are the areas and practices most in need of development and change?
☐ How could change be best initiated and supported?

Note: Areas where changes might occur could include administrative structures, resources, attitudes (staff, community, children), leadership, staff development practices, advisory services etc.

At the next staff meeting copies of this document were given to all staff, who indicated that they felt happy with the suggested areas for discussion. At this meeting teachers decided that the interviews should be conducted over the next 2 weeks, and that I should report back to the whole staff in the fourth week of the term. The principal suggested that the staff should then divide into subcommittees that should focus on drafting schemes for different areas within language (e.g., reading/writing and speaking/listening). These groups would then report back to the staff as a whole for further discussion. The aim was to have a final draft of the language policy and scheme ready to present to the board of trustees by the last week of that term. If the board approved, then the policy and scheme would be made available to the wider community of parents and whānau for comment in the third term. At this stage of the research it appeared that staff generally were keen to get on with this work and were satisfied that it was fulfilling real as well as bureaucratic needs.

Stage Two: Interviews and Policy Issues

The interviews were held over the next 2 weeks, mostly either after school or during lunchtimes. The principal had cancelled the staff meeting for one of these weeks, so that teachers had that hour of time in "exchange" for time that they spent with me. As with Te Maha, the interviews were wide ranging and often went beyond the outlined questions. Most interviews took between half an hour and an hour, and most were done with individuals, though 2 staff chose to be interviewed together.

Over all, teachers indicated that they felt that the current programmes and attitudes in the school supported children's language development well. Co-operative approaches to learning were used in all classes, and peer support was emphasised. Teachers commented that "valuing children" was part of the school culture, and as such they felt that a fundamental aspect of their programmes was encouraging children "to have a go", and to believe that "what they say is worth saying". One teacher, for example, said:

> we encourage the children to listen to others' opinions, and we listen to what the children have to say - the children have a chance to make decisions, they're not just told what to do. It seems to be part of the philosophy of the school, and that's very good for language.

Teachers also commented on the strength of parental support and said that this sense that "parents and teachers were working together" was really valuable in establishing a supportive and positive environment for children.

Teachers worked closely within each of the syndicates, and it was apparent that these groupings were most important in terms of planning and developing programmes, and providing opportunities for teachers to share ideas and seek professional guidance and support. Teachers in each syndicate commented on the importance of the co-operative approach taken within the syndicates, and indicated that this was crucial to ensuring that language programmes were appropriate, balanced, and stimulating. In planning for such programmes, teachers emphasised the importance of flexibility in contributing to a positive language-learning environment, and they deliberately used a variety of different approaches to teaching and learning, and ensured that flexible groupings were used for different activities.

Staff indicated that they felt that the school was generally well resourced with quality up-to-date books and materials. They commented very positively on the high level of support given by the board of trustees and the principal both in terms of finance and support for the decisions that teachers themselves made about what they wanted to use. However, teachers also suggested that resources in the school generally needed to be better organised. There was a lack of a central storage area, and materials tended to be located in syndicate areas. There was also no central record of what resources were available in each syndicate, and staff suggested that greater accessibility to material and more sharing across syndicates would be useful.

Although the overall picture of provision for language and learning given by teachers was positive, teachers did identify some aspects of current practice that they felt needed clarifying or development, and suggested that these might usefully be addressed in a language policy for the school.

Policy Issues

Coverage

Most teachers said that they believed that the policy should deal with language in its broadest sense. They were keen that it did not become an "English" policy and that it did cover Māori, other languages, bilingual teaching, and ESL. Only one teacher had reservations about this, saying that she believed that Māori should be dealt with in a separate policy and scheme. Most teachers also indicated that they believed that it would be most useful to deal with language as a whole. They suggested that, although the scheme might deal with different areas of language (such as "speaking and listening" and "reading and writing") in different sections, it was important that these areas were clearly linked. In describing this approach to language some teachers referred specifically to Cambourne's "whole language" approach (Cambourne, 1988). One teacher, however, suggested that to achieve balance it was necessary to have a separate reading policy and scheme, because "otherwise reading tended to either dominate or alternatively get swallowed up".

Provision for Children from Non-English-speaking Backgrounds

Teachers indicated that they felt that the school as a whole made a very positive effort to recognise and respond to the needs and interests of children from non-English-speaking backgrounds. A number of teachers said that they really enjoyed the opportunity to work with children from a variety of cultures, and suggested that the multicultural make-up of the school was a very positive aspect, giving it a "richness". However, staff identified the need for development in this area, and raised 2 main areas of concern in relation to the current provision of programmes and support:

- The focus of both classroom programmes and extra support tended to be on developing and extending children's English. Some teachers wondered if they should also be encouraging first-language maintenance, and how they as "monolingual" teachers might accomplish this. While there were some practices which some teachers were already using (such as the use of greetings in other languages, and encouraging and supporting children's use of their first language in paired or small-group situations), teachers identified this as an area in which there was a real need for professional development. In terms of balancing first- and English-language development, teachers also said that there was a need to take parental wishes into account. It was suggested that some attempt to survey parental attitudes would be appropriate in determining development in this area.

- Extra support available was used for the withdrawal of children from class for one-to-one ESL teaching. Some teachers questioned whether this was the most appropriate and effective way of helping children's English-language development. Teachers also said that a problem with this process was that often they did not keep informed about what children were actually doing while they were withdrawn from class. They suggested that if the benefits of withdrawal were to be maximised then some system of ensuring adequate communication between the teachers involved needed to be established. The point here was that unless this communication was clearly identified as part of the process, it tended not to happen, not because it was unimportant, but simply that it tended to "get lost" under the weight of other demands. Teachers also identified ESL teaching as an area in which there was a need for school-wide staff development, so that as classroom teachers they were able to teach English to children from non-English-speaking backgrounds more effectively.

Diversity of Language Experience

During the interviews almost all teachers commented on the wide range of language experiences that children brought with them to school. As well as there being a number of children from non-English-speaking backgrounds, teachers commented on the diversity of experience amongst children whose home language was English. Although teachers consistently expressed a reluctance to stereotype children, most said that children from working-class homes and some said those from solo-parent families were much less likely to come to school with the sort of language which was valued or rewarded in the classroom. Teachers offered a number of explanations for this including, concern that:

- children in solo-parent families often have limited access to oral language, because that parent's time is limited, and they do not hear so much adult conversation;
- children in working-class and solo-parent homes often have limited experiences outside home because of lack of money;
- sometimes these children have had limited experience of written language both in terms of reading books or writing themselves, or seeing others doing so;
- children in working-class families are often exposed to "poor" or "wrong" language models.

Contrasting with these children were those, identified by teachers as more commonly from middle-class homes, whose parents had obviously consciously prepared their children for the sorts of language that are valued and encouraged in schools. These children came to school with complex oral skills, and were often able to read and write simple words, and so on. In terms of developing policy, teachers said that there was a need to accommodate this diversity, and ensure that language programmes provided for extension for the most competent children without "failing" others.

The Teaching of Te Reo and Tikanga Māori in the Junior and Senior Syndicates

Although the bilingual classes had an established kaupapa in relation to the teaching of te reo Māori and tikanga Māori within these classes, there was no policy for the rest of the school. It was clear that almost all of the teachers in the school believed that there should be school-wide teaching of te reo and tikanga, and that they did not see the existence of the bilingual classes as absolving them of a duty to provide programmes in these areas. However, most felt that they themselves were not providing adequate programmes and were uncertain of how best to improve this situation.

Teachers tended to question their own competence and abilities in speaking te reo. At the same time a number commented that they were aware that lack of confidence was not a good reason for "standing still". Some did question whether, as non-fluent speakers of Māori, they provided the best models for children. In addition to establishing closer contact with the bilingual classes, it was also suggested that it might be more useful to have a fluent speaker from the community come into the classrooms.

Although the teachers in the bilingual classes said that they were very happy to provide assistance and resources to other teachers, there were no formal arrangements for the provision of such support. In addition to this, resources were not centrally located in one place, so bilingual resources were located in the bilingual block. Thus, although there was nothing that obviously stopped other teachers using these resources, access both to the bilingual teachers and Māori materials was not built into the system, and there seemed to be very little sharing of ideas across the syndicate divide. This situation was also perhaps inadvertently compounded by the fact that the bilingual teachers said that they were keen not to "threaten" other teachers, or make them feel that "they had to do Māori". One bilingual teacher explained that it was her belief that "if the teaching of te reo is to be successful then it must be done voluntarily". Other teachers, however, indicated that they were ready to go beyond this, and they were keen to establish policy in this area. There was general agreement amongst these teachers that it was very important that the language policy should not be an "English" policy and that it should cover the learning and teaching of te reo.

School Structure and Communication Between Syndicates

The most consistently expressed concern in the interviews focused on the lack of communication between the 3 syndicates, and particularly the "divide" between the bilingual classes and others in the school.

Within syndicates, teachers said that there was good sharing of ideas and resources, and that there was an appropriate balance of leadership, support, flexibility, and freedom. However, aside from full staff meetings there were no formal structured opportunities for teachers or children to work with members of other syndicates. Staff were concerned that this meant that there was a lack of coherence in terms of the programmes. Senior-syndicate teachers said that they had no clear idea of the ways in which they might most successfully build on the children's learning in the junior syndicate, and conversely the junior-syndicate teachers said that they felt they did not know what the expectations of the senior syndicate were, or how they could best prepare the children for the senior classes.

Similarly, teachers commented on the lack of communication between the bilingual classes and the other syndicates. Teachers in the junior and senior syndicates emphasised their concern that the situation had become one in which there was a sense of "us and them", both for teachers and for children. One teacher, for example, said:

> At our school it seems to me that we are sectionalised, rather than corporate. . . . We are starting to have kids ganging up against each other . . . actually the real problem is between the senior school and the bilingual kids. You know the Māori versus the Pākehā, which is really crazy because there are so many Pākehā kids in the bilingual unit. But the identification is very much to that whānau group. Unfortunately, I think to the detriment of the rest of the school.

One teacher also commented that it was difficult for other teachers to establish a rapport with the children in the whānau group, and that this could lead to discipline problems, because the children "only perceive the teachers in those 2 classes as important . . . I think because they don't see themselves as belonging to the school, but only to the whānau group".

Teachers in the non-bilingual classes indicated that closer links with the bilingual teachers and classes would also help clarify the role that they themselves could and should play in teaching te reo in their own classrooms, and in developing curricula that were culturally sensitive and inclusive. One teacher suggested, for example, that more contact between the classes might provide a positive way of introducing, or extending the use of, te reo in the "non-bilingual" classes.

