

*Te Kōrero Māori ki ngā Tamariki  
I roto i ngā karu o ngā kaiako hou*

Speaking Te Reo Māori to Children:  
From the perspective of early childhood teachers

Rachel Nanette Holder

A thesis submitted to Auckland University of Technology  
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree  
of  
Master of Education (M.Ed.)

2015

Te Kura Mātauranga  
School of Education

Supervisor: Dr Christine Jenkin

# Whakapapa

Ko Hikurangi te maunga

Ko Waiapu te awa

Ko Ngāti Porou te iwi

Ko Horouta te waka

Ko Te Poho o Rawiri te marae

Ko Maui te tūpuna

Ko Holder koutou ko Ensor āku whānau

I te taha o tōku matua, ko Lewis tōku koroua, ko Genevieve tōku kuia

I te taha o tōku whaea, ko Reginald tōku koroua, ko Phyllis tōku kuia

Ko Eugene tōku matua

Ko Judy tōku whaea

Ko Donna tāku tuakana

Ko Mike rāua. Ko Steve āku tungāne

Ko Joshua rātou, ko Larah, ko Zane āku tamariki

Ko Rāhera tāku ingoa

Kei Tamāki-makau-rau tāku kāinga noho aianeī

He kaiako ahau

Kei te mahi ahau, ki Te Wānanga Aronui o Tamāki Makaurau

No reira, tēnā koutou, tēnā koutou, tēnā koutou katoa.

## Abstract

This research aligns with the bicultural orientation and vision of the early childhood curriculum of Aotearoa New Zealand: *Te Whāriki He Whāriki Mātauranga mo ngā Mokopuna o Aotearoa: Early Childhood Curriculum* (Ministry of Education, 1996) and the founding document of Aotearoa New Zealand Te Tiriti o Waitangi. My research illuminated evidence that early childhood teachers were speaking very little te reo Māori to children, despite the Ministry of Education stressing the importance of the early childhood sector having an authentic connection with Māori (Paki, 2007). The level of te reo Māori spoken to children by nine qualified early childhood teachers, was explored, as well as implications impeding their proficiency in speaking te reo Māori. Those sampled included both bilingual and monolingual teachers, however; none were fluent in te reo Māori. Research data was collected via observations, semi-structured interviews, and interviews via email, throughout 2014. Six barriers which impeded teachers implementing the bicultural imperatives of *Te Whāriki* were identified, one of which was their fluency in te reo Māori. An unexpected finding of this research, was that teachers misinterpreted the bicultural curriculum, within the context of *Te Whāriki*. Teacher accounts indicated that despite a mandate to protect and sustain te reo Māori me ngā tikanga, the Ministry of Education and tertiary institutions have not sufficiently supported teachers in speaking te reo Māori with children. One of the challenges of this research concerned my own beliefs at the lack of spoken te reo Māori from teachers to their children. Suggestions for further research include identifying what is still missing to enable teachers to effectively implement the bicultural imperatives of *Te Whāriki* as well as, looking at the bicultural content of teacher education programmes.

## Table of Contents

1	Chapter One: Background to this Thesis .....	1
1.1	Overview .....	1
1.2	Researcher Vision Regarding the Research Questions .....	3
1.3	Decline of Te Reo Māori .....	4
1.4	Positioning Myself as the Researcher-Māori child growing up Pākehā .....	9
1.5	Entrance to Tertiary Education-Clarity of Mismatch .....	10
1.6	Addressing Hindsight to Move Forward .....	12
1.7	Methodology .....	12
1.8	Research Findings .....	13
1.9	Structure of this Thesis .....	14
2	Chapter Two: Review of the Literature .....	17
2.1	Overview .....	17
2.2	A Way of Life that Sustained Te Reo Māori Me Ngā Tikanga .....	19
2.3	Māori and British Sign Te Tiriti o Waitangi .....	22
2.4	The Decline of Te Reo Māori through Schooling for Assimilation .....	24
2.5	The Waitangi Tribunal and Te Reo Māori .....	29
2.6	A Foundation Lost and Navigating a Path Forward .....	31
2.7	<i>Te Whāriki</i> : An Intended Journey Toward Biculturalism .....	36
2.8	The Benefits of Learning Te Reo Māori for all New Zealanders .....	40
2.9	Summary .....	42
3	Chapter Three: Research Procedures .....	44
3.1	Overview .....	44
3.2	Kaupapa Māori Research .....	45
3.3	Māori Consultation .....	52
3.4	Western Research .....	53
3.5	Participant Recruitment and Access .....	55
3.6	Participant Teachers .....	56
3.7	Data Collection: Running the Observations .....	57
3.8	Data Collection: Running the Semi-Structured Interviews .....	58
3.9	Kai and Koha .....	60
3.10	Data Management and Analysis .....	60
3.11	Researcher Accountability .....	61
3.12	Ethical Considerations: Tikanga Māori .....	61
3.13	What I Would do Differently .....	63
3.14	Summary .....	64
4	Chapter Four: Emergent Research Findings and Discussion .....	65
4.1	Overview .....	65
4.2	Bicultural or Multicultural? .....	68
4.3	<i>Te Whāriki</i> .....	72
4.4	Centre Leadership .....	77
4.5	Relevant Professional Development .....	81

4.6	Personal Considerations .....	87
4.7	The Role of Tertiary Institutions .....	92
4.8	Summary .....	97
5	Chapter Five: Conclusion.....	99
5.1	Overview .....	99
5.2	Revisiting the Research Questions .....	100
5.3	Implications of this Research .....	101
5.4	Potential Solutions.....	102
5.5	Contribution and Strengths Research .....	104
5.6	Challenges of this Research.....	105
5.7	Recommendations and Future Research .....	107
5.8	Concluding Comments .....	108
	References .....	110
	Glossary .....	135
	Appendices.....	136
	Appendix A: Bicultural Imperatives of <i>Te Whāriki</i> .....	136
	Appendix B: Centre Manager Information Sheet .....	137
	Appendix C: Centre Manager Access Agreement .....	139
	Appendix D: Participant Information Sheet.....	140
	Appendix E: Participant Consent Form .....	142
	Appendix F: Observation Chart .....	143
	Appendix G: Semi Structured Interview Questions.....	146
	Appendix H: Interview via Email .....	147

## List of Tables

Table 3.1. Teacher Ethnicity and Centre

Table 3.2. Ethical Considerations of Kaupapa Māori

Table 4.1. Qualified Teachers Level of Spoken Te Reo Māori to Children

## Whakatauākī

Ehara tāku toa i te toa takitahi engari he toa takitini.

It is not my strength alone, but the strength of many that contribute to my success.

The whakatauākī within this thesis were chosen for their spiritual significance. They derive from Woodward Ltda at <http://www.maori.cl/Proverbs.htm>

The purpose of this website is to create awareness of Māori language and culture.

## Attestation of Authorship

I hereby declare that this submission is my own work and that, to the best of my knowledge and belief, it contains no material previously published or written by another person (except where explicitly defined in the acknowledgements), nor material which to a substantial extent has been submitted for the award of any other degree or diploma of a university or other institution of higher learning.

---

Rachel Nanette Holder

In accordance with Auckland University of Technology's Ethics Committee (AUTEC), the final ethics approval for this research project was granted on 7 October 2013, Ethics Approval Number 13/269.



## Acknowledgements

To my parents Eugene and Judy Holder, thank you for your immense and unconditional love. It is an honour to be your daughter.

To my children, Joshua, Larah and Zane, thank you for tolerating my absence, I love you. To my ‘borrowed’ children, Nan and Devin, thank you for supporting me. In spending time with Joshua, Larah and Zane, you have enabled me to complete this journey and I am so very grateful.

To my supervisor and mentor Chris Jenkin, for your tireless advice, support, and encouragement, I am so grateful. You gave me the strength to continue when obstacles made completing this journey seem impossible. You are a dear lady, one of a kind. To Andra Jenkin thank you for your knowledge, time and expertise in proof reading.

Dr Jens Hansen, thank you for both your technical support, and academic wisdom. Your hospitality at Woodhill Park Retreat and equally your introduction to the Inspiration Programme were instrumental in completing this thesis.

To the teachers who contributed to this research project, thank you for your willingness and openness. To have worked alongside you in bringing te reo Māori to the forefront of early childhood education has been humbling.

Temepara Sexton, you remain my inspiration. There is no one more deserving of eternal light and love, mā te wā e hoa.

My dear sister, Donna Dougan, I finally completed this. If only I could call and tell you. I love you.

## Conventions of this Thesis

As te reo Māori is one of the official languages of Aotearoa New Zealand, Māori words throughout this thesis are not considered foreign, consequently, they are not italicised. A glossary of Māori words has been included, except where these are titles of sections or from references that include a translation. The only exception to this has been the inclusion of Māori words within the reference list, so as to meet APA 6<sup>th</sup> referencing conventions. The most significant example of this is the title of the national early childhood curriculum in Aotearoa New Zealand *Te Whāriki*. Due to this thesis frequently drawing on *Te Whāriki* it will only be referenced when there is a direct quotation. In addition to this, the words bicultural and biculturalism should be viewed as interchangeable unless a specific meaning has been affixed to them.

# 1 Chapter One: Background to this Thesis

Tōku reo, tōku ohoooho, tōku reo, tōku mapihi maurea.

My language is my awakening; my language is the window to my soul.

## 1.1 Overview

As tangata whenua of Aotearoa New Zealand, I consider due emphasis must be given to te reo Māori with the need being for Māori and other ethnicities to proactively speak the language throughout everyday conversations. It is only through this collective approach that language confidence and language revitalisation can continue. Central to this research project are Māori, the indigenous people of Aotearoa New Zealand. For decades Māori have fought to prevent the deterioration of their language te reo Māori. Specifically, the focus in this thesis is on te reo Māori within the context of the early childhood sector of Aotearoa New Zealand; which provides care and education for children aged 0 to 6 years (Bushouse, 2008). Irrespective of which early childhood setting children in Aotearoa New Zealand attend, their learning context is positioned within the bicultural orientation and vision of *Te Whāriki* (Alvestad, Duncan & Berge, 2009). This vision defines Aotearoa New Zealand as the home of Māori language and culture. The Crown's (Ministry of Education, 1996) expectation of teachers is that their early childhood curriculum must promote te reo Māori me ngā tikanga, which obligates teachers to speak te reo Māori with children. In order to be qualified, early childhood teachers must hold a recognised teaching degree coupled with a New Zealand Teachers Council registration (Ministry of Education, n.d).

This thesis therefore, discusses the mandate of qualified early childhood teachers speaking te reo Māori to children, as emphasised in the bicultural imperatives of *Te Whāriki*. It will also consider the ability of teachers to achieve this mandate. The research objective was to recognise what was currently occurring by way of te reo

Māori spoken by teachers. This was followed by identifying barriers considered to impede teachers in speaking te reo Māori, with solutions offered to support their teaching, and that of early childhood teachers in training. The overall intent of this research was to facilitate an authentic connection between the early childhood sector and Māori, through teachers speaking te reo Māori with children.

This chapter begins with my vision of where te reo Māori should sit within Aotearoa New Zealand, and is followed by justifying the need for Māori and other early childhood teachers to speak te reo Māori to children. Much international research described the sectarianism imposed upon indigenous people having suffered language decline at the hands of colonisers (Ka'ai-Mahuta; 2011; May, 2012; Walsh & Yallop, 2007). In acknowledging this for Māori tangata whenua of Aotearoa New Zealand, this research has considered where te reo Māori sits within a small group of early childhood centres. The following research questions were aimed at discovering and establishing solutions toward teachers speaking te reo Māori to children.

*What level of te reo Māori are qualified mainstream early childhood teachers speaking with their children?*

*What are the implications of this?*

The next section gives attention to the deterioration of te reo Māori, outlining the Crown policies and practises which many academics agree are responsible for the degradation of Māori language, economic, political, cultural, and social structures. Consideration is given to the underachievement of Māori within the education sector which has also been linked to government legislation having contributed to the degradation of te reo Māori. The ongoing efforts of Māori concerning the Crown recognising this finally prompted initiatives supporting the ongoing growth and development of te reo Māori.

Contextualising my position as the researcher begins with my story of growing up Māori within my Pākehā whānau, and continues through my current path, graduating with a Masters of Education. While writing this section of my thesis it became apparent that my own journey emulated much of the literature discussed in Chapter two, particularly regarding the minimal representation of Māori language and culture within the education sector.

The methodology of kaupapa Māori research is introduced; its framework provides a traditional and contemporary insight into “Māori views and praxis of emancipation” (Tooley, 2000, p.3). The theory of kaupapa Māori research stresses the need to affirm Māori voices and Māori knowledge. In doing so, Māori are given the opportunity to generate positive outcomes for their people, who in this case, are bringing te reo Māori to the forefront of the early childhood sector.

Next, the findings from the collected data are outlined and they represent the barriers considered by early childhood teachers impeding their speaking te reo Māori to children. The closing section of this chapter outlines the structure of this thesis.

## 1.2 Researcher Vision Regarding the Research Questions

In a similar manner to other research methodologies, kaupapa Māori research begins with the researcher considering something they are curious about and formalising this into a question which might fill a knowledge void (Cram, 2001). In the first place, I strongly believe Māori alongside other ethnicities within Aotearoa New Zealand should acknowledge and speak te reo Māori daily. Indeed, all teachers in Aotearoa New Zealand, irrespective of nationality, have a responsibility to protect and sustain te reo Māori me ngā tikanga as stated in Te Tiriti o Waitangi (Ka'ai, Moorfield, Reilly &

Mosley, 2004). Additionally, the expectation held by the Ministry of Education (1996) is that all early childhood teachers acknowledge and implement the bicultural imperatives outlined in *Te Whāriki*, which include speaking te reo Māori to children.

There is much international research validating the plight of indigenous people worldwide who have suffered irreversible damage at the hands of colonisers, particularly in terms of language decline (Cleary, 2007). Suffice it to say, while teachers speaking te reo Māori to children are validating the cultural identity of Māori, their doing so is integral to the identity of all those living in Aotearoa New Zealand. According to Smith (1999) kaupapa Māori research is seen as a pursuit for decolonisation, healing, and unification. Within this thesis, I considered what was currently occurring with teachers in a small group of early childhood education centres.

### 1.3 Decline of Te Reo Māori

May (2012) explains the first stage in language decline was the coloniser placing immense pressure on indigenous minorities to speak the introduced language. Over time, fluent indigenous speaking elders declined in numbers leaving only a small number left to teach younger generations. Te reo Māori and Māori culture are firmly associated; inevitably, the decline in numbers of those who could speak the language would then be followed by a weakening of Māori culture (Fishman, 1991). The final stage of language decline saw the coloniser's language supersede the indigenous language, with the latter being inevitably forgotten. Remnants of this are evident within the history of Māori language decline and began with the colonisation of Aotearoa New Zealand by mainly British settlers (Jenkins & Matthews, 1988; May, 2012). The governmental policies and practises that followed were aimed at spreading the English language and culture throughout all Aotearoa New Zealand society.

Nowhere was this more prominent than within the education sector, with the sentiments of Māori reflected by Carey (1997) who wrote “Being a minority student is a paradox, to live we have to assimilate and learn the dominant way of living, while also trying to preserve our traditions” (p. 132). According to Pauls (2015, para. 1) assimilation is “the process whereby individuals or groups of differing ethnic heritage are absorbed into the dominant culture of a society”. This is the definition I have used to explain assimilation in this thesis.

According to Sheriff (2010) and Walker (1990), the catalyst responsible for the destruction of Māori language was neo-colonial dominance whereby the colonisers influenced and controlled Māori economic, political, cultural, and social structures. The subsequent underachievement of Māori has been directly linked by a number of academics, both Māori and non-Māori, to governmental policies and practises (Bishop & Glynn 1999; Irwin 1991; Smith 1990; Walker, 1991).

Earlier research (Bishop & Glynn 1999; Mead, 1997) pointed to the fact that the Crown had failed to address the widespread underachievement of Māori within an education sector that was developed, and implemented with little or no input by Māori.

Educational policies and practises relentlessly undermined Māori culture and language with Irwin (1991) concluding it was “education of Māori and not education for Māori” (p. 4). Scheurich and Young (1997) later criticised the Crown saying their constant restrictions upon Māori language gave the perception Māori had equal positioning when in fact; western theories and policies prevailed. The Crown initiative which silenced the language within the education system (Kawharu, 2014) was summed up by Henare (as cited in the Waitangi Tribunal, 1986) who said “the facts are incontrovertible, if there was no such policy; there was an extremely effective gentleman’s agreement” (p. 9).

Such disparities as were statistically identified in the Hunn Report (1961) confirmed the demoralisation of Māori people, this is discussed further in Chapter two (McIntosh & Mulholland, 2011). The ongoing challenge for Māori has been to succeed within the western education sector, while safeguarding their language, identity, and culture. The educational future of Māori sits firmly beneath that of the Crown, a far cry from the original intent of equal partnership between Māori and the Crown as guaranteed within Te Tiriti o Waitangi (Ministry of Education, 2014b; Orange, 2004; Waitangi Tribunal, 1986). Justification for the establishment of policies empowering Māori to realise their academic potential resided within Te Tiriti o Waitangi and are reiterated by the United Nations (2012).

Māori have fought hard to preserve their language, and their efforts were realised throughout the 1970s, with the implementation of education initiatives that firmly addressed the decline of te reo Māori. The Crown and other political parties eventually conceded that Māori had a legitimate grievance (Manning, 2000). Te reo Māori became an official language of Aotearoa New Zealand on August 1<sup>st</sup> 1987 (New Zealand Government, 2014). It was determined by the Waitangi Tribunal (1986) that the lone efforts of Māori would not ensure survival of their language. Following a mandate from the Waitangi Tribunal (1986), the Crown committed to reduce disparity by raising the academic achievement of Māori while moreover, taking active steps to support the growth and development of te reo Māori (Tooley, 2000). Such recognition would have been inconceivable had the efforts of Māori abated (McIntosh & Mulholland, 2011; O'Sullivan, 2007).

Founded upon the principles of kaupapa Māori, Te Kōhanga Reo (Māori immersion early childhood centres) and Kura Kaupapa (Māori immersion primary schools) were established in the 1980s. They were hailed as one of the most influential initiatives of Māori to ensure the survival and regeneration of te reo Maori ma ngā tikanga (Te



Kōhanga Reo National Trust, 2015). Te Kōhanga Reo and Kura Kaupapa have challenged mainstream views and in doing so, provided an alternative environment for educating Māori and non-Māori children (Pihama, Smith, Taki & Lee, 2004; Tooley, 2000). Briefly, kaupapa Māori research is by Māori, for Māori and is designed to assist Māori (Cram, 2001) and this is discussed in Chapter Three. These environments empowered children to learn Māori language, values, and protocol for both the marae and home setting (Cloher & Hohepa, 1996).

Many Māori agreed Te Kōhanga reo and Kura Kaupapa were solutions for revitalising te reo Māori me ngā tikanga and addressing the education system which disadvantaged their people (Te One, 2003). Presently, Te Kōhanga Reo is regulated by the Ministry of Education, and this has proved detrimental in Te Kōhanga Reo maintaining their initial vision of kaupapa Māori. Nevertheless, the intent of Māori in revitalising te reo Māori me ngā tikanga saw Te Kōhanga Reo continue as a viable option for early childhood education. Te Taura Whiri i Te Reo Māori: Māori Language Commission was established on 1<sup>st</sup> August 1987 by the Māori Language Act 1987 (New Zealand Ministry of Justice, 2011). Their role being:

...to initiate, develop, co-ordinate, review, advise upon, and assist in the implementation of policies, procedures, measures, and practices designed to give effect to the declaration of the Māori language as an official language of New Zealand, and generally to promote the Māori language, in particular, its use as a living language and as an ordinary means of communication. (New Zealand Ministry of Justice, 2011, p. 1)

The Annual Report on Māori Education released by the Ministry of Education (2010a) determined that for Māori to achieve academic success, they had the right to access high quality Māori language throughout their education. The central focus of Ka Hikitia - Accelerating Success 2013-2017 (Ministry of Education, 2013) was recognition that the academic achievement of Māori was magnified when education reflects “their identity, language and culture” (p. 6). The objective is to develop culturally intelligent, bilingual

adults who can contribute positively to society. Accordingly, to ensure a cohesive approach, the Crown, “reviews schools and early childhood education services, and publishes national reports on current education practice” (Education Review Office, n.d) note that all education sectors are to work in partnership with *Ka Hikitia -Accelerating Success 2013-2017* (Ministry of Education, 2013) and *Tau Mai Te Reo -The Māori Language in Education Strategy 2013-2017* (Ministry of Education, 2015a). Furthermore, in line with *Ka Hikitia* (Ministry of Education, 2013), *Tau Mai te Reo* reiterates that all children irrespective of ethnicity, have access to quality te reo Māori throughout early childhood, primary, secondary and tertiary education (Ministry of Education, 2015a).

The Ministry of Education (2015a) in the document *Tau Mai te Reo -The Māori Language in Education Strategy 2013-2017* recognised that “the Ministry of Education and education sector agencies have obligations, as Crown agencies, to actively protect Māori language as a taonga, guaranteed under the Treaty of Waitangi” (p. 4). In this way te reo Māori is “valued, appropriately considered, and prioritised in education” (2015a, p. 4). In line with this, the Crown appointed eleven lead agencies to increase the awareness of te reo Māori revitalisation, improve the societal status of the language and increase the use of te reo Māori among Māori and non-Māori (Te Puni Kokiri, 2014).

The chore initiatives show the Crown are working toward closing the disparities between Māori and non-Māori within the education sector. Their message is clear; all those involved in education must understand the commitment and obligations required of them. This will ensure they meet their obligations under Te Tiriti o Waitangi, one of which is to protect and sustain te reo Māori me ngā tikanga. Presently, the academic achievement of Māori remains below that of non-Māori and statistics show that less than 3.7% of the total population of Aotearoa New Zealand can speak te reo Māori

(Statistics New Zealand, 2013). With an expected estimated 30% increase of Māori school children by 2030, the need to rectify this concern now sits at a crisis point (Berryman, Kerr, Macfarlane, Penetito, & Smith, 2013). There can be no confusion, te reo Māori must be actively spoken within the education sector, beginning I believe within early childhood education.

#### 1.4 Positioning Myself as the Researcher-Māori child growing up Pākehā

I was adopted at six weeks of age and unlike many others who have been adopted, I have always felt a true sense of belonging. With this in mind, the term adoptive has been negated when referring to my parents/siblings/family. I cannot recall the exact time my parents told me I was adopted but it was very early in my upbringing. Perhaps this has contributed to my acceptance of the adoption process rather than feeling resentment. My Indian father and Pākehā mother raised my siblings and I in central Auckland and I can recall childhood memories of love and laughter irrespective of occasion. With olive skin I resembled my siblings and the only time my identity was called into question was in revealing my parent's ethnic backgrounds, and then my own being Māori and Spanish. Consistent with adoptions in the early seventies, the information provided about my biological parents was limited to my ethnicity and my biological mother's full name. My parents have always conveyed their commitment in supporting me to locate my biological whānau if I desired to do so.

By chance, my early twenties saw me share conversations with a Māori lady that frequented the same gym as I. Engaging in practises synonymous with kaupapa Māori customs, we shared several conversations about growing up, with one leading to the realisation that she was my biological mother's sister. I can recall her crying and embracing me as the enormity of our discovery became clear. In comparison, I had mixed emotions which Trinder, Feast and Howe (2004) suggest is common for those

who have been adopted. They describe the process of reuniting with biological parents as being difficult because biological parents have far greater expectations than those of the person who has been adopted. Often the adopted person only wants answers about their identity. The biological parent however holds memories and angst from parting with their child, and seeks to close the void. Irrespective of my mixed emotions, my parents encouraged me to accept an invitation to reunite with my biological whānau. The visits with my biological whānau were spent sharing their accounts of growing up in the East Coast and my stories of growing up in Auckland. Generally, it was a positive experience and the new knowledge enabled me to complete my whakapapa.

My biological family and I remain in contact via social media and while there is so much more to learn I believe my being Māori is not dependent upon my willingness to be submerged within my biological whānau. Rather, I believe it is my willingness and commitment to being submerged in, being Māori.