The physical structure of the school also contributed to the divide between the different sections of the school. One member of the senior team worked in the same block as the 4 junior classes, but apart from this the teams were housed in different buildings, and teachers very seldom went into areas other than their own. It is interesting to note that the senior team teacher, who worked in the junior area, was the only teacher in the interviews who commented that she did have good links with another syndicate.

In order to facilitate communication between teachers and children in different syndicates, one teacher had suggested that the school set aside a regular time during which children would meet in vertically grouped classes. These groups would be paired, with the 2 teachers coming from different syndicates. Other teachers also suggested that communication across staff could be encouraged if more time in staff meetings were focused on professional issues and the sharing of ideas rather than concentrating on day-to-day administrative issues.

Staff said that a key aspect of the language policy would be its ability to address the need to provide staff with a clear, overall view of language programmes in the school. They were very concerned to ensure that the policy would provide for coherence across the syndicates, giving all teachers a much clearer idea of what was expected of children at different levels in the school.

Curriculum Guidelines

In order to establish the basis for this coherence, a consistent suggestion made by teachers was that there needed to be some sort of check list or set of guidelines as to the sort of expectations that were appropriate at different stages of schooling. It was suggested that these would also be useful in providing a basis for evaluation and assessment procedures. However, there was uncertainty about how such a check list might be structured, and some teachers had reservations regarding how workable and/or desirable it might be. Within the interviews with these teachers the questions raised included:

- Can expectations at each level be balanced with the need to be working from where the child is at?
- Is there a danger that check lists might become a straitjacket (for both the teacher and child)?
- Is there a danger that children will be seen as "failing" if they do not measure up to expectations?
- How specific/general should such a check list be?
- Should there be check list specific to each level, or should there be a more general check list appropriate to a variety of levels?

    (For example -

        Can use conventions of written English;

By the end of standard 2 children should be able to use full stops correctly;
Talks willingly to partner/small group/large group;
Reads for pleasure).

- How big is a check list going to be?
- Is it likely to become a white elephant that is impossible to use in practice because it takes up so much time?

Stage 3: Reporting Back and Taking Action

I reported back on the interviews at the staff meeting in the fourth week of term. Within the interviews the most pressing concern identified by staff had been the need to improve and facilitate communication between children and adults across syndicates. This area of concern was acknowledged in the meeting, but it was decided that the need to establish a language policy and scheme should remain the focus of school development and the research.

There was some brief discussion about the idea of "check lists of learning expectations" and the shape that a scheme and policy might take, but due to the limits of time (and other business), it was decided that further discussion should occur at syndicate level the following week. Syndicate meetings would focus on the sorts of language-learning outcomes that syndicate members perceived as being important for the children they were teaching. To provide a starting point for these meetings, I agreed to provide a written summary of the ideas that people had expressed in relation to developing a list of learning outcomes as a basis for scheme development. In the event, due to other circumstances and the pressure of other issues, it was only in the junior syndicate that this discussion took place.

Within the junior-syndicate discussion, a number of further questions and concerns about check lists were raised. Teachers said that the purpose of lists of learning outcomes needed to be considered very carefully. Specifically, there was concern that such lists could be used to monitor teachers, rather than being used to benefit or support either pupils or teachers in any positive way. We also discussed the concern that check lists of skills expected at a particular level were very normative in terms of the way they implied that learning and language might develop, and in terms of setting expectations about what children should (or should not) be able to do at any particular age or stage. Teachers indicated that they felt that it might be more useful to generate a framework of more generic skills that could be expected to be developing at all levels. The group decided that it might be useful to try brainstorming such a list with staff as a whole. They also suggested that, although they wanted to maintain a whole-language approach, it might be more manageable to focus on a narrower area (such as listening). Since the previous staff meeting, 2 staff (one from the junior syndicate and one from the bilingual classes) had visited another local school to look at a whole-language programme that was running throughout the school, and the group seemed enthusiastic about the ways in which they might be able to develop a programme at Rimuroa. During the meeting teachers commented on the difficulty of what they were doing, and the time that would necessarily be involved in developing a scheme co-operatively. However, there was agreement with one teacher who said that:

> . . . it might be long and it might be bitter, but it will be worth it. And we'll get better at doing it. If

> we are going to own it, if it's going to be ours, then it should be something that we do together, that we agree about.

The following staff meeting was set aside, apart from brief coverage of administrative issues, for the "brainstorming" session suggested by the junior syndicate. Staff decided to look at listening and speaking during this meeting and then focus on reading and writing at a later date. In generating these lists, staff deliberately tried to identify those sorts of skills which were relevant to all 3 syndicates, and could then be used to generate more specific learning goals that would be relevant to particular classes and individuals. I agreed to take notes during that meeting and then organise the lists into "some sort of order". On this basis, the following lists were put together and returned to the school the following week.

Speaking - English and Te Reo Māori?

Overall aims: to speak with - clarity, fluency, confidence, competence, sensitivity, increasing complexity

Conventions: voice: pronunciation/articulation, pitch, volume, pace, tone, emphasis, pause
register/manners
appropriateness
vocabulary
coherent organisation of ideas/logical order
accuracy/grammatical correctness

Purposes: to inform, plan, entertain, instruct, direct
to persuade, influence
to express ideas, feelings, opinions
to get along with others - e.g., greetings, interest, sympathy, etc.
for stories/make-believe
to question
to sort out ideas, reflect (language and thinking)

Contexts: awareness of audience
1. *familiar* --- *unfamiliar*
2. *informal* (e.g., conversation) --- *formal* (e.g., chairing meeting, assembly, school play, performance)
3. *discussion:* contributes, relevance of contributions, questions, taking turns, inclusion of others, telephone calls

Listening

Overall aims:	to be able to listen - purposefully, critically, analytically, carefully, confidently, attentively
Conventions:	body language
	attentiveness/concentration
	can isolate/discriminate words and sounds
	understanding of vocabulary
	understanding of sentence construction
	politeness/manners
Purposes:	pleasure (including music)
	detail
	main ideas
	to gain information
	to follow directions
	to identify overall purpose of speaker
	to listen and repeat simple/complex messages
Contexts:	1. *informal* (e.g., conversation) --- *formal* (e.g., assembly)
	2. *one-to-one* --- *large groups*
	3. *familiar* --- *unfamiliar* context/speaker/radio

Up until this point in the research, it had appeared that things were progressing well, and that there was a commitment, particularly in the junior syndicate, to developing a policy and scheme that was relevant, meaningful, and really addressed the issues that the teachers had identified as being important. However, during the next 2 to 3 weeks there was a definite change in pace and interest. In some sense it seemed that the project "died" and the momentum and interest that appeared to have been established seemed to evaporate.

In part this was due to the need to address a variety of other issues, including a proposal that a kōhanga reo be set up within the school grounds. The senior teacher in the senior syndicate also decided to go ahead with plans to establish vertically grouped whanaungatanga. This would involve each teacher working with a group of children from across the school for an hour-long period once a fortnight. Teachers would be partnered, preferably an experienced with an inexperienced teacher, making a "house" group of 2 teachers and about 60 children. Although some teachers were reluctant to participate, the staff agreed to try out the idea in the third term of 1992, and then make a decision on whether to continue with it in 1993. Meanwhile, language faded into the background.

In discussion with me about this situation, the principal agreed that it was important that the work on language that had been started be followed through, and suggested that another staff meeting needed to be set aside specifically for work on language. In order to refocus attention and, remotivate staff, the principal also suggested that it might be useful to get in an outsider with experience in the area of school policy and programme development. This was arranged, and a meeting with staff was scheduled towards the end of the second term.

It was clear at this meeting that staff felt that the effort that was required to write a full scheme outweighed the value that the scheme might have, especially in view of the fact that the new draft English curriculum had been signalled for release early in 1993. Following this meeting, staff decided that a small language committee should be established and that this committee should put together a draft policy to be returned to staff for discussion early in the third term.

This committee met twice at the beginning of the third term and put together the draft policy which was subsequently put to, and passed by, staff. It was due to be put to the board of trustees and then parents and whānau in 1993.

Language Policy (DRAFT)

Rationale

Language is something learnt and a tool for learning. There is a close relationship between the language students use, their identity, and their culture. Language reflects and influences the way people think, the way they feel about themselves and the way they relate to others (Department of Education, 1988b, p. 10).

Purpose

- To develop children's ability to understand, appreciate, and use language effectively.
- To foster intellectual, emotional, and imaginative growth.
- To help children develop a positive self-concept.
- To extend children's awareness of ideas and values. (Department of Education, 1986, p. 10)

Guidelines

- Each classroom teacher will be responsible for setting up, maintaining, and regularly evaluating a balanced language programme in accordance with the school scheme.
- Children will be exposed to all aspects of language.
- Each classroom teacher will be aware of individual needs and differences and take into account the variety of cultural differences.
- Programmes will provide for the extension and enrichment of all children's language.
- Teachers will teach language skills and will provide appropriate models.
- The school will have a group for the promotion of language programmes, communicating new developments to the staff, and monitoring their implementation where relevant.

Conclusion

Language is an essential part of communication and learning which plays a major part towards an individual's personal development and self-esteem.

Conclusion

Although staff motivation and commitment to the research had seemed high early in the project, the momentum, once it had slipped away, was not regained. Senior staff and the principal suggested 2 major reasons for this in discussions at the end of the third term.

☐ **The "action" taken in terms of working on a language policy did not actually directly address the particular concerns that had been highlighted in the interviews with teachers.**

Teachers had identified a number of specific issues in the interviews, including ESL provision, the teaching of te reo Māori in the junior and senior syndicates, and the need for improved communication between syndicates. However, these were not directly addressed in the work that was subsequently undertaken. Instead work focused on a much broader, less defined area, with the intention of establishing a policy in line with the agenda set by ERO, rather than with accomplishing changes that had been targeted as important by the staff themselves. One senior staff member suggested that:

> The issues staff had identified seem to have got buried under some bigger idea. . . . One of the problems was that we said that we'd look at language and suddenly staff found themselves confronted by this huge monolithic monster staring at them from afar - and thinking 'My god, how can we deal with that?'

It is interesting in this light to note that the vertical grouping of children *did* take off. Although this initiative had been proposed before the research was undertaken, the principal said that:

> the data (from the interviews) I think gave us, as management anyway, the kick that we needed to follow through on the vertical groupings because that showed clearly that a concern was the split.