### 1.5 Entrance to Tertiary Education-Clarity of Mismatch

It would not be until entering tertiary education in 2008, that I would recognise my earlier education regarding the colonisation of Aotearoa New Zealand was unequivocally inaccurate, because I was now exposed to the writings of prominent Māori scholars. Studying for a degree, the Bachelor of Education in Early Childhood, while working and raising my children was exhausting. Shared conversations with class peers revealed I was not alone, particularly concerning our teaching placements. To clarify, for three consecutive weeks each year, we volunteered full time in local early childhood centres. The experiences were aimed at linking our degree theory with our practice. While my first practicum had me feeling valued and accepted by practicum teaching staff, children and whānau, the theory and practice were disconnected, particularly regarding teacher obligations to speak te reo Māori to children.

Fundamentally, the Ministry of Education's expectation of teachers is that they must carry out the early childhood curriculum directive to promote te reo Māori me ngā tikanga, this is stated within the bicultural imperatives of *Te Whāriki* (see Appendix A).

While on practicums however, my class peers and I realised that although teachers at the practicum centre espoused speaking te reo Māori, the language was rarely spoken, or not spoken at all. In line with this Jenkin (2010) argued that student teachers struggled to implement the bicultural imperatives of *Te Whāriki* as practicum centres were unable to provide role models in this area. I discussed this disconnect with a class lecturer and while she agreed with Jenkin (2010) she was unable to offer me a solution.

While this disconnect had left me feeling uneasy, it was an incident in my final week of practicum that would have me questioning a career within early childhood education.

To clarify, teachers at the practicum centre borrowed Māori resources from a local library the day prior to a visit from an Education Review Office representative.

Sanctioned by the Ministry of Education these representatives investigate and compile a report on specified aspects of teaching staff, and their early childhood centres. The report allows parents to make an informed decision regarding centre suitability for their children. For many Māori, a major component of this report is the bicultural pathway of a centre in terms of acknowledging whānau Māori, Māori language and Māori history.

In this instance, the final report stated the practicum centre was rich in biculturalism and supportive of Māori despite practicum teachers speaking little or no te reo Māori at all.

Notably, the Māori resources were returned to the library the following day.

I considered the actions of both practicum teachers and the Education Review Office representative, offensive to Māori. The token inclusion of items such as puzzles and books aimed at making the environment more welcoming is said to be disempowering to Māori (Colbung, Glover, Rau, & Ritchie, 2007) because the environment is not authentic. Such token practises also disregard Ministerial obligations to protect and

sustain te reo Māori me ngā tikanga. Offering a different viewpoint is Jenkin (2010) who suggests teachers who speak te reo Māori to children albeit minimally, are beginning a journey toward bicultural teaching.

## 1.6 Addressing Hindsight to Move Forward

Having qualified with a Bachelor of Education in Early Childhood in 2011, the catalyst to my commencing my Masters of Education was a degree paper on the colonisation of Aotearoa New Zealand and the signing of Te Tiriti o Waitangi. While I was not oblivious to these significant historical events, it is fair to say, the true implications felt by Māori were omitted from my own education and upbringing. Based on what I learnt in the paper and my own role as an early childhood teacher, I considered it my responsibility to further investigate te reo Māori within the early childhood sector.

Working within an early childhood centre in South Auckland, my colleagues and I spoke te reo Māori to children. Our Māori whānau shared the aspirations they held for their children and they were actively engaged in their children's learning. This was in stark contrast to what I encountered while on practicum, where te reo Māori was rarely spoken and teachers did not appear to be engaged with Māori whānau. The value of contextualising whānau Māori within their language and culture was apparent, as was my resolve to research the level of te reo Māori early childhood teachers are speaking with their children. The overall intent of this research is to facilitate an authentic connection between Māori and the early childhood sector. This benefit for Māori can be realised through teachers speaking te reo Māori to children.

## 1.7 Methodology

Of significance to this thesis is the methodology of kaupapa Māori research, which underpins the principal ideology for the procedures applied in this project. Kaupapa

Māori research encompasses a contemporary insight into “Māori views and praxis of emancipation” (Tooley, 2000, p. 12). This methodology was applied from the outset and guided both the methods of data gathering, and the dialogue between myself and the participating teachers (Paki, 2007). Kaupapa Māori research is fundamentally conceived, developed, and carried out by Māori, for Māori, with the distinctive modes of analysis and theory designed to assist not only Māori, but all people (Cram, 2001; Nepe, 1991). This is the precursor of what many researchers are trying to achieve today (Jackson, 1996). Consequently, kaupapa Māori research places emphasis on Māori voices being heard and the contribution of Māori knowledge implementing positive outcomes for their people. As a conceptualisation of Māori knowledge, kaupapa Māori research emphasises the significance of the researcher accurately interpreting the data (Barnes 2000; Smith 1999). By its very nature, kaupapa Māori research requires the researcher to comprehend Māori structures, knowledge, people, and procedures (Nepe, 1991). Importance is also placed upon the researcher integrating their own knowledge and that of Māori, throughout the interpretation of the collected data (Smith, 1999).

## 1.8 Research Findings

The first of six findings concerned teacher’s misinterpretation of biculturalism within the context of *Te Whāriki*. It became clear that despite all teachers following the same national curriculum, their interpretation and subsequent pedagogy varied dramatically. This then directly related to their willingness and commitment to speak te reo Māori to children.

The second finding considers the bicultural framework of *Te Whāriki* and the expectation that teachers promote te reo Māori me ngā tikanga throughout their centre. One aspect of this is teachers speaking te reo Māori with children. Teachers in this

research collectively agreed that *Te Whāriki* failed to inform them on how to achieve this mandate.

Thirdly, teachers placed significant importance on those in leadership and management positions, to acknowledge, reinforce and model a commitment toward speaking te reo Māori, whilst the fourth finding concerned teachers agreeing there was an absence of relevant professional development in supporting their knowledge, ability, and confidence to speak te reo Māori.

The fifth finding acknowledged the personal considerations of teachers, which in some instances have not only impeded their willingness to accept the bicultural imperatives of *Te Whāriki* speaking te reo Māori with children, but also their professional obligation to do so.

Finally, the part played by tertiary institutions, or more specifically, the bicultural aspects of their teacher education programmes, emerged as an important finding. Only one teacher considered by graduation that their programme contextualised Māori as tangata whenua as well as prepared them to promote te reo Māori me ngā tikanga.

## 1.9 Structure of this Thesis

The first of the five chapters in this thesis began with the researcher's position on te reo Māori followed by outlining the overall intent of this research, which was to facilitate an authentic connection between the early childhood sector and Māori through teachers speaking te reo Māori to children. The objective of this research was to recognise what was currently occurring by way of te reo Māori spoken by teachers, investigate barriers impeding them from achieving this, and establishing solutions to increase the likelihood of their doing so. Māori, the indigenous people of Aotearoa New Zealand were introduced, as was the context of the early childhood sector. The research questions



were defined, then the researcher's own journey from growing up in central Auckland to eventually settling and studying in South Auckland was discussed. Chapter one concluded with an overview of kaupapa Māori research and highlighted the key findings.

Chapter two, a review of the literature, argues that the early childhood sector is obligated to sustaining an authentic connection with Māori, which includes teachers speaking te reo Māori to children. Fundamental is the discussion concerning traditional Māori practises which proved crucial in sustaining te reo Māori me ngā tikanga. Te Tiriti o Waitangi is introduced, and whilst the signing of this document holds variable meanings for New Zealanders today, it remains highly contested between Māori and Pākehā. Consideration is given to the Crown's breach of their obligations toward Māori, as is a review of the missionary period in terms of assimilating Māori throughout all facets of the education sector. The associations between te reo Māori, Te Tiriti o Waitangi and the Waitangi Tribunal, are defined particularly in terms of recognition that te reo Māori is an official language of Aotearoa New Zealand. The introduction of *Te Whāriki*, the first bicultural curriculum of Aotearoa New Zealand follows. Emphasis is placed on the bicultural imperatives of the curriculum which requires teachers to acknowledge their professional obligation toward Māori. While *Te Whāriki* is resolved to honour the partnership between Māori and the Crown, as shown in Te Tiriti o Waitangi (Ritchie. 2003a), all teachers in this research considered this to be problematic, because of the document's philosophical approach.

In spite of the Crown commitment to protect and sustain te reo Māori, statistics show that those who can speak te reo Māori are less than 3.7% of the total population of Aotearoa New Zealand (Statistics New Zealand, 2013). In view of this, attention is given to the advantages of all New Zealanders learning to speak te reo Māori.

The participating teacher's recruitment process as well as data collection, management, and analysis are discussed. This chapter concludes by affirming the ethical considerations of kaupapa Māori research, which have underpinned this research and been pivotal in safeguarding all those involved.

Chapter four presents the research findings from the collated data with emphasis placed on teacher's voices being accurately reported. Six barriers were identified by early childhood teachers as impeding their speaking te reo Māori to children. Discussion surrounding these barriers enabled teachers and myself to establish solutions in addressing them. These are also discussed.

Chapter five revisits the research questions, and considers if these questions were successful in authenticating a connection between the early childhood sector and Māori, whereby teachers speak te reo Māori to children. The implications of this research are discussed with focus on the roles of both the Ministry of Education and tertiary institutions. The research contribution draws attention to the fact that despite early childhood teachers following the same national curriculum, their interpretation of *Te Whāriki*'s bicultural imperatives varies greatly. There was a lack of distinction between bicultural and multicultural, which is discussed as some teachers misunderstood the necessity to engage in bicultural development despite their professional obligation to do so. Recommendation of future research surrounding the bicultural aspects of early childhood teacher training programmes as well as, looking at the bicultural content of teacher education programmes are discussed. The contributions and strengths of this research identify teacher misinterpretation of the term bicultural, within the context of *Te Whāriki*, as well as adding to the small body of literature concerning early childhood teachers' bicultural development. Challenges include participant recruitment and data collection methods. The concluding comments will then draw this portion of the research to a close.

## 2 Chapter Two: Review of the Literature

Tangata ako ana i te whare, te tūranga ki te marae, tau ana.

A person, who is taught at home, will stand collected on the marae.

### 2.1 Overview

A fundamental aspect of language revitalisation in Aotearoa New Zealand is contextualising the historical implications of te reo Māori. International literature confirms the association between indigenous languages and culture (Fishman 1991). Throughout history, the language of te reo Māori fluctuated from being the sole language spoken within Aotearoa New Zealand, to being confined to only small rural Māori communities (Paki, 2007). Even when Pākehā first began to arrive, te reo Māori remained the chosen language for communication between Māori and non-Māori (Spolsky, 2003). At the beginning of the 20th century, 90 per cent of Māori school children still spoke te reo Māori as their first language, yet by the mid-20<sup>th</sup> century the language was in crisis with many Māori arguing te reo Māori was dying out (Ka'ai-Mahuta, 2011; Waitangi Tribunal, 1986). The ongoing efforts of Māori eventually saw the Crown forced to take responsibility for the demise of Māori language and culture. The Crown introduced initiatives aimed at increasing the number of Māori speaking and understanding their language. Current statistics reveal, however, that not enough was done to ensure language regeneration with the total number of Māori speaking the language in 2013 recorded as 21.3 per cent (Statistics New Zealand, 2014a), a far cry from the beginning of the 20th century.

The aim of this chapter is to draw attention to the catalysts responsible for the decline of te reo Māori and Māori culture through the colonisation of Aotearoa New Zealand. The policies and practises of assimilation that followed have forever changed the centrality of te reo Māori and imposed unrelenting implications upon Māori today. Emphasis is

placed on the education sector where in this thesis I argue that despite the efforts of the Ministry of Education (1996; 2010a; 2013; 2015a; 2015c), the early childhood sector lacks an authentic connection with Māori, as teachers are speaking te reo Māori minimally or, not at all (Paki, 2007).

I begin by discussing traditional Māori practises of sharing knowledge, which centrally located te reo Māori and as such, were pivotal in sustaining te reo Māori me ngā tikanga post colonisation. Emphasis is given to the collective role of Māori in educating their children. British migration to Aotearoa New Zealand, however, immediately began to diminish Māori traditions and education practises. Despite the signing of Te Tiriti o Waitangi in 1840, the British imposed policies removed authority, power, control, and resources from Māori, into British hands.

Te Tiriti o Waitangi is central in the struggle for contemporary Māori to revitalise te reo Māori me ngā tikanga. The signing of the document particularly in terms of Crown assurance implied Māori would have all they valued protected, including te reo Māori. Irrespective of this, the Crown imposed educational policies and practises of assimilation which saw te reo Māori banished from the everyday lives of Māori children (Jenkins & Matthews, 1988). The greater destruction resulted from Crown policies and practises introduced into the state controlled education sector.

Consideration is given to this and the role of the Waitangi Tribunal (1986) who are responsible for investigating the detrimental effects colonisation had upon Māori. Of significance to this research is the Tribunal ruling that te reo Māori was protected under the terms of Te Tiriti o Waitangi, therefore, the Crown had a responsibility to be proactive in ensuring the language was protected and sustained (May, 1999).

The resounding impact of colonisation upon contemporary Māori within both education and wider society is discussed. It is fair to say that Crown recognition of the

inequalities imposed upon Māori within education, have led to successful initiatives. These are considered, as well as Crown recommendations and strategies to regenerate te reo Māori me ngā tikanga into the wider education sector. Although the intention of these documents is admirable, it is important to realise that te reo Māori me ngā tikanga continues to be marginalised by the western education sector (Bishop, Berryman, Cavanagh, & Teddy, 2009; Mahuika, 2008).

Finally, the national early childhood education curriculum *Te Whāriki* is considered, beginning with discussion of the draft version, through to the bicultural imperatives teachers are expected to weave through their pedagogy today. One such imperative is their speaking te reo Māori to children. This can also be seen within Crown legislation whereby teacher's practice must reflect the partnership between Māori and the Crown as outlined in Te Tiriti o Waitangi (Education Council New Zealand, n.d; Ministry of Education, 2015a, 2015b, 2015c). The debate surrounding the viability of teachers doing so is central to this research project.

A fundamental aspect of reviving te reo Māori is the need for Māori and non-Māori to speak the language throughout everyday conversations. In addition to sustaining the indigenous language of Aotearoa New Zealand, it has been determined by the Crown and academics alike that bilingualism has social, cognitive, linguistic, and economic benefits and discussion of these will conclude this chapter.

## 2.2 A Way of Life that Sustained Te Reo Māori Me Ngā Tikanga

Any attempt to build a picture of Māori civilisation prior to colonisation, is based upon Māori sources of information having been passed on through generations (Higgins, 2014). From these, it can be concluded that although the colonisers established a written mode of te reo Māori, it was an oral language and the only means of transferring social, religious, commercial, and political knowledge among Māori people (Jellie,

2001; Pere, 1997; Pihama et al., 2004). Paki (2007) asserts this method of transferring knowledge, was pivotal in sustaining not only their language but also their culture and ways of doing things. In addition to conversing and sharing everyday experiences, skilled orators would practice rote learning which they then significantly developed so as to reinforce links to both the seen and unseen aspects of te ao Māori (Hemara, 2000).

Teaching Māori children derived from traditional Māori contexts of whakapapa, waiata, whakatauākī, kōrero tawhito, and whaikōrero and each centrally located te reo Māori. The contexts worked congruently to engage and support the teaching and learning that was taking place (Barlow, 1991; Hemara, 2000). Te reo Māori then reinforced the relationships between the child, their ancestors, and the land (Durie, 1997). Children were then empowered to take responsibility for their actions and interactions with others as well as their environment (Durie, 1997; Hemara; 2000; Royal-Tangaere, 1997).

Such practises saw te reo Māori colloquially termed as storytelling being that the language was comprised of folk tales and myths, rich in poetry and imagery that was said to lodge in those receiving the knowledge (Kawharu, 2014). Te reo Māori invoked the belief that “traditional Māori learning rested on the principle that every person is a learner from the time they are born (if not before) to the time they die” (Pere, 1994, p. 54). No one individual person was seen to own knowledge, rather it belonged to the entire whānau and iwi (Metge, 1995). For this reason te reo Māori and the roles played by one’s memory were considered central by many Māori believing “kōrero is the food of chiefs” (Gadd, 1976, p. 8).

Historically, knowledge sharing was obligatory as it benefited all in Māori society. For this reason the process was inclusive, co-operative and reciprocal. With this in mind, Māori children engaged in the traditional practice of ako which is located alongside other Maori cultural concepts (Pihama, et al., 2004). In this way, Ako encompasses a

teaching and learning relationship where the teacher learns from the student and the student learns from the teacher. This is in stark contrast to Eurocentric education which positions the teacher higher than the level of the student who learns (Hemara, 2000).

Lee and Lee (2007) point out that prior to colonisation, Māori children were educated in their homes and wider village communities rather than formal school settings. Ka'ai et al., (2004) and Pere (1997) explain the historical education of Māori children was entrenched within whanaungatanga. Māori wānanga were overseen by tohunga with children from high ranking whānau invited to attend (Jahnke & Taiapa, 2003). Other children were taught through whānau who were recognised far beyond a contemporary viewpoint of just parents and siblings. Irrespective of which setting children were taught in, the environments were both inclusive and reciprocal. For Māori, whānau encompassed grandparents, uncles and aunts, cousins, and siblings, all of whom were committed in raising the children with each assuming different roles (Ka'ai et al., 2004; Metge, 1995; Morehu, 2005; Pere, 1994; Walker, 1990). Children were taught practical experiences through stories, games, waiata, karakia, and whakapapa. Such methods:

Provided the child with explanations as to their place in the scheme of things, their positioning in society, descriptions of places, events and people of historical significance, aspects of tribal lore necessary for the child to be knowledgeable of and the day to day expectations of them within the whānau. (Pihama et al., 2004, p. 15)

Te reo Māori, Māori cultural traditions, and acceptable behaviours were taught by parents and grandparents (Kawharu, 2014; Lee & Lee, 2007). Grandparents were responsible for the daily care of their grandchildren and it was through these caring and nurturing relationships that learning and teaching transpired (Nepe, 1991). Physical skills such as fishing, hunting, and cooking were taught by the wider community. This holistic teaching ensured both Māori language and culture remained intact (Lee & Lee, 2007; Pihama et al., 2004). These traditional methods of educating Māori children

nurtured their well-being and prosperity while passing on cultural knowledge which was vital in their assuming an active role within Māori society (Pihama et al., 2004).

To discuss all the implications responsible for displacing te reo Māori and Māori preferred practises would far exceed the remit of this thesis given that the research focuses on early childhood teachers speaking te reo Māori to children. What is central to this thesis is discussion surrounding the signing of Te Tiriti o Waitangi between Māori and the British Crown in 1840.

### 2.3 Māori and British Sign Te Tiriti o Waitangi

Te Tiriti o Waitangi is generally regarded as the founding document of Aotearoa New Zealand (Barrett & Connolly-Stone, 1998) and was initially signed in the Bay of Islands on February 6, 1840, in response to France threatening to claim Aotearoa New Zealand as theirs (Harmsworth, 2005; King, 2007; Rice, 1992). Despite an overwhelming inability to understand what advantage there might be for their people, Crown representatives directed Hone Heke, and 42 other chiefs to sign Te Tiriti o Waitangi amidst a lack of preparation and chaos (King, 2007; Orange, 2004). The document was then taken around the country eventually securing the signatures of another 500 chiefs (Harmsworth, 2005; Smith, 2005). Regardless of 39 chiefs refusing to sign the document, the Colonial Office in England later declared Te Tiriti o Waitangi applied to *all* Māori tribes and thus, British sovereignty was proclaimed over the entire country on 21 May, 1840 (Orange, 2004).

The prominence of Te Tiriti o Waitangi today has resulted from a convergence of factors such as Māori protests, Crown settlements for grievances, iwi development and the Waitangi Tribunal. Each factor has impacted on the variable meanings people hold regarding the document, however; the value, meaning, and relevance of the document



remains highly contested between Māori and Pākehā today (Oh, 2005; Smith, 2005).

The following discussion describes the foundation for such ongoing disputes.

The loss of Māori control over land, possessions and treasures, to the British Crown, stemmed from the document being translated from English text to Māori text. The latter document was signed by Māori and in comparing the two, evidence suggests the loose translation was done so Māori would consider it acceptable (Rice, 1992). Walker (1990) implies there is doubt as to whether Māori were aware that they were signing away their mana.

It is important to realise the Māori version of Te Tiriti o Waitangi guaranteed Māori the right of sovereignty, and full British citizenship. In return for this, Māori were guaranteed full rights of ownership of their lands, forests, fisheries and other possessions; and the same rights and privileges of British subjects (Bishop & Glynn, 1999; Orange, 2004; O'Sullivan, 2007). In stark contrast however, the English version stated Māori agreed to surrender the sovereignty of Aotearoa New Zealand, to the British Crown.

When considering Te Tiriti o Waitangi there is considerable debate between Māori and Pākehā as to whether Māori did indeed; concede sovereignty to the British Crown, in return for retaining limited property rights (Waitangi Tribunal, 1986). According to Ka'ai-Mahuta (2011) Māori have always considered Te Tiriti o Waitangi a national dual planning system, whereby both Māori and Pākehā values are recognised within every aspect of policy making in Aotearoa New Zealand. It was argued by Jackson (1988) that "to many Māori people, the terms of the Treaty provided the ultimate protection for their way of life, their institutions, and their culture: they were mechanisms to protect their taonga" (p. 48). The word taonga is applied by Māori to anything they consider to hold significant value. A primary example of this is their language, te reo Māori which

is not only central to Māori culture and mana, it is described as “the very soul of the Māori people” (Waitangi Tribunal, 1986, p. 34).

In spite of this, the British Crown failed almost immediately to honour the terms of Te Tiriti o Waitangi, with Māori resources seized and Crown control secured over Māori taonga. In contrast to the Māori experience, the colonisers benefited under the new British legislation and they remained unwilling to recognise the impact on Māori throughout all aspects of their lives and culture (Temm, 1990; Walker, 1990). The processes of assimilating Māori prevailed and traditional Māori practises responsible for sustaining te reo Māori and Māori ways of life were broken down (Sheriff, 2010). Further to this, Crown legislation would lead to the demise of traditional learning environments for Māori children (Durie, 1998; Matahaere-Atariki, 2000; Smith, 1997; Walker, 1990). A discussion follows regarding the deliberate eradication of te reo Māori through a Crown controlled education sector.

## 2.4 The Decline of Te Reo Māori through Schooling for Assimilation

Immediately following colonisation, te reo Māori remained the principal language of Aotearoa New Zealand. This was due to Pākehā dependency upon Māori for trade and employment within social, commercial, political, and educational arenas (Mallinson, Childs & Van Herk, 2013). There was, however, no denying Crown intent to realise a society that had only one language and one culture namely, their own (Jenkins & Matthews, 1988; Orange, 2004). To achieve this, assimilation policies of “monolingualism and monoculturalism” were inflicted upon Māori by the Crown and these were evident up until 1960 (Walker, 1989, as cited in Thomas & Nikora, p.3, 1992). Such policies were described as:

The ‘permanent welfare’ of the Māori included the abandonment by them as soon as possible of their own customs in favour of English law, and the adoption by them of such European skills as would command the respect and outweigh

the prejudices of the incoming settlers. The saving of the Māori race involved the extinction of Māori culture. (Ward, 1995, p. 38)

Māori practises of educating children were presumed by the British to be substandard comprising of mediocre content such as arts and crafts and certainly not worthy of recognition (Cushner, 2009). The Crown set out to eradicate such practises subsidising missionaries to establish schools to take over the education of Māori children (Weiner, 2000). From the outset Māori language and culture were deemed problematic in teaching Pākehā content, consequently, imposing assimilative practises upon Māori children was crucial if they were to be successful in the future (Sheriff, 2010).

Many Māori recognised the value in their children learning western theories and English, as they desired their children to be successful in the Pākehā world (Barrington, 2008). Hook (2010) goes on to say that while many Māori considered their adapting to western theories as “the difference between life and death” (p. 4) Māori were at no time prepared to disregard their own language and culture. Eurocentric education officially began in 1816 with the opening of the first missionary school in Rangihoua, with others established nationwide, even in the most remote provinces (Hokowhitu, 2004; Ka'ai et al., 2004; Lee & Lee, 2007; Tooley, 2000).