☐ **Teachers had indicated that they wanted a *whole* school policy. However, the established independence of syndicates made this very difficult.**

At a certain point in the process of trying to achieve something that would work for all 3 syndicates, the policy/scheme stopped being "owned" by anybody. As one teacher said: "I think that it's really difficult to have any policy that covers an organisation like ours that has separate, self-conscious entities within it".

The division between syndicates was obviously a contentious issue within the school, and one that, while discussed in individual interviews, was not discussed amongst staff as a whole. One teacher explained:

> It's very hard to talk about - you have to be so diplomatic - you can talk about it - up to a point - but you walk very close to a line which can make it look as if you are attacking somebody.

Given this, it may well, as another teacher suggested, have been better to approach change at syndicate level. At this level teachers were used to working closely, they had established a shared "vision" and understanding of what they wanted, and in the past this had been the site for successful curriculum development.

Other Issues

There were a number of other related issues which compounded these problems:

- Consultative, co-operative curriculum development is necessarily a time-consuming process. In the school development plan, one major area of development was scheduled per term. However, as the principal said, this meant that:

  > There just isn't time to do things justice. If you really want effective language teaching, it's better for the school to develop (policy) for itself. If the school is going to be motivated and to own it - it's not just jargon it's true.

- There was no regular scheduled time for whole staff development other than staff meetings. These meetings often had to deal with lengthy administrative issues. This meant that in many instances although language had been on the agenda, there was not enough time to engage in any really useful discussion.

- The divide between syndicates also meant that it was difficult for any one teacher in the school to establish responsibility for providing leadership or direction in any particular area. So even though one teacher had nominally been allocated responsibility for language, that role of leadership really only extended to the team in which the teacher worked. Given the number of activities that are going on at any time in a school, there is a danger that projects will get "lost" unless there is someone who has clear responsibility for what is happening.

- The principal suggested that there was also some initial resistance on the part of some staff to having an "outsider" involved in the school. Although this resistance appeared to have disappeared early on, I felt that my presence may have contributed to the situation in which nobody else within the school actually took over responsibility for trying to "recharge" staff enthusiasm, or really bring people together in working on language. The implementation of vertical grouping, in which one member of staff took a clear role in terms of responsibility for motivating and managing change, was much more successful.

As a researcher it was somewhat frustrating to watch what was happening at Rimuroa in terms of the action-research process. In retrospect, it is possible to identify other courses of action that may have been more successful. However, the initial commitment of the research had been to give the school control over the research process, and it would have been neither appropriate, nor necessarily desirable, for me to take a more directive role within the school. In evaluating the research process, it must be acknowledged that, given the time and effort put into the project by myself and staff, the outcomes were minimal in terms of valuable change. The principal was positive about what had been accomplished "in the context of it being over and above everything else we've done this year " and said that the pluses were that "the school has got a draft language policy which has been approved by staff . . . and we've made a start in developing a scheme statement which will be what we actually use in the classroom". As well, individual teachers indicated that it had been useful to talk and think about language, and that this was worthwhile in terms of their teaching. However, this sort of response may well have been more to cheer me up, than a true comment on the value of the research.

CHAPTER 5

Bilingual Classes in Mainstream Schools

Following the implementation of Tomorrow's Schools, both schools involved in the research had established special classes within which there would be a greater emphasis on te reo Māori and tikanga Māori. The existence of these special classes provided evidence of each school's concern with language issues. However, prior to undertaking the research I had decided that, as a Pākehā researcher, it would be inappropriate to look specifically at the organisation or curricula of these classes, as this is more appropriately an area for Māori research that is fully culturally and linguistically sensitive to this context.

However, as it happened, a major issue for both schools centred on the relationship between the different sections of the school: specifically, the relationship between the Māori-language classes and mainstream classes. Because the interface between these classes and other classes in the school *is* a matter that is of concern to the school as a whole, I felt that it was appropriate that this issue be addressed through the research process and the discussion in this report. It should be emphasised that the discussion in this chapter is exploratory rather than conclusive, raising questions and tentative suggestions, rather than providing answers.

News reports, current affairs programmes, and talkback radio would indicate that concern about how schools can best meet both Māori and Pākehā interests is widespread. It would also appear that many schools and communities are wrestling with concerns about separatism, racism, and intergroup tensions and conflicts, as well as facing difficulties in establishing the funding and support necessary for bilingual and total immersion units to succeed.

This chapter builds on the case-study materials and highlights some of the issues that schools face in supporting Māori-language immersion programmes. The number of schools offering such programmes has shown a dramatic increase over the last 6 years: at 1 July 1993, 13 percent of schools were offering some form of Māori-language immersion programme (Ministry of Education, 1994). This includes kura kaupapa Māori, but given that the 1994 budget provided for only 5 new kura kaupapa Māori, bringing the total to 33, it is clear that the overwhelming majority of Māori children are being, and will continue to be, educated in the wider primary and secondary sector. The need to establish and provide support for Māori-language immersion programmes in mainstream schools is thus a major issue in education in this country.

The general inference drawn in this chapter is that the state has a very real responsibility to support Māori initiatives in education, and that all schools have a responsibility to seek out appropriate, sensitive, non-controlling, and non-interfering ways of implementing that support. Recognition of "tino rangitiratanga", the right to autonomy or self-determination, in no way absolves those with most economic, political, and social power in our society, from responsibility for support. However, the maintenance of tino rangitiratanga in the context of education for Māori in mainstream schools is no easy challenge; and the tensions need to be unravelled and made explicit if they are to be resolved.

These tensions as they arose in the research are outlined in the light of Kemmis and

McTaggart's (1988) 3 broad, and overlapping, domains of individual and cultural action:

- *Language and discourse:* What is Māori/immersion/bilingual education? What contradictions and difficulties are evident in the ways in which they are discussed?
- *Activities and practices:* How do the practices and activities of those involved in bilingual/total immersion classes contrast with the activities and practices of those in mainstream classes?
- *Social relationships and organisation:* Who controls Māori education in mainstream schools?

Language and Discourse

What Is Bilingual Education?

There is considerable variation in terms of what various parties mean by, and expect from, bilingual education, and this can be a source of confusion and conflict. Most simply, bilingual education can be defined as the use of a non-dominant language as the medium of instruction for some or all of the school day. In Aotearoa/New Zealand this ranges from programmes in which children are totally immersed in Māori language, and English, if it is taught, is taught as a second language. Such programmes aim for complete fluency in literacy and oracy in both Māori and English. At the other end of the scale are classrooms in which English is used as the main language of instruction, and Māori is used primarily for classroom management. In all bilingual programmes it is imperative that the language and culture go hand in hand, and Māori tikanga will be important in shaping the content, delivery, and kaupapa of the programme.

In the context of this discussion then, bilingual and Māori education refer to education programmes within which there is some level of immersion in Māori language. This may vary from total immersion to minimal use of te reo as part of the programme.

Research evidence would indicate that it is full immersion that offers children the best chance of becoming fully fluent in both the minority language and the dominant language (Baker, 1993: Waite, 1992b). Such programmes provide the most efficient and effective way of supporting language maintenance and revitalisation (Te Puni Kōkiri, 1993; Ministry of Education, 1994).

The degree of immersion in te reo Māori will depend to some extent on the resources available. At both research schools it was apparent that the bilingual/language-enrichment classes functioned primarily in English. At Te Maha, neither teacher in the language-extension classes spoke Māori as their first language, and this limited their ability to teach the programme in Māori. This problem was compounded by the fact that there were very few members of the school's community who were fluent in te reo. Although the teachers at Rimuroa were both first speakers of Māori, most of the children in the bilingual classes were from English-speaking backgrounds, and this influenced the level of te reo that the teachers believed was appropriate to use. Contrasting with this, was evidence that the Māori communities in each school had higher expectations about how much te reo Māori would be used, and the extent to which their children would become fluent in te reo.

The research at Te Maha indicates the "developmental" nature of solutions to this problem. It is likely to take time for teachers to develop their own confidence and fluency in te reo and to establish the community and resource base that they need to support immersion programmes. Ohia's (1993) description of the development of bilingual education at Newtown School in Wellington also reflects the need to change over time. In this school, parents and whānau were pivotal in ensuring the implementation of a total-immersion programme in the school. The school had moved from having just one bilingual class in which English was the dominant medium of communication in 1986, to having a Māori-language unit (Ngati Kotahitanga) comprising 2 total immersion and 2 fifty-percent immersion classes in 1992. The process of introducing total-immersion education had necessarily been taken over time:

> As the fluency of the teacher grew, and more resources in the Māori language were developed, the classes developed to the stage where Māori was the only language spoken, both as the language of cognition and of management. (Ohia, 1993, p. 89)

The current situation at Newtown School also provides for children's language-development needs, and the bilingual unit has the potential to be used as a transition stage before entry to the total-immersion classes. Ohia's research indicates that establishing community support for bilingual education had also been developmental: the actual presence of the bilingual unit had been instrumental in raising staff and board of trustees' awareness of, and positive attitudes towards, Māori educational initiatives. By 1992, both staff and the board of trustees had high expectations of the unit, but were still concerned about the lack of resources available for the classes and the demanding workloads faced by unit teachers.

It may be, however, that schools choose *not* to increase levels of immersion for other reasons. Different groups within the school may hold different expectations about the ultimate directions for, and goals of, bilingual education in the school. A particular problem in schools in which both Pākehā and Māori children are enrolled in bilingual classes may reflect differing aspirations on the part of Māori and Pākehā parents. Similarly, staff may hold different conceptions regarding how fast or how far they want bilingual programmes to develop.

Within "mainstream" schools, bilingual classes are likely to be in the minority. In this situation, if te reo Māori is not clearly valued by the school as a whole, then this may serve to highlight its minority status. This may further be accentuated by obvious differences in the levels of available class resources in English and Māori. Similarly, the actual hierarchy of the school's administration, the language used in combined assemblies, library resources and organisation, and so on may all contribute to a situation in which the hidden curriculum of the school as a whole effectively trivialises the provision of bilingual education as superficial.

Talking About Bilingual Education

At perhaps the most obvious level, language was problematic in terms of knowing what to call the different class groups in each school. Officially in each school the bilingual/language-extension classes were not "units", as in both schools this was thought to indicate a separate structural base that was undesirable. They were then "classes", that were "just part of the school". Informally, however, teachers commonly referred to the classes as units, and there was lack of agreement about how close, or how separate, the different sectors of the school were, or should be.