Missionaries introduced schooling founded upon western theories and by 1827 had established a print form of te reo Māori and also translated the Bible into te reo Māori (Simon & Smith, 2001). This perpetuated missionary control over the knowledge and information Māori could access (Ka'ai et al., 2004; Tooley, 2000). It appeared that missionaries purposefully undermined Māori knowledge and preferred cultural practises; while also disestablishing connections between Māori children and their whānau and iwi (Te Puni Kokiri, 2010).

The primary objective of missionaries was to civilise and convert Māori to Christianity (Pihama, 2001). This was not an arduous task as the New Testament was printed entirely in te reo Māori, thus Māori embraced the opportunity to learn to read and write in their own language (Henare, 1998; Museum of New Zealand Te Papa Tongarewa, n.d.).

In keeping with the missionary objective, lessons were spoken in te reo Māori to ease Māori into English instruction, lesson content was religious based and often founded upon Bible translations (Barrington, 2008). This shift toward Christianity for Māori profoundly increased the number of Māori children being sent to attend their schools. (Henare, 1998). While some Chiefs resisted, others could see the value in their children acquiring the ability to read and write (Simon & Smith, 2001). By 1842, most Māori aged between 10 and 30 could read and write their own language, a higher literacy rate than in the rest of the population (Howe, 2003).

Indeed, missionaries saw children as the medium to passing their knowledge on to older Māori and further ensuring missionary control (Jones, 2015; Simon & Smith, 2001).

With this in mind, Māori children speaking te reo Māori informally was also discouraged, thus increasing the likelihood of faster assimilation. Barrington and Beaglehole (1974) considered Pākehā in the education sector were unrealistic to think “formal schooling could transform the Māori and fit him for a different environment” (p. 4).

For Māori, the British Crown and missionary assimilation of their children was described by Walker (1991) as “cultural surrender, or at the very least, the suppression of Māori identity” (p. 5). The missionary period in Aotearoa New Zealand was “an objective consistent with contemporary British missionary practises in many parts of Africa and the East” (Lee & Lee, 2007, p. 134). Much international research describes

the plight of indigenous children all around the world being transitioned toward schools with religious undertones, while being discouraged from speaking their first language or continuing their native traditions (Fournier & Crey, 1997). The following describes the heartache and struggle that unfolded for Māori throughout the missionary period.

From a Māori perspective, the entire social structure of Māori society was disrupted. Any transition away from the intergenerational unit which focused on the holistic wellbeing of the whānau, especially the care and education of children, would require intensive thought and strategic planning which involved whānau, hapū and iwi to identify alternative support infrastructures. A reluctance to do so would surely jeopardise the wellbeing of Māori children and the intergenerational transmission of Māori knowledge, language and culture. (Morehu, 2005, p. 3)

The Education Ordinance introduced in 1847 directed missionary teachers to replace te reo Māori with English (Hokowhitu, 2004). This resulted in te reo Māori being confined to provincial Māori communities, away from the Pākehā majority (Ministry of Culture & Heritage, 2015). Missionary schools were abandoned from the late 1850s due to Māori wars, however; the Crown merged with missionaries in the 1860s establishing English speaking Native Schools and in doing so, the Crown gained their first opportunity to influence and control the entire national education system (Jenkins & Matthews, 1988). Schooling became compulsory for Māori in 1894 (Calman, 2015). This dominant position enabled the Crown to define what was appropriate in terms of “language, knowledge, customs, relationships and general lifestyle” (Pihama, 2001, p. 206) while systematically eroding Māori culture and replacing te reo Māori with English (Simon & Smith, 2001).

In 1867, the Crown initiated the Native Schools Act and offered support educating Māori by building village schoolhouses. That said, Māori were expected to donate land, fund the building costs and pay teacher salaries (Barrington, 2008; Simon & Smith, 2001). Children, who lived too far away to attend English speaking Native Schools, were not spared from assimilation. Initiated by the Crown in 1867, the Native Schools

Act was established to address the Māori village schools which were deemed obtrusive to the assimilation process, the village schools were placed under government control (Simon & Smith, 2001).

Initially overseen by the Native Department, control of village schools was given to the Department of Education in 1877 (Calman, 2015; Hokowhitu, 2004; Rice, 1992; Simon & Smith, 2001). While the English speaking Native School curriculum had initially allowed te reo Māori, Pākehā teachers would eventually replace this with English and firmly discourage the use of Māori (King, 2007; Rice, 1992; Walker, 1991).

Fundamentally, Crown assimilation eroded Māori language, belief systems, and culture for Māori children, while actively promoting Pākehā belief systems and culture (Simon & Smith, 2001). Hokowhitu, (2004) wrote that the “parliamentary debates on native education put more emphasis on the assimilation of Māori children into European culture and society, than humanitarian duty” (p. 158). Similarly it was later argued:

The Native Schools Code of 1880 accepted an assimilationist language policy, calling for initial use of Māori and rapid transition to English. By 1903, the new Inspector of native schools saw no reason for any delay in using English and imposed a ban on the use of Māori in schools. (Spolsky, 2005, p. 70)

While many Māori predicted the adversity the Pākehā way of life would have on their culture and language, the majority only came to this realisation with the onset of urbanisation in the 1950s (Mead, 1997). Indeed, many Māori recall being disciplined in some way for speaking te reo Māori during the 1930s and 1940s (King, 2007). Children caught speaking te reo Māori in school were punished and despite this cruelty not being official state legislation, it continued to be practised throughout the 1950s and 1960s (Jenkins & Matthews, 1988; Ministry of Culture & Heritage, 2015; Spolsky, 2003).

The shift from rural to urban life saw the essence of Māori cultural structures break down. As a result, many third and fourth generation urbanised Māori are far removed from their ancestral links; they were incapable of acknowledging their language and

culture and were left with no one able to teach them (Bishop & Glynn, 1999; Te Puni Kokiri, 1998a). The impact of external factors upon te reo Māori was described:

When a community of minority language speakers is embedded within a larger community using another language; if both languages can serve the same functions and domains, then the minority speakers are often drawn to the majority language because it offers greater access to material rewards, employment, economic opportunities, and status perhaps. Over time as the majority language becomes more dominant, minorities are required to learn and use the majority language. Over time the young have no incentive or opportunity to learn the language, consequently within three or four generations there may be no native speakers, and even the native speakers can only speak in a restricted set of registers. (Kaplan & Baldauf, 1997, p. 62)

In 1956 the National Advisory Committee on Māori Education documented Māori and Pākehā needs were comparable (Hook, 2010). Concurrently, the 1960's saw assimilation policies interchanged with the Crown's newly introduced policy of integration which was intended to draw Māori and Pākehā together and lessen cultural differences (Thomas & Nikora, 1992). Booth and Hunn (1962) were quick to point out however; the responsibility of change was on Māori rather than Pākehā. In due time, assimilation and integration policies were defied by Māori who began challenging their inferior position within society in favour of one that recognised Māori language and culture (Walker, 1990). Many initiatives intent on revitalising te reo Māori have since occurred. Of significance was the Māori language petition of 1972 which saw 30,000 signatures presented to Parliament (Te Rito, 2008) and resulted in the Crown introducing voluntary te reo Māori classes into primary and secondary schools (Metge, 1980). The role of the Waitangi Tribunal has also been pivotal in revitalising te reo Māori and this is discussed in the next section.

## 2.5 The Waitangi Tribunal and Te Reo Māori

The Waitangi Tribunal was established by the Crown in 1975 to investigate and make recommendations on claims brought by Māori regarding breaches made by the Crown in relation to Te Tiriti o Waitangi (Sharp, 2004). In terms of this research, the

association between Te Tiriti o Waitangi and te reo Māori was recognised in 1985 after a landmark case was presented to the Tribunal by Dr Huirangi Waikerepuru (May, 1999). Waikerepuru (May, 1999) argued Te Tiriti o Waitangi principles and broad objectives were unattainable if the language of one Tiriti partner was unrecognised. The significance of te reo Māori for Māori had been stated previously by Sir James Henare:

The language is the core of our Māori culture and mana. Ko te reo te mauri o te mana Māori. (The language is the life force of the mana Māori). If the language dies, as some predict, what do we have left to us? Then, I ask our own people, who are we? 'Language according to Oliver Wendell Holmes 'is a solemn thing, it grows out of life, out of its agonies and its ecstasies, its wants and its weariness. Every language is a temple in which the soul of those who speak it is enshrined'. Therefore the taonga, our Māori language, as far as our people are concerned, is the very soul of the Māori people. What does it profit a man to gain the whole world but suffer the loss of its own soul? What profit to the Māori if we lose our language and lose our soul? (Henare, as cited by the Waitangi Tribunal, 1986, p. 34)

With this in mind, Waikerepuru (May, 1999) emphasised Crown obligations to honour Māori as tangata whenua as shown in Te Tiriti o Waitangi (Ritchie & Rau, 2006; Waitangi Tribunal, 1986). According to Waikerepuru (May, 1999) failure to recognise te reo Māori, directly equated to the Crown failing to recognise Māori as their affirmed partner within Te Tiriti o Waitangi and the indigenous people of Aotearoa New Zealand. Attention was then drawn to Article 2 of the Māori version of Te Tiriti o Waitangi which guaranteed Crown protection of “O rātou taonga katoa” covers both tangible and intangible things and can best be translated by the expression “all their valued customs and possessions” (Waitangi Tribunal, 1986, p. 42). The Tribunal concluded te reo Māori was a taonga; a significant part of Māori culture. It followed then that according to Te Tiriti o Waitangi, te reo Māori must be protected and sustained by the Crown (Barrett & Connolly-Stone, 1998; Bishop & Glynn, 1999; King, 2007; May, 1999; Te Puni Kokiri, 2003).



The Tribunal report also stated that for the survival of te reo Māori, the effort of Māori alone would not suffice. Their recommendation was for a newly formed administration to supervise and foster the use of te reo Māori and its preservation (Waitangi Tribunal, 1986). Eventually, te reo Māori was confirmed as an official language of Aotearoa New Zealand on August 1<sup>st</sup> 1987 (New Zealand Government, 2014).

While the Tribunal ruling was a major milestone and turning point in the history of Māori language revitalisation, social and educational frameworks within Aotearoa New Zealand continue to be dominated by western teaching and learning theories (Tooley, 2000). Despite Crown attempts to close the void between Māori and Pākehā many still consider that while there is an issue to debate, it remains idealistic. The Waitangi Tribunal (1986) suggested that many Pākehā and people of other ethnicities born raised in Aotearoa New Zealand, do not consider the plight of Māori important. Furthermore, the Tribunal proposed it is some immigrants “have persisted in an attitude of superiority” (p. 14), which may be because they have little connection to Māori and Aotearoa New Zealand.

Clearly, the Crown recognises the importance of te reo Māori within the education sector. Irrespective of this, however, the implications for Māori learners remain far reaching within both education and wider society which will now be discussed.

## 2.6 A Foundation Lost and Navigating a Path Forward

The academic journey of Māori following colonisation has been described by many, as disastrous (Cram, Philips, Sauni, & Tuagalu, 2014; Hunn, 1961; Sheriff, 2010). The Waitangi Tribunal Report stated

The promises of the Treaty of Waitangi of equality in education as in all other human rights are undeniable. Judged by the system’s own standards Māori children are not being successfully taught, and for that reason alone, quite apart

from a duty to protect the Māori language, the education system is being operated in breach of the treaty. (Waitangi Tribunal, 1986, p. 58)

Ka'ai-Mahuta (2011) termed the Eurocentric education as “cultural invasion, cultural subordination, language domination, hegemony, curriculum, class structures, racism, meritocracy, intelligence testing, and negative teacher expectations” (p. 196). Such was the power imbalance, that Māori were considered responsible for their poor academic outcomes as they failed to take advantage of what the education system offered them (Sheriff, 2010). Such bias was founded upon the assumption that Māori experienced equitable education, when in fact; Māori had been expected to forfeit their language, culture and aspirations to the Pākehā majority (Ka'ai-Mahuta, 2011).