"Labelling" the classes was also a problem. Discourse in which one group is defined in terms of another group can be marginalising and disempowering. So, for example, contrasting "the bilingual classes" with "mainstream classes" might be perceived as already constituting the bilingual classes as somehow different or apart from the "normal" processes of schooling. However, trying to avoid language which might be, or be seen to be, discriminatory can become tortuous and cumbersome. The naming of the language-extension classes as "Te Puāwaitanga" in Te Maha provided one solution to this problem, and also provided a label which those involved felt was more consistent with the aims of the classes. Again though, there is sense in which this still "names" these classes as different, or other. Perhaps a next step would be to provide the mainstream classes with a name which at least aims to demonstrate that all groups within the school were acknowledged as different but regarded as equal.

These sort of language difficulties were especially evident in the problems that teachers had in referring to the groups when using pronouns - there was a consistent attempt on the part of most teachers, Māori and Pākehā, to avoid "them" and "us" type labelling, and this was commented on by teachers. However, despite this, "them" and "us" were clearly entrenched in the discourse practices of the schools. Alton-Lee, Nuthall, and Patrick's (1987) studies of classrooms demonstrate how pervasive and alienating teachers' and children's use of "us" and "them" can be in classroom situations.

Linked to this is a concern about the ways in which the children within the bilingual classes were described. Simon's (1986) work on teachers' attitudes towards Māori children provides considerable evidence of how pervasive and damaging stereotyping can be, even when it rests on what are, in fact, good intentions. Mitchell and Mitchell's (1993) research further describes how Pākehā teachers' wrong assumptions can create misunderstanding and discipline problems. At Te Maha, staff acknowledged negative stereotyping of Māori children: this included the expectation that such children would behave badly and would be troublemakers, would come to school with "very little language", and were unlikely to succeed academically. When such problems did arise in the language-extension classes, they were likely to be seen as "Māori" problems, rather than "normal" problems. Some teachers at Te Maha talked about their own changing attitudes. Their willingness to consider their own prejudices, talk about them, and challenge what others said seemed to have been an important factor in terms of developing support for Māori education in the school.

As important as what teachers did say, was what they did not say. At Rimuroa, the tensions between different groups were specifically avoided as an open topic of discussion. As noted in the case study, one teacher commented on how difficult it was to say anything because of concern that it would be taken as criticism. Even at Te Maha, where there appeared to be a very open and supportive relationship between Māori and Pākehā teachers, some Pākehā staff commented at one meeting that they felt freer to open up and ask questions in a situation in which they were not going to cause offence. In terms of the research, it is almost inevitable that, as a Pākehā. I heard only one side of this story. It is important to note that the research itself may have "silenced" or not have heard what Māori participants, and participants from other cultural groups, had to say.

The claim sometimes made by Pākehā of being "frightened to say anything in case you are labelled as a racist" might be interpreted in a number of ways. It may simply be used as a way of implying that Māori and the "politically correct" are overly sensitive. It may be provided as an excuse for evading responsibility for what happens to Māori children in education. It may, however, reflect a genuine acknowledgment of one's own ignorance, and a realisation that there is a need to learn more about cultural sensitivity and "cultural safety". In each case, there is obviously a need for learning. Māori have been active in educating Pākehā, but given the urgent need for Māori to focus their energy on educating Māori children and communities, it is important that Pākehā themselves take more formal and informal responsibility for educating themselves in these matters.

In both schools, teachers commented on their own lack of confidence in using te reo Māori; and in one school some teachers commented that they felt excluded in situations in which Māori was spoken. However, as Bell (1991) comments "It is easy to prevent Māori being spoken, and takes effort to encourage it" (p. 68). At the very least, he suggests, Māori should be free to speak Māori in all situations, and monolingual Pākehā should encourage them to do so, even though they will not understand what is being said. Pākehā teachers with Māori children in their classroom have a special responsibility for fostering Māori language.

This raises the question of whether Pākehā should be learning te reo. There is something of a dilemma here. The danger is that Pākehā ability to use te reo can be used to Māori disadvantage. Arapeta Tahana provides a disturbing example of this, drawn from his own experience:

> I had decided I should get into the main stream. They advertised a Māori PR (position of responsibility) at Seddon [*where he was currently employed teaching a Māori 'opportunity class'*]. I applied, but they gave it to this Pakeha chap who had done Māori I at university. I was speechless. Here I was grown up in a totally Māori community and, not only that, I had got stage three Māori, so I had all the academic stuff as well! So I left. They had made it quite clear what they thought of me. (Tahana, 1994, p. 213, italics added)

Such practices are of real concern, and if there is to be any real shift in terms of the prestige of te reo Māori, then the linguistic hegemony of English must be challenged, and this is probably only realistically possible if more Pākehā take steps towards being bilingual in Māori and English. Given the economic imperative which is fuelling interest in language learning, the danger is that the emphasis placed on "international" languages will in fact further relegate te reo Māori to lower linguistic status in the eyes of the dominant majority (Irwin, 1994).

The "Dangers" of Bilingual Education

Resistance to bilingual education appears to be widespread and well entrenched in Aotearoa/New Zealand. This reflects the considerable difficulties that bilingual education in general faces in establishing itself as a valid form of education in predominantly monolingual societies. Baker (1993, following Ruiz) suggests that in such situations bilingualism is identified as a "problem" which is best solved by assimilating language-minority speakers into the majority language.

In rationalising resistance to bilingualism, its problems are commonly identified as occurring at 3 levels:

Cognitive Problems

Although research has not conclusively established that bilingualism is cognitively advantageous, it tends to have shown a positive link between bilingualism and enhanced cognitive functioning (Baker, 1993). However, concerns are frequently raised that children who grow surrounded by 2 languages will be cognitively and linguistically confused, and will have difficulty expressing themselves adequately in either language. Lambert's (1975) concept of subtractive bilingualism (in which the first language is deliberately discouraged and a second language imposed) suggests that in some cases this might happen, but that this is as a result of the context rather than caused by bilingualism itself. Contrasting with this are contexts which support additive bilingualism, and in which both languages are valued and encouraged. In these contexts both the individual and society are likely to benefit from bilingualism.

Personal and Social Problems

Opposition to bilingual education is often supported by claims that it is personally and socially disadvantageous. In this case, minority-languages are said to be linked to problems such as underachievement in school, unemployment, and lack of social, economic, and political opportunities for the minority-language speakers. The "best" education for cultural and linguistic minorities is claimed to be one that stresses the dominant language and culture. From this perspective Māori education is seen as failing to equip children for the "the real world". Smith (1992) argues that Pākehā hold to the myth that Māori autonomy implies rejection of both Pākehā culture and the English language. In contrast to this, as an outcome of Māori immersion education, kura kaupapa parents want "their children to have excellence in Māori and English culture and language" (p. 161). Irwin (1994) also comments on such misconceptions:

> A major tension which continues to plague Māori education into the 1990s is the assumption that Māori education is an inwardly focused enterprise, concerned only with educating Māori children to live in their immediate Māori community, with a backward looking yearning for the days of old, a local not a global concern. (p. 156)

Economic and Political Problems

It is at this level that perhaps the greatest resistance to establishing widespread immersion education lies.

As emphasised throughout this report, Māori immersion education, at least in its early stages, requires considerable expenditure in terms of resource development, teacher training and support, and curriculum development. While it might be argued that this cost "should be measured against the social cost of the failure to provide it" (Hollings, 1991, p. 61), governments are not noted for their readiness to balance immediate expenditure against long term wellbeing. These costs are also often presented, at a national level, as competing with other more relevant language initiatives (including both the need for a more sound education in English, and the need to develop national resources in international trade languages). At a local level, the costs of Māori immersion programmes may have to compete with other school initiatives and interests, including those of other ethnic minority groups.

Secondly, the revitalisation of te reo Māori is often typified as a threat to the idea of "one New Zealand". Baker (1993) identifies this concern as being widespread in predominantly monolingual countries, suggesting that the majority language is often regarded as the common leveller, and unity within a nation as being synonymous with uniformity:

> The dominant majority often see minority education as creating national disunity, disintegration rather than integration. The frequent criticism of bilingual education is that it serves to promote differences rather than similarities, to separate rather than integrate. (Baker, 1993, p. 257)

Indeed, in Aotearoa/New Zealand kura kaupapa Māori and immersion units in schools are frequently described as "separatist". Smith (1992) suggests that "in this sense, separatism is often used as an emotive argument, a scare tactic employed to trade on fears of Pākehā insecurity and thereby develop a unified Pākehā resistance" (p. 161). As he goes on to point out, however, there is little evidence that, if Māori did gain more control over their own education, social harmony, or Pākehā wellbeing, would be endangered.

Activities and Practices: Who Does What?

Extra Pressures on Māori Staff in Bilingual Classes

Teachers in primary school bilingual classes are likely to face a range of problems and challenges over and above those which teachers in mainstream classes must deal with. Mitchell and Mitchell (1993) provide a daunting list of these extra responsibilities in their analysis of why Māori teachers leave teaching. They include:

- the need for constant community consultation and involvement in order to make the programme work;
- the need to design a programme which meets the needs and aspirations of children, parents, school, and community;
- the need to design a programme which achieves bilingual goals (although the teacher may have very little knowledge or understanding of the concepts or techniques of bilingualism);
- the need to convince the other school staff and the general community of the value of bilingualism and the importance of te reo for Māori children;
- the need to overcome ignorant and prejudiced attitudes on the part of school boards of trustees, school staff, parents of children at the school, and the general community;
- the need to make many of the resources necessary to teach in bilingual or total immersion classes (a number of former teachers told us of working to midnight almost every night just to have enough materials to operate in the classroom the following day - converting maths gear and exercises to Māori, creating stories in te reo, games, charts, and so on were almost daily tasks);
- the need to overcome difficulties such as large class numbers, inadequate facilities, limited access to resources, and personal limitations in fluency and training;
- the overwhelming responsibility of being successful in a Māori matter, especially when the right to learn one's own language has been such a long battle;
- the conflict engendered by being accountable to the Māori community and to the school system which is very European;

- the inevitable conflicts which arise between trying to teach in a way appropriate to Maori children and the expectations of an administration which has only a limited understanding of Māori culture, values, and teaching methods;
- and the expectations of Māori parents that the Māori teacher will provide everything their child needs. (p. 59-60)

All these extra pressures were evident to some extent in the research schools, and the consequent stress on teachers was of concern to those teachers involved, as well as other teachers in the school. Both principals had been active in providing administrative and moral support for these teachers. They had also both been active in advocating for the classes at school, board, and community level. In this way they had taken on an important role in educating the school community, rather than leaving it to the bilingual/language-enrichment teachers to defend and explain the existence of these classes.

At school level, Mitchell and Mitchell (1993) also note the importance of recognising "the extra demands and the dual accountability Māori teachers face in the form of appropriate timetabling, release time, essential facilities, administrative support, and positive reinforcement from the principal and senior staff" (p. 121). Proposed targeting of Māori language factor funding according to the level of immersion, may provide a more adequate basis for doing this in those schools with higher level immersion programmes. However, in schools with lower level programmes (or as it stands currently, with fewer Māori pupils) extra support for bilingual teachers would need to be drawn from general funds. Currently in education it is apparent that *all* primary teachers face heavy workloads and high stress (Livingstone, 1994). In this situation there is a danger that differential levels of support, whether they be decided on at central or local level, will become an area of contention unless all staff are fully convinced of the rationale behind such decisions.

At the level of the state, there is an urgent need for funding and support. Perhaps the most pressing issue is the desperate need to establish a pool of experienced teachers who are fluent in te reo, and extending opportunities for Māori to receive adequate and appropriate pre- and in-service teacher training is essential. The need then is to ensure that appropriate support is available so that Māori teachers are encouraged to remain in education (Mitchell and Mitchell, 1993). This will involve: continued development of curriculum statements in Māori; increasing the levels of appropriate teaching resources; and ensuring that *all* staff in schools, and others involved in the running of schools, including members of boards of trustees, receive training that raises their awareness and understanding of Māori issues.

Wider Responsibility for Te Reo and Tikanga Māori in Schools

In both research schools, teachers indicated that there was a need to ensure that te reo and tikanga Māori were taught across the schools as a whole. At Rimuroa, however, teachers indicated that they felt uncertain about their own competence to teach te reo, and it appeared that there was relatively little use of te reo in most classrooms. One teacher also indicated that there was uncertainty about the protocol for non-bilingual class teachers in undertaking Māori activities, such as visiting a marae. Should this be done by the teachers in the bilingual class, or was it appropriate for a Pākehā teacher to initiate such an activity? In this case, the existence of bilingual classes in the school seemed to leave teachers in mainstream classes without a clear idea of their responsibilities for developing programmes in te reo and tikanga Māori.

At Te Maha, the use of te reo was gradually increasing throughout the school, and teachers acknowledged their own changes in attitudes towards the relevance and importance of te reo in their programmes. The half-hour per week of te reo in each class had been useful in providing a base of te reo which teachers were then able to reinforce in their own programmes. However, this meant that funding was diverted away from the language-enrichment classes. The fact that the language-enrichment classes were linked to the junior and senior syndicates, and that the deputy principal (and leader of the senior syndicate) was Māori, also meant that te reo Māori had a "presence" in the sense that issues relating to the teaching of the language-enrichment classes were brought up in those forums, and were thus seen as syndicate, rather than "unit" issues. In a sense, this meant that the Māori teachers were often engaged in providing informal staff development on Māori issues. However, at Te Maha the sharing of ideas and resources at syndicate level meant that this was not just a one-way process.

In neither case had teachers in the school specifically looked at how Māori in mainstream classes were affected by the new structures. The position of these Māori students who had chosen, or whose parents had chosen for them, to remain in the mainstream classes, is unclear. There is a possibility that they face double marginalisation: their minority status in mainstream classes was emphasised; and they were also effectively split off from their Māori peers. Mainstream teachers will obviously need to be sensitive to the particular circumstances that such children face, and consider ways to ensure their status and wellbeing is protected in this complex situation.

Social Relationships and Organisation

The structural relationship between the bilingual/language-enrichment class and the other classes at Te Maha and Rimuroa provides an interesting contrast. At Rimuroa these classes were quite separate from the other classes both physically and in terms of planning and organisation. School staff meetings were largely organised around administrative rather than curricular matters, and except on an informal personal level (and this appeared limited) there was little in the way of professional interchange between the bilingual teachers and the teachers of the other classes. This situation was of concern to a number of teachers in the school, but was not openly acknowledged or talked about.

At Te Maha on the other hand, the language-enrichment classes were very much part of the school. However, while teachers perceived this as being positive, it was decided during the research that the classes needed more autonomy, so that curriculum, organisation, and delivery could be developed in a way which was more consistent with the kaupapa of Māori education.

There has been no formal opportunity to evaluate the changes that occurred in the schools since then as part of this research project. However, continued informal contact with the schools indicates that the balance between autonomy and being part of the wider school has not been resolved in either case, and that tensions have continued, and at Te Maha have actually increased.

Balancing Unity and Autonomy

Can schools achieve a structure which maintains unity and networks of support, while still allowing for real diversity and tino rangitiratanga in relationship to Māori immersion classes?

While optimistically, it is perhaps possible to argue that this can be achieved, it is important to acknowledge that there are considerable difficulties that schools, and communities, are likely to meet in trying to achieve such a goal. Most schools are made up of a variety of interest groups, with competing needs. Schools are also clearly not democracies, and some groups are likely to hold more power than others. While schools in which there is a high proportion of Māori children may successfully establish Māori-language programmes which meet the aspirations of the Māori community, other schools may meet considerable resistance to such initiatives.

Jefferies (1993) looked at Māori developments in 15 schools since the implementation of Tomorrow's Schools. His study indicates that unless there are relatively high percentages of Māori enrolments, schools are unlikely to develop bilingual programmes, and even with high percentages of Māori students, there is likely to be considerable resistance to the development of such programmes.

Jefferies provides details of the developments in the 4 schools in which there had been the most extensive changes in Māori education. Two schools, both with more than 95 percent of students on their roll being Māori, were eventually given kura kaupapa Māori status by the Ministry in 1993. However, in one school this had not occurred without considerable friction between various groups in the schools, and participants in both schools felt that developments had been obstructed by the Ministry of Education. A third school, with a Māori roll of 40 percent, had established 2 bilingual classes, though it was apparent that there was significant conflict between Māori and Pākehā members of the school community. The fourth school (secondary), with a Māori roll of 25 percent, had established a bilingual programme using Māori and English at each form level. However, Māori were still a small minority on the board of trustees, and as one of the Māori members of the board noted this still meant that a Māori voice in decision making was tokenistic, with no real power in influencing school policy.

However, Jefferies stresses that these 4 schools "are in no way representative of schools in general, and are more likely to be the exception rather than the norm" (p. 5). The report also touches on the resistance to Māori education expressed by teachers. In one school with a Māori roll of 20 percent, 7 out of 9 teachers indicated that they saw the current provision (in which pupils were withdrawn from normal classes for 1 hour of Māori language per week provided by an uncertificated teacher's aide) as already sufficient or as giving te reo "too much emphasis".

Realistically, then, it may be that, at the current time, and given the wider power structures of society in Aotearoa/New Zealand, kura kaupapa Māori offer the only truly viable and effective avenue for Māori control of Māori schooling.

Summary

In some ways it would appear then that Māori education faces a catch-22 situation. It may be extremely difficult, if not impossible, to provide for Māori autonomy in education within "mainstream" schools, and this will compromise bilingual programmes. As Simon (1986) notes:

> No matter how brilliantly conceived a policy on Māori education may be, no matter how sensitively it may be planned to cater for the needs of Māori children and to develop biculturalism in Pākehā, it must contend with Pākehā power and control within the system throughout its implementation. Such policies can thus be subverted at the departmental, board or school level. (p. 42)

It must also be acknowledged that, in those situations in which schools are "successful" in offering bilingual programmes, this is not because of state-provided support, but because these schools:

> are fortunate to have staff who are fluent in the Māori language; who have good classroom management skills; who have the ability to improvise and create their own resources and are experienced teachers. These schools probably have excellent support from their communities as well. (Jenkins, with Ka'ai; 1994, p. 161)

Jenkins and Ka'ai suggest that within the state framework, Māori education has been dependent on Māori energy and initiative; usually given on a voluntary basis. The state, meantime:

> has retained the bulk of the resources, retained the power of control over the programmes, and has ceded nothing in terms of allowing 'tino rangitiratanga' to operate in Māori education. (Jenkins, with Ka'ai; 1994, p. 162)

Notwithstanding, it is clear that the majority of Māori are being, and will continue to be, educated in situations in which they are in the minority. Given this, as stated at the outset of this chapter, it is essential that Māori education in mainstream schools is encouraged and supported, and that this is done as far as possible in ways which are appropriate, sensitive, non-controlling, and non-interfering.

State funding and support for Māori education are clearly a priority. It is important that such funding and the development of Māori language resources are not portrayed as competing against the demands of what some see as more economically valuable market languages. Through the Treaty of Waitangi, the state has a legal and moral responsibility to recognise and support the special status of te reo Māori and tikanga Māori as the language and culture of the tāngata whenua.

In addition to state support, there is need for support at a local level. Schools *can* organise practical support in terms of resourcing, supporting teacher development, and sharing appropriate professional skills. In addition, perhaps one of the most important roles that Pākehā can play is in terms of raising awareness and understanding of Māori issues amongst other Pākehā, particularly those who are in positions of authority. Smith (1992) makes the point that:

> While it is acknowledged that it is important to sensitize Pākehā people to Māori culture and language, this has often been carried out at the expense of Māori interests using Māori resources, Māori money and Māori people. Valuable resources are thus directed away from the priority of meeting Māori needs. In this sense, there has been a capture of Māori resources by Pākehā people, albeit unintended. (p. 159)

Ideally, self-education should aim to help Pākehā to:

- become more sensitive to Māori interests and how they might be supported;
- be more aware of the ways in which Pākehā interests can dominate school practices and policies in overt and covert ways, and how to change them; and
- be more able to advocate for Māori interests in those situations in which this might be appropriate.

Having said this, it is important to acknowledge the changes that have already been made, despite resistance. Schools *are* changing; they are being challenged by Māori education and some schools are taking up that challenge. As schools make room for, and learn to support, Māori education, it may be that the changes will go further than the bilingual classroom. If a school really *values* te reo and tikanga Māori, and if this is reflected in all levels of the school's discourse, practices, and structures, then this sends important messages to Pākehā as well as Māori children. Perhaps such changes are the first signs that te reo Māori does have a chance of becoming strong, central, and critical to our national identity.