Much literature nominated, described, and critiqued throughout chapters one and two of this research has drawn attention to the fact that Crown policies have relegated Māori to the status of servants in their own educational journey whilst simultaneously marginalising their language, knowledge and cultural practises (Irwin, 1991; McIntosh & Mulholland; 2011; Simon & Smith, 2001). The educational and socio-economic gaps between Māori and Pākehā were first officially identified in the 1961 Hunn Report. Current research by Marriot and Sim (2014) determined widespread inequality of Māori still exists today, across a number of forums incorporating “health; knowledge and skills; employment; standards of living; cultural identity; and social connectedness” (p. 1). They stated:

This research indicates that while New Zealand has had some successes in reducing inequalities, the gaps in inequality among the majority of the indicators investigated in this study show worsening outcomes for Māori and Pacific people. This growing gap in inequality between Māori and Pacific people, and the European population, warrants greater government attention if the gaps are not to continue increasing into the future. (Marriot & Sim, 2014, p. 27)

Piggot-Irvine, Aitken, Ritchie, Ferguson and McGrath (2009) concluded that western teaching and learning theories disregarded te reo Māori and Māori preferred learning

practises such as ako, thus Māori learners were isolated within competitive, independent learning environments that solely benefitted Pākehā children. A report released by the Ministry of Education (2010c) concluded that Māori achieved far less within all measurable dimensions of education in comparison with the rest of society. Tahau-Hodges (2010) and Te Puni Kokiri (2012) suggested that inequitable learning during the mandatory education period of 6 to 16 years of age, directly impacted on the willingness of Māori to transition into higher education and eventually the labour market (Earle, 2009).

At this time, the only educational policy deemed effective by Māori for promoting and sustaining te reo Māori me ngā tikanga has been the Māori initiatives of Te Kōhanga Reo and Kura Kaupapa (Pihama et al., 2004; Te Puni Kokiri, 1998b; Tooley, 2000). Of significance to this, however, are statistics which show that in 2014 only 10% of the total preschool population attended Te Kōhanga Reo (Ministry of Education, 2014a) and only 2.3% of the total schooling population attended Kura Kaupapa (Ministry of Education, 2015b). Having little connection with their Māori heritage, the majority of Māori learners attend mainstream education which Bishop et al.(2009) point out has“kept Māori in a subordinate position, while at the same time creating a discourse that pathologized and marginalized Māori peoples' lived experiences” (p. 8).

Currently, efforts toward bicultural development are being made by the Ministry of Education, especially if we consider Crown initiatives such as *Ka Hikitia -Accelerating Success 2013-2017* (Ministry of Education, 2013) and *Tau Mai Te Reo -The Māori Language in Education Strategy 2013-2017* (Ministry of Education, 2015a). These documents aim to assist revitalisation of te reo Māori across the entire education sector. While this is a major step forward, literature suggests there is still much to be done to completely eliminate Eurocentric education and have te reo Māori as a living language (Rau & Ritchie, 2005; Ritchie, 2008; Williams, Broadley & Lawson Te-Aho, 2012).

Research of Te Kōhanga Reo concluded their philosophy of prioritising te reo Māori me ngā tikanga directly led to Māori children acknowledging their cultural identity and a sense of belonging (Cooper, Arago-Kemp, Wylie & Hogen, 2004; Mitchell & Cubey, 2003; Reedy, 1994). Māori children who develop a sense of belonging to their educational setting will actively engage in their learning. They are then far more likely to accumulate confidence and knowledge to move through to the next education sector (Bishop & Glynn, 2000; Durie, 2003; Phillips & Mitchell, 2010; Tahau-Hodges, 2010).

In contrast, children who lacked physical and emotional well-being and a sense of belonging to their early learning became increasingly disconnected with the school environment (Ministry of Education, 2010b). This is significant as negative experiences gained throughout a child's early years, will likely influence their approach to subsequent schooling. Under these circumstances Māori adolescents have low levels of achievement and likely drop out of school early with no intention or aptitude to move into tertiary education (Bishop et al., 2009). In order to understand the Māori learner's apparent apathy toward education it is useful to consider Metge (1984) who articulated "both mana and self-image are connected with action and success. The loss of mana involves more than mere reduction of self-esteem, it means loss of power and capacity for achievement" (p.76). It is important to realise that education is considered key to employment (Stiglitz, 2013) so Māori students dropping out of school early with no formal qualifications, are jeopardising their future success.

There are implications within wider society. The most compelling evidence for this is statistics which confirmed that in 2012, 51 % of prison inmates were Māori; most had numerous high school absences and left school before the legal age (Statistics New Zealand, 2012). The unemployment rate for Māori that same year was 14.2 %, twice as high as the national rate (Marriott & Sim, 2014). Adversely, Māori children when compared to non-Māori children were far more likely to live in beneficiary households

(Perry, 2009) with poorer educational outcomes and greater criminal rates later in life (Salmond, 2003). Lower incomes resulted in many Māori living in housing, which was substandard as well as overcrowded. They were unable to nourish themselves and their children appropriately (Walker, 1996). All of these factors have been attributed to Māori having on-going severe health problems (Ridge & Wright, 2008).

In contrast, possibility for Māori health and well-being is illustrated by Mason Durie in his Te Whare Tapa Whā model (Ministry of Health, 2015) which is based upon the concept of a wharenui (meeting house). With a strong foundation and four equal sides, each side represents a dimension of Māori health as follows:

- Taha wairua (spiritual health), the capacity for faith and wider communication
- Taha hinengaro (mental health), the capacity to communicate, think and to feel
- Taha tinana (physical health), aligns with one's mind, spirit and family.
- Taha whānau (family health), the links to our ancestors, our ties with the past. (Ministry of Health, 2015)

In this model if one health dimension is damaged or missing, the person will suffer ill health. I support this argument in that each health dimension centralises around te reo Māori, therefore, the decline of indigenous language, will indeed impact upon the holistic health of Māori.

The deficit theories concerning Māori being solely responsible for their poor positioning within society have been entrenched in the everyday language of many New Zealanders (Bishop, 1999; Mahuika, 2008; Smith, 1997;). Such marginalisation within social mainstream has left Māori unable to challenge the findings of published research (McIntosh & Mulholland 2011) “let alone the esoteric findings of academic elites” (Walker, 1990, p. 231). Irrespective of this and the Waitangi Tribunal ruling (Bishop & Glynn, 1999; King, 2007; Te Puni Kokiri, 2003) that the Crown must protect and sustain te reo Māori me ngā tikanga, mainstream society prohibiting this from taking

place has been tolerated (Bishop & Glynn, 2000; Carroll, Casswell, Huakau, Howden-Chapman & Perry, 2011; May, 1999; Royal, 2007). Deprived of their language and culture, Māori continued to experience loss of confidence and cultural identity (Hook, 2007).

A report concerning the welfare of Māori in society concluded that when compared to other ethnicities, Māori children were far more likely to experience generations of family violence (Hook, 2007; Whānau Ora Taskforce, 2010). Te Puni Kokiri (2010) were quick to argue that violence is not indicative of Māori culture rather the majority of Māori children and adolescents are loved and nurtured (Rose, 2012). Research suggests the high levels of violence and crime among Māori are attributed to the disestablishment of traditional Māori structures which were founded upon their language of te reo Māori (Kruger, et al., 2004). Such poor outcomes will likely continue the societal stigma of Māori until society acknowledges the significance of valuing their cultural identity, which encompasses te reo Māori me ngā tikanga (Berryman, 2008; Mahuika, 2008; Te Awēkotuku, 1991). Fishman (2001) emphasised that without the recognition of an indigenous language throughout wider society, it is unlikely that language can be preserved. At the present time Crown initiatives and legislation are explicitly addressing the need for all those who work within the education sector to sustain te reo Māori and acknowledge tikanga Māori (Ministry of Research, Science & Technology, 2007). Such regulations are found within all facets of society particularly the education sector with the development of the first bicultural early childhood curriculum *Te Whāriki*.

## 2.7 *Te Whāriki*: An Intended Journey Toward Biculturalism

The Ministry of Education (2015d) define early childhood and care centres in Aotearoa New Zealand as settings “used regularly for the education or care of 3 or more children”

(para. 1). The government appeared to show little interest in what was being taught and the sector was solely dominated by western teaching and learning theories (Codd, 2005; May, 2002). Due to individual centre and teacher philosophies, the range of learning styles and structures within the early childhood sector in Aotearoa New Zealand prior to 1990, met the needs of growing community diversity (Codd, 2005).

One suggestion leading toward the eventual development of a curriculum framework was in response to international education reforms and increased awareness regarding the importance of a child's early learning (Alvestad et al., 2009; May & Mitchell, 2009). This increasing global awareness was deemed critical to begin closing the achievement gap between children living in lower and higher socio-economic districts (Bellm, Gomby, Kipnis, Sakai, & Whitebook, 2009).

The rationale in developing a curriculum that affirmed Te Tiriti o Waitangi and the partnership between Māori and the Crown was one response to the language decline of Māori following colonisation (Ritchie, 2005; 2008). Irrespective of the setting in which children are enrolled, their learning context was positioned within the bicultural vision created by the early childhood curriculum *Te Whāriki* (Alvestad et al., 2009).

Overseen by the Ministry of Education, Margaret Carr and Helen May in collaboration with Tilly Reedy from Te Kōhanga Reo and her husband Tamati Reedy, the draft version of *Te Whāriki* was created (Oh, 2005; Nuttall, 2003). The last two were also responsible for writing sections of the final document in te reo Māori (Jenkin, 2010). Deriving from "Māori pedagogical and philosophical beliefs" (Te One, 2003, p.11). the draft version of *Te Whāriki* was seen by Māori as an opportunity to address western teaching and learning theories that have continuously disadvantaged Māori.

Although this may be true, the Ministry of Education deemed it necessary to alter the draft version and align it with the New Zealand Curriculum Framework; thus heavily

compromising the original bicultural vision of the document (Alvestad et al., 2009; Nuttall, 2003). Irrespective of this however, the final version of *Te Whāriki* was still committed to providing the early childhood sector with a vision that recognised “New Zealand is the home of Māori language and culture” (Ministry of Education, 1996, p. 42).

To be clear, the bicultural vision reflects the partnership between Māori and the Crown as shown in Te Tiriti o Waitangi (Warren, 2014), the Graduating Teaching Standards (Ministry of Education, 2015d), and Registered Teaching Standards (Education Council New Zealand, n.d, para 5). This partnership asserts equal validation of Māori and Pākehā language, culture and identity.

*Te Whāriki* was officially introduced by the Ministry of Education in 1996 (Jenkin, 2010; May, 2002, 2010; Nuttall, 2003; Oh, 2005; Reedy, 1993). The curriculum was not only the first national early childhood curriculum; it was also the first bilingual national curriculum that recognised bicultural development (Alvestad et al., 2009; Ritchie, 2002, 2003a; Ritchie & Rau, 2011). The term bicultural development defined teachers in an educational setting that were actively working toward attaining an equitable bicultural society (Ritchie, 2003b).

Intended for application within both English speaking and Māori immersion centres, *Te Whāriki* states that teachers are required to be familiar with current theories of tangata whenua (Bishop & Glynn, 2000) and acknowledge their professional responsibility to strengthen the bicultural aspirations of Māori (Carr & May, 1993; Ritchie, 2002). The principles, strands, and goals of the document are interwoven to represent a holistic approach to learning and teaching which is, preferred by Māori (Nuttall & Edwards, 2007).



The bicultural imperatives of *Te Whāriki* collectively acknowledge and promote te reo Māori me ngā tikanga and a working partnership with whanau Māori (Jenkin, 2012). There is no prescribed content nor are there directives informing teachers about what and how to teach, rather teachers weave their own interpretation of the content (Clark, 2005; Smith, 2013). In fact, Jenkin (2010) and Clark (2005) propose this non-prescriptive approach should be considered a philosophy rather than a curriculum. The rationale was that this non-prescriptive approach would enable the different early childhood care and education settings to be maintained within one national curriculum. Equally important the curriculum content could be modified to suit their children, whānau, and community (Alvestad et al., 2009; Jenkin, 2010).

While there is widespread agreement that *Te Whāriki* reflects diversity, concerns have been raised regarding the viability of teachers meeting the document requirements as they are not prescribed (Sleeter, 1996). It was for this reason *Te Whāriki* was criticised by Cullen (1996) who said the gap between the documents ideals and teacher practice was insurmountable without clear guidance and support (Clark, 2005). In fact, Cullen (1996) said without this *Te Whāriki* would likely hinder teachers rather than guide them.