CHAPTER 6

Reflecting on the Research Process

Although the stages, or moments, of action research can be identified in a general sense, the way in which the research process will unfold in a specific context can obviously not be determined beforehand, or decided upon by one person. Decisions regarding the research need to made collectively and collaboratively, and the agenda for the research must be negotiated by all those who are involved. The research has to be responsive to the context and the participants, and will therefore be shaped by them.

As is evident in the case studies, the research went very differently in each school, and the contrast provides an opportunity to consider the appropriateness and effectiveness of the research approach in different contexts. Evaluation of the research requires both consideration of the procedures and methods employed, and some reflection on the ways in which the research contexts may have contributed to, or detracted from, the success of the research in terms of stimulating democratic involvement and change. Finally, there are some implicit tensions in the role of an "outsider" in research which is essentially dependent on the involvement of "insiders", and this will obviously have influenced the research process in each school.

Research Procedures

Keeping Records

Obviously, as in any research, it is important that what happens is carefully and accurately recorded. Within action research, it is also important that these records are, within the limits of confidentiality, accessible to participants. Participants should have the opportunity to comment on the fairness and accuracy of any information collected; and have the opportunity to negotiate the ways in which this information is interpreted and conveyed to others.

Within this research project, there were a number of approaches to collecting and recording data. They included:

General Observations and Field Notes

In getting to know the schools, the early part of the research involved meeting teachers and spending time in different classrooms. In both schools, there was an "open door" policy with regard to parents and whānau coming into the school, and teachers were used to having other adults in the classroom with them. Given that the purposes of the observations were to get a general picture of the school, as well as giving the school a chance to get to know me, participant observation was the most appropriate approach to take, and generally I was actively involved in what was going on in the classroom.

As the research progressed, there were also occasions during which I seemed to be spending a large amount of time in the staffroom or around the school, often waiting to see someone, who had inadvertently been held up. Although this was occasionally frustrating, it was at these unplanned times that some of the most worthwhile, revealing, and interesting "research" took place. For example, I was able to spend a considerable amount of time with parents, who provided a really rich picture of the schools and the communities. It was also at these times that I sometimes had longer conversations with teachers which, while not necessarily explicitly focused on the research issues, gave much more breadth and depth to my understanding of the ways in which the schools worked. These times contributed, I hope, to the research in terms of my ability to work sensitively and effectively with the research in the schools as a participant, rather than remaining as a complete "outsider".

Throughout the research, I kept "field notes" documenting these general observations, as well as minutes of meetings, records of visits to the schools, class observations and interviews, and so on. Minutes of meetings were always typed up and distributed to staff; and the other notes contributed to the general feedback to staff.

Document Analysis

In building up a general picture of the schools, access to school documents was invaluable. These included school schemes and policies; newsletters and questionnaires to parents; school, team, and classroom planning documents; ERO reports; school bids for equity funding; minutes from staff meetings, and so on.

Taping Interviews

A major source of information in the initial stages of the research was gained through interviews with all the teachers in each school. Rather than fully transcribing the interviews, I summarised each interview and kept a record of "quotes" which seemed especially relevant. Although this meant that there was some re-listening to the tapes in later stages of the research, in general it saved considerable time/expense.

Taping interviews in a research project such as this can be useful in a number of interlinked ways:

- A taped recording provides a more complete record of the interview than could be gained by taking notes, or writing up notes after the interview.
- It is much easier to concentrate on the interview and the person whom you are interviewing if you are not taking notes at the same time.

These points may not be so important in very structured interviews; or interviews in which the range of responses is limited so that they can be easily coded or recorded. However, in a semistructured interview in which responses are likely to be long, diverse, and complex, it is important to be able to think and respond to what the interviewee has said. In action research the interview should also ideally be much more of a two-way process, where information is shared between 2 colleagues, rather than a set situation in which one person asks the questions and the other answers.

- A taped recording of an interview provides opportunities to re-listen to what has been said.

This point has several implications. On re-listening to the tapes it became very apparent to me that in the actual interviews I had often only "heard" some of what had been said; on other occasions I had actually "heard" something quite different from what had been said. There were also situations in which it was very apparent that I had failed to convey my ideas clearly. While this is not really surprising from the perspective of linguistics, it proved very useful in allowing me to think about my own part in the research process, and in providing me with "feedback" on where I could change, and hopefully improve, my own communication skills.

However, in addition to these advantages, there are several disadvantages associated with taping interviews:

- Some participants will feel very uncomfortable with being taped. Clearly they should have the right to choose not to be taped if this is so.
- Although this discomfort is only temporary for most people, few people "forget" that the tape is running, and this will obviously influence what they will say, especially about contentious issues.

These points illustrate aspects of a more general problem that is likely to occur in interviews. Within any interview it is likely that power is vested primarily in the "questioner", and this is exacerbated by the cassette recorder. So, even if there has been an attempt to democratise the interview process, the person with easiest access to the tape is likely to be seen as having some measure of "control" over what has been said by the other person. Ensuring confidentiality, and making sure that participants have opportunities to comment on the validity and appropriateness of the handling and interpretation of interview material should help overcome this, at least to some extent. However, these precautions may still not fully resolve this issue.

Finally, these last points are linked to the more general issue of "accuracy" in using and interpreting taped material. Being able to use the actual words that participants have used can be really important in illustrating the final research report, giving it some life, and acknowledging different "voices" and the sense of "shared authorship" of collaborative research. At the same time, what is said orally in one context can have a very different interpretation in the context of a written report. It is important that reports be "fair" to the participants, and that the principles that underlie the research are used to inform judgments about how to use research material.

Giving Feedback

In terms of providing feedback during the research, verbal feedback and oral reports were quicker and more accessible to staff. Written reports not only require a longer turn-around period, but appear unlikely to be effective in engaging teachers' attention.

This was illustrated during the research. Although, in one school, an ERO report had been made readily available to teachers in the staffroom, when it came to the meeting to discuss the report it was apparent that very few teachers had done more than glance at the document. This is not in any way intended as a criticism of those teachers, but *within* the school day, it was obvious that the nearly constant demands of teachers' work did not provide spaces for reading material that was not immediately and practically relevant.

The final case studies included in this report were doubly "unattractive" to participants. First, they were given to the schools well after the events that they described, so that they really were "history" by then. The schools had moved on and the descriptions of what had happened seemed distant and far removed from the current situation. Second, as written reports with no direct practical implications for what was happening at that time, they were immediately perceived as having a low priority for teachers.

Although the schools were not the primary audience for these case studies, it is important to note that this has meant that there has been little real negotiation regarding the actual written case studies and this report. Some attempt to get round this was undertaken towards the end of the research in each situation, in which I discussed the proposed shape of the case studies and the report with some of the teachers in each school. In each case this was done with those teachers who had been most closely involved in the research, and we also discussed their perceptions of the research process. However, it is almost inevitable that the emphasis of the case studies and the report has shifted during the process of writing, and ideally, there should have been greater involvement of a wider range of participants in this later "writing up" phase of the research.

Confidentiality

There were 2 distinct levels of confidentiality within the research. Within the schools, there were a number of occasions in which it was important that the confidentiality of participants was respected with regard to other participants. Sometimes participants indicated that they did not want their views conveyed to others for specific reasons. On other occasions to have "named" what was said may have exposed participants to criticism from others, or it may have generated conflict between participants. However, maintaining confidentiality by making statements anonymous can still prove difficult, as participants are often likely to be able to work out who said what despite the removal of identifying information.

Issues of confidentiality at this level are also complex in terms of the principles of action research. Given that the ideal situation for collaborative work is one in which there is open and honest sharing of information, to become involved in *not* revealing views or the names of those who have expressed certain views, is in a sense contradictory to the research rationale. As well, if the research process is really challenging and changing the status quo, then it is likely to be uncomfortable, and in this situation, some measure of conflict or resistance may be an important part of the process itself. Thus, if the research does not honestly reveal all information, it is perhaps in danger of conspiring to retain the status quo.

It does not seem appropriate to generate a blanket solution to this problem, and each situation probably needs to be evaluated with regard to the rights, needs, and interests of the different participants in the light of particular contexts. Kemmis and McTaggart (1988) suggest that action research should protect the interests of the "underdogs" (p. 106) and this might provide some guidance for decision making. As well, it is important to remember to consider carefully any long-term ramifications that breaking confidentiality might have for participants. This is especially important in situations in which the researcher is an "outsider" and will not necessarily have to live with the consequences of decisions that are made. It is also important that participants are not left with a distrust of research in general.

In this research, if I erred, it was probably on the side of conservatism in terms of protecting the anonymity and confidentiality of the participants involved. At Rimuroa, this caution may have bought into, and thereby contributed to maintaining, the unwillingness to talk openly about the relationship between the bilingual classes and the other syndicates.

At a broader level, the research must also respect the confidentiality of the participants and schools in the wider community. In the case of this report it was decided that this was most appropriately achieved by giving the schools pseudonyms, and not revealing the location of the research. However, in many ways this offers only superficial protection to the schools, and in a country as small as Aotearoa/New Zealand, it would not take any very sophisticated detective work to establish which schools were being described. Given this, much has been deliberately left out of the case studies and this report. In particular, there has been a concerted attempt to ensure that while they are fair, neither the report nor the case studies reveal anything that might be used to damage the reputation of either the schools or the participants.

The problem of writing a report that is critical but honest is common within action research. Kelly (1985) emphasises the particular difficulties in presenting evidence that is "negative":

> I do not think we have yet found a satisfactory way of resolving this dilemma. Our position lies uncomfortably between that of the internal evaluator whose main loyalty is to colleagues and the school, and the external researcher for whom informal comments and small incidents may provide the most revealing data. (p. 147)

Respecting the confidentiality of the schools was also an issue during the research itself. Who does the researcher talk about to the research? This research project was fortunate in being supported by Val Podmore and Richard Benton from the New Zealand Council for Educational Research during the research itself, and their advice about the project has been extremely useful. However, they were not available on a day-to-day basis for the kind of professional debate about issues and problems that were important in working through the research. In part, this was done with the participants themselves, but there has also been considerable support from others involved in education, though on occasion this has been restricted by concerns about confidentiality. It may have been appropriate to establish tighter "boundaries of confidentiality" at the outset of the research process. This may simply have involved identifying 2 or 3 research "confidantes" with the schools, and asking these people for professional support during the research process. In a sense this formalises the informal networks of support that are important at all levels of education, but acknowledges that such support may breach confidentiality.

Involvement

As noted in the case studies, both schools had close links with their communities, and consultation and communication with the community were built into school processes. In each case sectors of the schools' communities had played a key role in establishing the bilingual/enrichment classes, and in this way had been a major influence in determining the direction of the school.

However, in both schools, staff decided that the initial interviews and planning should involve only themselves. I had raised the possibility of including representatives from the boards of trustees, and/or other members of the schools' communities, but staff indicated that, at least in the initial stages of the research, they felt that it was important to identify their own priorities and concerns. Widening involvement would depend on the directions that the group chose to take.

Kemmis and McTaggart (1988) note the importance of starting action research with small groups of collaborators who share a common concern, and then widening the community to include more and more people "who are involved and affected by the practices in question" (p. 25). Certainly, starting with a very large group in which there are likely to be conflicting priorities may, in fact, be inimical to change. In an earlier research project that looked at language-policy development in 8 schools (McPherson, 1991), only 3 schools actively sought parent or student input. In each school, parents and students maintained more conservative standpoints than teaching staff, and in this sense made it more difficult to plan and implement change.

However, it is important that teachers do not automatically exclude other groups from becoming part of the action-research process. This is obviously particularly necessary in situations in which changes may have a vital effect on others, and where there may be a lack of full knowledge or understanding of the interests of other groups.

The Research Context

There were a number of aspects of the contexts in which the research was undertaken that had a particular impact on the research. These included the structures of decision making and curriculum and school development that were already in place within the schools prior to the initiation of the research process, and the outside pressures and demands that the schools faced in terms of school development. These have been highlighted in the case studies themselves, and are discussed in more general terms here.

Whose Agenda Does the Research Address?

A clear difference in the research process that was undertaken in the schools was that the agenda for the research at Te Maha clearly emerged from the concerns that teachers saw as important, whereas at Rimuroa the research was required to "fit" within the recommendations that had been set by ERO.

The focus of the research at Te Maha stemmed directly from the issue that staff had identified as of greatest common concern to them. Although different staff had differing perspectives, there was a shared commitment to solving an issue that obviously "mattered" to almost all staff.

At Rimuroa, ERO had set a clear directive to the school in terms of reviewing curriculum areas, and the research was perceived by the principal as providing an ideal opportunity to facilitate this in the area of language policy. However, it became apparent in the interviews and as the research progressed, that the policy itself was not addressing issues that teachers believed were "vital" and that it had become a bureaucratic exercise. This feeling was exacerbated by the knowledge that the national curriculum for English was likely to supersede any document or approach that the school might develop. ERO had, however, stated that curriculum development should not wait until the release of the relevant documents.

Nonetheless, there were aspects of language policy which *were* important to staff, especially in relation to provision for children from non-English-speaking backgrounds, and the teaching of te reo and tikanga Māori in the junior and senior syndicates, as well as the concern regarding the structural divisions within the school. In retrospect, the research may have been able to have more impact if it had focused on one of these first two areas. Teaching NESB children as an area of development in particular, may have had the potential to involve a smaller group that included those with a special concern in this area. This in turn may have been one way of initiating a collaborative relationship across syndicates.

These points emphasise the value of starting action research with a group that has a shared commitment to a particular issue, and then gradually working to widen the group involved in the research. McTaggart (1991) describes this as an "organic community of interest" (p. 60) within which there already exists an expressed commitment to an area of action. Certainly, it would seem clear that if the group does not believe that the issue really matters to them, then it is unlikely that they will really become involved in making changes to practice.

Making Time Available

A key factor in sustaining the momentum of change at Te Maha seemed to be associated with the fact that a regular fortnightly meeting slot, alternating with staff meetings, was set aside specifically for working on the developments for "Te Puāwaitanga" (the language-extension classes). Earlier in the research most of the group discussion was done during staff meeting slots, and teachers were released from class for the interviews. This meant that the research was accommodated within the existing meeting schedule, and reflected the principal's emphasis on using meetings for staff development rather than administration.

At Rimuroa, staff meetings were more informal, with much more discussion of administrative matters, and issues of general interest. They were held weekly, and it was not possible to schedule "research" meetings within the existing meeting timetable. This meant that research meetings effectively encroached on times that teachers would be using for something else. This obviously compounded the problems that the research process faced in terms of teacher commitment and enthusiasm.

Although these different approaches to meeting times made it easier to find time for the research at Te Maha, there were also benefits to Rimuroa's approach to meetings. The meetings were friendly and marked by laughter. Although not as much "work" was covered, there was more time to deal with queries, and the meetings were consistently used by the principal to give encouragement, positive feedback, and support to the staff.

Livingstone's recent survey of teacher workloads indicates that they are "soaring" (1994, p. 1) and are accompanied by increasing stress, with as many as 38 percent of teachers indicating that if they had a choice they would leave the job. In this situation, it may be extremely important to ensure that meeting times such as those at Rimuroa are not taken over by activities which make even more high energy demands on teachers.

Livingstone's report indicated that the areas which generated most stress for teachers were associated with:

> the changes brought about by Tomorrow's Schools reforms: the almost simultaneous implementation of many new curricula, and the over-rapid way in which this was being done: the avalanche of administrative paperwork now descending upon them; the perceived pressure of reviews from the Educational Review Office; and the need to develop new assessment and appraisal systems. (1994, p. iv)

These pressures on teachers obviously make very considerable demands on teachers in terms of time and energy. Action research also requires time, commitment, and energy. Given the current wider context of education it may be difficult, if not impossible, to sustain the collaborative, democratic, and critical approach that action research itself demands.

What Is the Role of the "Researcher" in Action Research?

The role of the outside researcher in action research is complex and there are some considerable tensions involved in being an "outsider", particularly in terms of balancing power and control over, and ownership of, the research process. The outside researcher may have the extra time and access to resources which can be crucial in the early stages of the research in terms of getting the project up and running. However, any continued dominance of the outsider will undermine the group's collective responsibility for the research process. Ideally, the outsider should become established as a member of the group, rather than leader or even facilitator; as McTaggart (1991) notes, groups are there "to be joined, not facilitated" (p. 46). However, just as the research process needs to be negotiated by the whole group, the actual role that the outside researcher plays also needs to be negotiated with the group.

The differences between the outside researcher's world and the world of the inside participants may make it difficult to establish an equal relationship. A balance of power and real communication can be difficult to attain if the outsider is viewed as an "expert" in a particular area; this is often likely to be the case, even if in practice it is the group who are the experts in terms of the context within which they work. On the other hand, the researcher may well be seen as someone who has little understanding of the day-to-day reality of life at the chalkface, and this may damage the credibility of the research and the perceived validity of the focus of research interest. Obviously, in trying to ensure that this does not happen, the outside researcher needs to work hard at establishing an honest and open relationship with the research participants.

In a research process which strives to be democratic, it is important that the role of the outside researcher should not be "privileged". However, there are obvious differences in what is expected of "outsiders" and "insiders". For me, my primary responsibility within the schools was with the research. For the other participants, their involvement in the research took place within the much more complex picture of all the day-to-day responsibilities that teachers have, and the complex web of interpersonal and professional relationships which are part of school life. It was much easier for me to plan to conduct interviews, prepare for and attend meetings, and keep records and provide feedback, than for the other participants.

In this situation, there is a very real danger that the outside researcher will end up with more responsibility and power than was planned or thought desirable (Kirkup, 1986). If ownership and control of the research process become established as belonging to the researcher, this in itself will destroy the possibility of collective responsibility for democratic change. In such a situation it is also unlikely that the research will survive beyond the term of the outside researcher's involvement.

However, an outsider can play a useful role in the action-research process in a number of ways. Carr and Kemmis (1986) note that "it is common for 'outsiders' to be involved in the organisation of action research, providing material and moral support to action researching teachers" (p. 201). Nixon (1992) suggests that the outsider can also be valuable in bringing a fresh perspective to the situation, and notes that this can be particularly valuable in interviewing participants:

> It allows one to ask questions that would otherwise be embarrassing in their simplicity; to broach with impunity, topics that represent, to the initiated, complete no go areas; and to make connections that run counter to the received wisdom of the insiders. (p. 93)

There was a very marked contrast between the roles that I played at Te Maha and Rimuroa. At Te Maha, once the research took off and the direction of action had been established, I really did become just another member of the group. When my formal involvement with the school was over, the research continued. At Rimuroa, on the other hand, responsibility for keeping things going stayed with me. My presence actually meant that there was no need for others to take over. When I left the school, work on language at the whole staff level stopped. This contrasts with the vertical grouping initiative, which not only sought to address what staff perceived as a real issue (communication between syndicates), but belonged to the staff.

In retrospect, while there might have been changes in what I did at Rimuroa in terms of possibly working with a smaller group, the research process at Rimuroa illustrates an important aspect of action research. Because action research *is* democratic, there is no way in which it can demand that people become involved; it cannot guarantee critical self-reflection or democratic collaboration.

Conclusion

In evaluating the research as it evolved in each school, it is evident that the success of the research process depended on the involvement of a collaborative group working for change that they had identified as "vital" to them. Action research cannot serve an agenda that has been set by an outside agency. The research also required considerable time, energy, and commitment on the part of those participating.

Within the current context of education in this country, in which teachers and schools face centrally mandated change on such a large scale, it is difficult to imagine how schools and communities can provide the conditions under which action research might be undertaken. Having said this, critical educational research such as action research may be one way in which education communities are able to challenge the changes, and even subvert them, so that those communities are able to take control of their own practice.

REFERENCES

Acker, J., Barry, K., and Esseveld, J. (1983). Objectivity and truth: Problems in doing feminist research. *Women's Studies International Forum, 6*(4), 423-435.

Alton-Lee, A., Nuthall, G., & Patrick, J. (1987). Take your brown hand off my book. *Set, 1*. Item 8.

Atkinson, A. (1992). Non-English speaking background students in New Zealand schools. Bulletin: *Research and Statistics*. (pp. 25-28) Wellington: Ministry of Education.

Baker, C. (1993). *Foundations of bilingual education and bilingualism*. Clevedon, Avon: Multilingual Matters.

Bell, A. (1991). The politics of English in New Zealand. In G. McGregor & M. Williams (Eds.) *Dirty silence: Aspects of language and literature in New Zealand* (pp. 65-76). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Benton, R. (1988). *The Matawaia declaration: Some educational and administrative implications*. Wellington: New Zealand Council for Educational Research.