There was also controversy surrounding the assumption teachers have the knowledge, fortitude and ability to implement the bicultural vision accurately (Clark, 2005; Ellis, 2008; May, 2001; Nuttall & Edwards, 2007). Chan (2011) adds that while *Te Whāriki* espouses to be bicultural and culturally diverse in nature, the curriculum continued to reflect the social norms of Pākehā and this can potentially exclude Māori and immigrant families.

It would seem such controversy remains, with the findings in this thesis establishing similar concerns. While the bicultural vision of *Te Whāriki* is considered a starting

point for all early childhood teachers to begin speaking te reo Maori to children, the benefits of learning the language for all New Zealanders will now be discussed.

## 2.8 The Benefits of Learning Te Reo Māori for all New Zealanders

For past generations of Māori, te reo Māori was considered more than just a means of communicating thoughts and knowledge (Timutimu, 1995). The language was inherent and considered the only way forward for their people with Pere (1997) saying:

Language is the life line and sustenance of a culture. It provides the tentacles that can enable a child to link up with everything in his or her world. It is one of the most important forms of empowerment that a child can have. Language is not only a form of communication but it helps transmit the values and beliefs of a people. (Pere, 1997, p. 9)

The majority of Māori today are unable to appreciate the significance of te reo Māori nor communicate their beliefs, thoughts and emotions in their native language (Ratima & May, 2011; Waitangi Tribunal, 1986). Those who can speak the language today are less than 5% of the total population of Aotearoa New Zealand (Statistics New Zealand, 2013) and almost exclusively Māori (Te Puni Kokiri, 2008). In recognition of this the government aims for the majority of Māori to have an ability to speak te reo Māori by 2028 (Ministry of Education, 2009). There are many forums available for all New Zealanders to learn to speak te reo Māori including community classes through to tertiary institutions and most have zero-fees. With this in mind, research has established numerous advantages of being bilingual and these far exceed just the ability to converse with others in a second language. An earlier study by Genesee and Cloud (1998) determined bilingual speakers can advance over monolingual speakers particularly, within economic, educational, and sociocultural arenas. In fact, the cognitive advantages of learning a second language as a child are vast with research also confirming adults can master a second language later in life and reap the same cognitive benefits (Merritt, 2015).

According to the Ministry of Education (2009) speakers of te reo Māori with other qualifications such as business, marketing, law, and tourism have an increased opportunity to gain employment (Genesee & Cloud, 1998; Kaplan & Baldauf, 1997). To clarify, as an official language of Aotearoa New Zealand, all citizens have the right to speak te reo Māori within all forums including government agencies. As expected, there is a need to employ personnel that are competent in both speaking and understanding the language (Ministry of Education, 2009). In terms of Aotearoa New Zealand's economy, speakers of te reo Māori are said to have an increased awareness of Māori cultural development enabling them to develop their own businesses (Ministry of Education, 2009).

Academically, bilingual students have the added advantage of accessing content from differing cultural forums thus improving their knowledge content to gain academic success (Genesee & Cloud, 1998). Merritt (2015) concurs, explaining bilingual students typically achieve higher exam results in reading, maths, and vocabulary. The Ministry of Education (2002) also states:

Students who develop equivalent skills in more than one language tend to be more creative and better at solving complex problems than those who don't and also to score higher than monolingual students in verbal and non-verbal tests. (Ministry of Education, 2002, p. 10)

Bilingualism can also enhance brain performance as the speaker is challenged to identify, negotiate, converse and problem solve in another language (Merritt, 2015). This ability has bilingual speakers confident with their decision making and highly competent in multitasking (Penn State, 2015). Their ability to engage and express themselves within another cultural forum advances their intercommunication skills (Ministry of Education, 2009). Suffice to say social, economic and political communication is maintained through respect and compassion toward the world view of others. Engaging in conversations where te reo me ngā tikanga is used is also said to

increase the speaker's aptitude to integrate language and cultural understandings into their lives (Matamua, 2006).

Renton and Butcher (2010) draws attention to the fact that children today are "the decision-makers of the future and those decisions will be based on learning, experiences and values gained during their childhoods" (p.161). Increasing respect for children and equality through bilingualism is key if they are to embrace diversity later in life (Gorinski & Fraser, 2006). Genesee and Cloud (1998) agree explaining the sociocultural benefit of bilingualism is the speaker's ability to expand their knowledge of the world and those within it, this leads to increased understanding and appreciation of the diverse world they live in (Ratima & May, 2011). Certainly, speakers of te reo Māori acknowledge tikanga Māori which in turn enables access te ao Māori, a Māori worldview. It is here that speakers learn behaviours valuable to everyday life such as integrity, harmony and balance (Durie, 1997; 2003).

According to Skerrett (2007) language revitalisation requires long term planning and the support of wider society. Surely the individual benefits coupled with their contribution to strengthening Aotearoa New Zealand international identity and unique heritage (Ministry of Education, 2009) warrants both Māori and all other ethnicities learning te reo Māori without delay.

## 2.9 Summary

When contextualising te reo Māori prior to colonisation, the language was fundamental not only to everyday conversation, but to sharing knowledge, stories, and educating Māori children. The legislative policies that followed British colonisation have been responsible for the decline of te reo Māori, especially within the state controlled education sector. The signing of the Māori version of Te Tiriti o Waitangi was ruled by the Waitangi Tribunal as valid cause to issue a mandate to the Crown to protect and

sustain te reo Māori. What followed was decades of negotiation between Māori and the Crown, and had the efforts of Māori abated, Crown commitment towards raising Māori academic achievement and sustaining te reo Māori would have been inconceivable. Nevertheless, despite successful Māori initiatives intent on language regeneration and cultural retention, Māori learners today continue to experience lower academic achievement, higher unemployment, poverty, criminality, and poorer health. The prerequisite is to have te reo Māori me ngā tikanga recognised and the language spoken by Māori and all other ethnicities throughout Aotearoa New Zealand. If Māori language and culture are validated in this way, Māori learners will feel the sense of worth and belonging which is key to their gaining academic success and a positive future. The next chapter will discuss the methodological approach of kaupapa Māori research which was the framework for this investigation with mainstream early childhood teachers application of te reo Māori me ngā tikanga within Aotearoa New Zealand.

### 3 Chapter Three: Research Procedures

He amorangi ki mua, he hāpai o ki muri.

A leader at the front and the workers behind the scenes.

#### 3.1 Overview

Given that the nature of my research centres on te reo Māori by a Māori researcher, an appropriate approach is kaupapa Māori research and accordingly, it is useful to detail what that is and why it will be used, and, as a corollary to that, ethical considerations will also be detailed. This chapter then, discusses the methodological framework of kaupapa Māori research which has underpinned the ideology applied in this research. Bishop (1997) and Smith (1999) tell us that Māori are one of the most researched peoples in the world and most of that research presents Māori from a deficit perspective. Intent on challenging this, kaupapa Māori research is conceived, developed, and carried out by Māori, for Māori and is designed to assist not only Māori, but all people (Cram, 2001; Nepe, 1991).

This chapter will begin by justifying the use of kaupapa Māori research which was pivotal in identifying barriers impeding teachers from speaking te reo Māori to children. Consideration is given to my consulting with Kaumātua throughout the process, which indeed proved instrumental in my overcoming some challenges that arose. In the next section I consider research governed by Eurocentric theories and see that many indigenous communities worldwide have endured the assimilation of their people, language and culture so it is here that kaupapa Māori research will prove most significant. The participant recruitment process and centre access is detailed along with an introduction to the teachers who were participants in this research. The methods of

data collection are discussed as are the changes necessary to accommodate two teacher requests for interviews by email.

In the next section, consideration is given to the framework of kaupapa Māori research. The following section looks at data management and analysis processes through which interpreting and re-interpreting of the data resulted in identification of six research findings. Finally, researcher accountability for ethical and moral behaviour is highlighted leading to the ethical considerations of kaupapa Māori research, followed by a closing summary.

### 3.2 Kaupapa Māori Research

Despite being a relatively new term it is a mistake to suggest that kaupapa Māori is a new phenomenon or, western teaching and learning theories masked in Māori concepts (Mahuika, 2008). Rather kaupapa Māori theory is defined by Nepe (1991) as a “conceptualisation of Māori knowledge” (p.15) that is “driven by whānau, hapū, iwi, Māori understandings” (Pihama, 2001, p. 104). Kaupapa Māori theory authenticates a Māori world view while ensuring ownership and control of Māori knowledge remains firmly in Māori hands (Pihama et al., 2004). Intent on pursuing the survival and revival of Māori language and culture, kaupapa Māori theory challenges colonial domination, with the aim of egalitarianism (Nepe, 1991; Pihama. 2001; Tooley, 2000; Smith, 1990). This is consistent with Smith (1992) who termed kaupapa Māori “an intervention strategy” through theory that “speaks to the validity and legitimacy of being Māori and acting Māori: to be Māori is taken for granted. Māori language, culture, knowledge and values are accepted in their own right’ (p. 15). Kaupapa Māori counteracts Pākehā assumptions that Māori beliefs, values, and knowledge are inferior to theirs (Bishop et al., 2009; Walker, 1996). With this in mind Smith (1999) writes:

Kaupapa Māori is a 'local' theoretical positioning which is the modality through which the emancipatory goal of critical theory, in a specific historical, political and social context, is practised. This 'localising' of the aims of critical theory is partly an enactment of what critical theory actually 'offered' to oppressed, marginalised and silenced groups. (Smith, 1999, p. 186)

Kaupapa Māori approaches have continued to grow throughout the years and are particularly evident amongst Māori researchers within education and health (Nepe, 1991; Mahuika, 2008). As a research methodology, kaupapa Māori guides the researcher to rigorously meet their academic obligations, however:

The ultimate goal of kaupapa Māori research, like much of the scholarship from indigenous and minority peoples, is to challenge and disrupt the commonly accepted forms of research in order to privilege our own unique approaches and perspectives, our own ways of knowing and being. (Mahuika, 2008, p. 4)

In terms of this thesis, the framework of kaupapa Māori research was significant in identifying barriers preventing teachers from speaking te reo Māori to children (Cram, 2001; Rameka, 2012). Another key point raised by Smith (1997) was that kaupapa Māori research was considered the most appropriate way for Māori to answer research questions concerning Māori.

Suffice to say, kaupapa Māori research underpinned the entire research process including data collection from observations, semi-structured interviews and with the thematic coding of the data. The philosophical and theoretical framework of kaupapa Māori research also informed the relationships between the teachers and myself with regard to identifying ways to increase teacher proficiency in, and use of, te reo Māori. Fundamentally, the application of kaupapa Māori research supported me to answer the research questions while simultaneously validating te reo Māori and bringing it to the attention of early childhood education (Paki, 2007). The research questions was:

*What level of te reo Māori are qualified mainstream early childhood teachers speaking with their children?*

*What are the implications of this?*



Historically, kaupapa Māori research was used to define questions asked by Māori and then for devising instruments and frameworks to answer these questions. Knowledge of kaupapa Māori was tapu and only entrusted to those considered capable of protecting and accurately conveying the knowledge to generate positive outcomes for Māori (Mahuika, 2008; Mead, 2003; Smith, 1997).

It would be decades later in the 1970s that Māori began to challenge their status as colonised people having endured the assimilation of their language and cultural values. In doing so, Māori recognised the importance of being centrally located within research about their people. One of the priorities was to prevent further decline of culture, language, and knowledge (Bishop & Glynn, 1992). This resolute approach saw Māori draw upon historical, theoretical foundations to assist in recovering from the detrimental impacts of colonisation (Mahuika, 2008; Smith, 1997, 2003;).