Benton, R. (1991). The history and development of the Māori language. In G. McGregor & M. Williams (Eds.) *Dirty silence: Aspects of language and literature in New Zealand* (pp. 1-19) Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Butler, J. (1992). *The use of the primary school as a community resource for adult learning*. Unpublished paper. Massey University, Palmerston North.

Cambourne, B. (1988). *The whole story: Natural learning and the acquisition of literacy in the classroom*. Auckland: Ashton Scholastic.

Carr, W. & Kemmis, S. (1986). *Becoming critical*. Lewes, East Sussex: The Falmer Press.

Chairperson, Board of Trustees (1992). Annual report for Rimuroa School. *Rimuroa School Newsletter,* July.

Cochrane, N., Lee, A., & Lees, P. (1993). Refugee students with no previous schooling. *Many Voices, 5,* June 1993, 18-19.

Cummins, J. (1981). *Bilingualism and minority language children*. Toronto: Ontario Institute for Studies in Education.

Cummins, J. (1988). From multicultural to anti-racist education: An analysis of programmes and policies in Ontario. In T. Skutnabb-Kangas & J. Cummins, (Eds.). *Minority education: From shame to struggle* (pp. 127-160). Clevedon, Avon: Multilingual Matters.

ERIC

Davies, L. & Nicholl, K. (1993). *Te Māori i roto nga mahi whakaakoranga: Māori in education*. Wellington: Ministry of Education.

Department of Education. (1986). *Language in the primary school: English. Statement of aims*. Wellington: Department of Education.

Department of Education. (1988a). *Administering for excellence: Report of the taskforce to review education administration. The Picot report*. Wellington: Department of Education.

Department of Education. (1988b). *National curriculum statement. Draft*. Wellington: Department of Education.

Education Forum. (1994). *English in the New Zealand curriculum: A submission on the draft*. Auckland: Education Forum.

Elley, W. (1994). Curriculum reform: Forwards or backwards? In H. Manson (Ed.) *New Zealand annual review of education. Te arotake a tau o te ao o te matauranga i Aotearoa, 3: 1993*, 37-50. Wellington: Victoria University.

Gordon, E. (1991). The development of spoken English in New Zealand. In G. McGregor & M. Williams (Eds.) *Dirty silence: Aspects of language and literature in New Zealand* (pp. 19-28). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Grundy, S. (1987). *Curriculum: Product or praxis*. Lewes, East Sussex: The Falmer Press.

Haden, F. (1994). Save us from cultural blindness. *Sunday Star-Times*. June 5. p. C7.

Hollings, M. (1991). The politics of education in Māori. In G. McGregor & M. Williams, (Eds.) *Dirty silence: Aspects of language and literature in New Zealand* (pp. 53-64). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Holmes, J. (1991). The role of the sociolinguist in society. In G. McGregor & M. Williams (Eds.) *Dirty silence: Aspects of language and literature in New Zealand* (pp. 39-52) Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Holmes, J. (1993). Women's role in promoting bilingualism. *Many Voices, 4*, February 1993. 4-11.

Irwin, K. (1994). Māori education in 1993: A review and discussion. In H. Manson (Ed.) *New Zealand annual review of education. Te arotake a tau o te ao o te matauranga i Aotearoa, 3: 1993*, 129-160. Wellington: Victoria University.

Jefferies, R. (1993). *Nga take Māori: Māori matters*. (D. Mitchell, Ed.). Report No. 9. Monitoring Today's Schools research project. Hamilton: University of Waikato.

Jenkins, K. with Ka'ai, T. (1994). Māori education: A cultural experience and dilemma for the state - A new direction for Māori society. In E. Coxon, K. Jenkins, J. Marshall, & L.

Massey (Eds.) 1994. *The politics of learning and teaching in Aotearoa-New Zealand.* (pp. 148-179) Palmerston North: Dunmore Press.

Kelly, A. (1985). Action research: What is it and what can it do? In R.Burgess (Ed.) *Issues in educational research: Qualitative methods.* London: Falmer Press.

Kemmis, S. & McTaggart, R. (1988). *The action research planner. Third edition.* Geelong: Deakin University.

Kirkup, G. (1986). The feminist evaluator. In E. House (Ed.) *New directions in educational research.* (pp. 68-86). London: Falmer Press.

Lambert, W. (1975). Culture and language as factors in learning and education. In A. Wolfgang (Ed.) *Education of immigrant students: Issues and answers.* Toronto: Ontario Institute for Studies in Education.

Language plan dropped. (1994). May 11. *Manawatu Evening Standard.*

Livingstone, I. (1994). The workloads of primary school teachers: A Wellington Region survey. Wellington: Chartwell Consultants.

McPherson, J. (1991). *Approaching equity through school language policy.* Unpublished master's thesis. Massey University, Palmerston North.

McPherson, J. (1992). Approaching equity through school language policy. *Collected conference papers. AARE-NZARE Conference.* Geelong: Deakin University.

McPherson, J. & Corson, D. (1989). *Language across the curriculum: Eight case studies of school based policy development.* Report to the Department of Education. Palmerston North: Massey University.

McTaggart. R. (1991). *Action research: A short modern history.* Geelong: Deakin University.

Middleton, S. (1993). Ko te reo te mauri o te tāngata: Language is the essence. But which language? And the essence of what? *English in Aotearoa, 20*, 34-43.

Middleton, S. (1994). English as a language in New Zealand. *English in Aotearoa, 22,* May 1994, 22-29.

Ministry of Education. (1993a). *Education for the 21st century.* Wellington: Learning Media.

Ministry of Education. (1993b). *English in the New Zealand curriculum. Draft.* Wellington: Learning Media.

Ministry of Education. (1993c). *The New Zealand curriculum framework.* Wellington: Learning Media.

Ministry of Education. (1993d). *Education Statistics of New Zealand*. October, 1993. Wellington: Data Management and Analysis Section, Ministry of Education.

Ministry of Education. (1993e). *Te Whāriki: Draft guidelines for developmentally appropriate programmes in early childhood services*. Wellington: Learning Media.

Ministry of Education. (1994). *Targeting of resources for Māori language education: A discussion document*. May, 1994. Wellington: Ministry of Education.

Mitchell, H. & Mitchell, M. (1993). *Māori teachers who leave the classroom*. Wellington: New Zealand Council for Educational Research.

Nixon, J. (1992). *Evaluating the whole curriculum*. Milton Keynes: Open University Press.

O'Connor, L. (1994). Personal communication, May.

Ohia, M. (1993). *Bilingualism and bilingual education: Their scope, advantages, disadvantages and the implications for Māori learners*. Unpublished master's thesis. Massey University, Palmerston North.

Peddie, R. (1991). *One, two or many? The development and implementation of languages policy in New Zealand*. Auckland: University of Auckland.

Peddie, R. (1992). Language and languages policy in New Zealand: Defining the issues. *English in Aotearoa, 18*, 40-50.

Peddie, R. (1993). *From policy to practice: The implementation of language policies in Victoria, Australia, and New Zealand*. Auckland: Centre for Continuing Education, The University of Auckland.

Preddey, E. (1994). ESOL supplementary funding for schools. *Many Voices, 7*, April 1994, 4-5.

Rivers, J. (1994), January 30. More schools surviving on private funds. *Sunday Times*. p. 15.

Simon, J. (1986). Ideology in the schooling of Māori children. *Delta research monograph*. 7. Palmerston North: Massey University.

Simon, J. (1992). European style schooling for Māori: The first century. *Access, 11* (2), 31-43.

Skutnabb-Kangas, T. & Cummins, J. (Eds.) (1988). *Minority education: From shame to struggle*. Clevedon, Avon: Multilingual Matters.

Smith, R. (1993). Potentials for empowerment in critical education research. *Australian Educational Researcher, 20* (2), 75-94.

Smith, G. (1992). Education: Biculturalism or separatism. In D. Novitz and B. Willmott (Eds.) *New Zealand in crisis: A debate about today's critical issues* (pp.157-165). Wellington: GP Print Ltd.

Spanish and Chinese get the nod. (1994), May 30. *Eduvac, 4.* 175, 6.

Spoonley, P. (1988). *Racism and ethnicity*. Auckland: Oxford University Press.

Tahana, A. (1994). There are few soft answers in education. In H. McQueen (Ed.) *Education is change: Twenty viewpoints* (pp. 210 -220). Wellington: Bridget Williams Books.

Te Puni Kōkiri. (1993). *The benefits of kura kaupapa Māori*. Wellington: Te Puni Kōkiri.

U.S. Department of Education. (1992). Foreign languages assistance programme. *Federal Register*. January 30, p. 3690.

Wagemaker, H. (1993). Reading achievement of New Zealand 9- and 14-year-olds. In H.Wagemaker (Ed.) *Achievement in reading literacy: New Zealand's performance in a national and international context*. Wellington: Research Section, Ministry of Education.

Waite, J. (1992a). *Aoteareo: Speaking for ourselves. Part A*. Wellington: Learning Media.

Waite, J. (1992b). *Aoteareo: Speaking for ourselves. Part B*. Wellington: Learning Media.

GLOSSARY OF ABBREVIATIONS AND MĀORI TERMS

ABBREVIATIONS

ERO	Education Review Office
ESL	English as a second language
ESOL	English as a second or other language
LOTEM	Languages other than English or Māori
NSEB	Non-English-speaking background
NZSL	New Zealand sign language
OECD	Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development

MĀORI TERMS

iwi	nation, people, tribe
kaiarahi reo	leader (of group or class) in Māori language
kaiāwhina	assistant, teacher's aide
kaumātua	respected tribal elder
kaupapa	philosophy, purpose
kawa	etiquette; correct ways of behaving in a particular place and circumstance
kōhanga reo	language nest - preschool education centre run according to Māori kaupapa
kōrero	talk, message
kotahitanga	unity
kura	school
kura kaupapa Māori	school based on Māori philosophy and using Māori language
Māoritanga	Māori practices, knowledge, and understanding
ngākau	"heart", mind
nga tikanga Māori	Māori customs or protocol
ngati	a word used in connection with tribal names, literally "the descendants of"
Pākehā	New Zealander of European ancestry
tāngata whenua	the people of the land, indigenous people
taonga	treasure, property
te reo Māori	the Māori language
tino rangitiratanga	sovereignty, right to autonomy
whānau	extended family
whanaungatanga	relationship; the process or state of living as part of an extended family