The application of kaupapa Māori research returns the control and power back to Māori (Bishop, 1994; Nepe, 1991; Tooley, 2000). The legal justification of applying a research methodology intent on emancipating Māori is to honour the partnership between Māori and the Crown as shown in Te Tiriti o Waitangi (Banister, et al., 2011). To that end, it was stated:

We have to accept that the Treaty did not submit us to the research methodologies and ethics of somebody else. The Treaty affirmed our right to develop the processes of research which are appropriate for our people, and to do that, the only people we have to seek permission from are our own. (Jackson, 1996, p. 4)

The academic interpretation of kaupapa Māori today is founded upon the framework intending to inform practises and overcome the struggles of Māori. In view of this:

Kaupapa is derived from key words and their conceptual bases. Kau is often used to describe the process of ‘coming into view or appearing for the first time, to disclose’. Taken further, kau may be translated as ‘representing an inarticulate sound’. Papa is used to mean ‘ground, foundation base’. Together

kaupapa encapsulates these concepts, and a basic foundation of it is 'ground rules, customs, the right of way of doing things. (Williams, 1844 cited in Taki, 1996, p. 42)

White (2013) considers research a powerful tool when led appropriately highlighting the need for researchers to focus on the reason they began, as this will support the creation of new knowledge and be a catalyst for change and improvement. In line with this, the core of kaupapa Māori research encompasses power negotiation (Barnes, 2000).

Researchers do not hold a senior position; rather their relationship with participants is reciprocal, with each sharing supporting roles and learning from one another (Rameka, 2012). Power is negotiated and power dynamics can be freely negotiated; resulting in voices and perspectives being heard equally (Cram, 2013; Smith, 2012). The researcher should, however, remain self-aware, thus allowing for power imbalances to be recognised and lessened (Bishop & Glynn, 1992). Such shared platforms enable equal conversations which in turn, support the researcher in interpreting the stories and reflecting meanings behind them back to Māori (Dyck & Kearns, 1995).

Fundamentally, a balance of power between all concerned is paramount and has been summed up in the following:

Researchers have the power to distort, to make invisible, to overlook, to exaggerate, and to draw conclusions based not on factual data, but on assumptions, hidden value judgements and often down right misunderstandings. They have the potential to extend knowledge or perpetuate ignorance. (Smith, 1999, p.176)

It is important to recognise kaupapa Māori research is not a rejection of western knowledge, rather the framework is deemed culturally appropriate for Māori people.

Thus the researcher affirms Māori individuality and progress to determine what has improved, and what still needs improvement (Cram, 2001). The unique, emancipatory framework is what differentiates it from research theories deriving from western

perspectives (Cram, 2009; Pihama, Cram & Walker, 2002; Jackson, 1996; Mahuika, 2008; Nepe, 1991; Pihama et al., 2002)

Notably, it is a mistake to think that kaupapa Māori underpins a western worldview, beneath a Māori disguise (McIntosh & Mulholland, 2011; Walker, Eketone & Gibbs, 2006). Rather, the ethical foundation of kaupapa Māori discards the notion of one culture, being objectified, and described by another (Bishop, 1996).

With this in mind, kaupapa Māori research is not concerned with the tools of analysis but rather researchers listening, then accurately interpreting and comprehending Māori structures, knowledge, people, and procedures (Barnes 2000; Smith, 1999). This is followed by researchers integrating their own knowledge throughout data interpretation while ensuring participant voices remain unchanged. The framework ensures Māori knowledge is distinctly Māori and as such, impacts on the way Māori people deliberate, comprehend, interrelate, and interpret the world around them (Cram, 2003; Nepe, 1991). It is said to create a space within the research to centre the Māori world view (Smith, 1997) while seeking to establish excellence for Māori, as it links to “Māori aspirations, politically, socially, economically and spiritually” (Smith, 1992, p 23).

In contrast to western research, kaupapa Māori research asserts Māori philosophical underpinnings (Reynolds, 2004) and this has been summed up as:

Kaupapa Māori presupposes that: the validity and legitimacy of Māori language and culture is taken for granted, the survival and revival of Māori language and culture is imperative and the struggle for autonomy over our own cultural wellbeing, and over our own lives is vital to Māori survival. (Smith, 1997, p.97)

Within the education arena, kaupapa Māori research represents a core set of outcomes aimed at Māori academic achievement. That is to say, the research is developed in a way that enables participants to understand their own position and, therefore, create the potential for change and ultimately educational achievement (Royal, 2007). The

principles which are the foundation to this research methodology are discussed in the next section (Cram, 2009; Smith, 2012).

### **1. Tino Rangatiratanga: Principle of Self-determination**

Tino Rangatiratanga asserts the goal of kaupapa Māori allowing Māori to control their own culture, aspirations, and destiny (Smith, 1990) while also connecting with “sovereignty, autonomy, self-determination and independence” (Pihama et al., 2002, p. 34). Tino rangatiratanga challenges the internal and external control of power, and traditional research, which predominantly benefited only the researcher and their agenda. Suffice to say, tino rangatiratanga is resolute on benefiting all research participants while promoting and sustaining Māori aspirations (Smith 1997). Within the context of this research, tino rangatiratanga ensured teachers held control over the research time-table which was revised so they could meet both work and personal commitments. This principle was also evident when informing teachers about this research contributing to the successful completion of a qualification and my objective to support early childhood teacher’s proficiency in, and use of, te reo Māori. Tino rangatiratanga also supported me to navigate challenges of this research concerning my own biases and this is discussed later in Chapter five.

### **2. Taonga Tuku Iho: Principle of Cultural Aspirations**

This principle asserts the centrality and legitimacy of te reo Māori me ngā tikanga, and mātauranga Māori (Reynolds, 2004). Within a kaupapa Māori paradigm, Māori ways of knowing, doing and understanding the world are seen as a “taken-for-granted identity [whereby] “to be Māori is both valid and legitimate” (Pihama et al., 2002, p.36). Te reo Māori is considered the medium through which Māori articulate their world views, whakapapa, mana, and knowledge. Within this research, time was given freely to

teachers sharing their experiences and stories. This increased the likelihood of their acknowledging that I genuinely valued all they had to share.

### **3. Ako Māori: Principle of Culturally Preferred Pedagogy**

The reciprocal process of ako encompasses learning, sharing and valuing through one another's contributions (Pere, 1994; Pihama et al., 2002; Tahau-Hodges, 2010). The process is constant and integral to the creation, transmission, conceptualisation, and articulation of Māori knowledge (Lee, 2005). Ako also recognises the importance of remaining connected to whānau throughout the research process (Smith, 2012). Ako was woven throughout the research process as I positioned myself alongside all teachers so that our reciprocal engagements enabled us to learn from each other through dialogue. Emphasis was placed upon establishing rapport with teachers to increase the likelihood of their expressing themselves. Teachers were given time to respond to questions and to take the lead when sharing responses.

### **4. Kia piki ake i ngā raruraru o te kainga: Principle of Socioeconomic Mediation**

This principle asserts the need to introduce mediation practises which assist in the alleviation of negative pressures and disadvantages experienced by Māori communities. For this reason alone, researchers are expected to recognise, and implement Māori ways of doing things (Smith, 2012). Having chosen to implement kaupapa Māori research, my intention was to challenge previous western research by promoting Māori cultural aspirations namely, revitalisation of te reo Māori.

### **5. Whānau: Principle of Extended Family Structure**

At the core of kaupapa Māori research whānau acknowledges the responsibility and obligations of the researcher to nurture the intrinsic connection between the researcher, the researched, and the research. The concepts of whanaungatanga and manaakitanga

are key elements of Māori society and culture, and as such, researchers use respectful social skills to engage with others. Subsequently, learning is enhanced, active, and collaborative (Smith, 2012; Tahau-Hodges, 2010). Within the context of this research, I ensured I introduced myself to all those in the centre irrespective of whether they were directly involved or not in this research project. Careful consideration was given to the diverse and rich knowledge present, with the exchange of views openly debated. Having built relationships founded on trust and respect, questions were answered truthfully and teacher requests were accommodated. Similar to *tino rangatiratanga*, *whanaungatanga*, and *manaakitanga* supported my navigation of challenges concerning my own biases and this too is discussed further in Chapter five.

## **6. Kaupapa: Principle of Collective Philosophy**

The kaupapa refers to the collective vision and commitment of Māori communities. This vision connects Māori aspirations to political, social, economic, and cultural well-being. The research topic or intervention systems, therefore, are considered to be an incremental and vital contribution to the overall kaupapa (Smith, 2012; Tahau-Hodges, 2010). Within this research, the collective vision of bringing *te reo Māori* to the forefront of early childhood education was shared by several teachers and myself. In working to achieve this I followed the guidance of my *Kaumātua* which is now discussed.

### **3.3 Māori Consultation**

Kaupapa Māori research is initiated with *Kaumātua* who are highly respected Māori people well versed in the cultural rituals and traditions within Māori society. They provide valuable knowledge of research methods and treatment of Māori participants throughout the entire research process, ensuring the process has integrity and benefits

the Māori community (Durie, 1998; Pihama et al., 2004; Smith, 2012). This is achieved through Kaumātua defining acceptable and ethical research behaviour in conjunction with other experienced researchers and members of the researcher's ethical committee (Cram, 2013).

I have known my Kaumātua since 2008 and consultation regarding potential research topics began prior to developing the research questions for this project. With this in mind, my Kaumātua was able to consider my prior knowledge and current ability so as to ensure the project being embarked upon was manageable and encompassed realistic expectations (Cram, 2013). Our discussions highlighted the principles of kaupapa Māori research particularly in terms of my responsibility to all those involved in the research and for those the research was about. I recognise Kaumātua guidance is highly significant for Māori undertaking kaupapa Māori research. It is rewarding to acknowledge the contribution of Kaumātua is slowly also being recognised by non-Māori researchers (Smith, 1999).

### 3.4 Western Research

Epistemological research projects have focused upon indigenous communities worldwide for decades, pillaging both their physical and intellectual property (Bishop, et al., 2009). Such research is described by indigenous communities as the assimilation of their people principally because, there is an expectation that indigenous communities must abandon their identity and culture (Koopmans, Statham, Giugni & Passy, 2005; Smith, 1997). This was summed up by Memmi (1965) who wrote that “the memory which is assigned to him is certainly not that of his people. The history which is taught him is not his own ... He and his lands are non-entities ... or referenced to what he is not” (as cited in Mahuika, 2008, p.2).

Eurocentric research was imposed upon Māori shortly after the British arrived with much of it deriving from a deficit rather than beneficial perspective (Mahuika, 2008; Smith, 1999). Carried out by non-Māori, many questioned the accountability of researchers who controlled the initiation, procedures, evaluation, and distribution of the newly defined Māori knowledge (Cram, 2001; Durie, 1998; Smith 1999). The researchers purely advanced their own academic careers and reaped all the benefits (Smith, 2003). They would assume Māori knowledge as their own, often supposing themselves to be experts of all things Māori, yet their perspectives are grounded in ways that are foreign to even Māori understanding (Cram, 2001; Nepe, 1991; Royal; 2007; Smith, 2003). Bristowe (2009) considers western research promotes the dominant discourse thereby minimising Māori knowledge while reinforcing negative stereotypical representations.

The Eurocentric research process is said to consume knowledge while denying the voice of indigenous people (Grieshaber & Cannella, 2001). Such research was described by Berryman (2008), Smith (1999) and Walker (1991) as simplifying Māori knowledge while undermining their life experiences. Māori were powerless to evade such persecution which saw their language and culture overlooked within both society and mainstream institutions (Gibbs, 2001; Walker; 1990). It was determined:

Traditional research has misrepresented, that is, simplified/conglomerated and commodified, Māori knowledge for ‘consumption’ by the colonisers and has consequently denied the authenticity of Māori experiences and voice. Such research has displaced Māori lived experiences with the authoritative’ voice of the ‘expert’ voiced in terms defined and determined by the ‘expert’. Further, many misconstrued Māori cultural practises and meanings are now part of our everyday myths of Aotearoa/New Zealand believed by Māori and non-Māori alike. (Bishop, 1996, p.14)

In addressing decades of deficit western research, contemporary Māori sought research methodologies that respected their culture and knowledge, while legitimately addressing



their concerns. What has now become preferred for Māori is kaupapa Māori research. (Bishop, 1997; Bishop & Glynn, 1999; Durie, 1998, Smith, 1992).

### 3.5 Participant Recruitment and Access

Researchers undertaking qualitative research projects, endeavour to select participants who may provide a greater understanding of their research question (Patton, 2015). It was my intention that participants for this research were to be qualified mainstream early childhood teachers, and as a result, I could investigate the bicultural aspects of their teacher training programmes. They were to be selected irrespective of their level of te reo Māori and ethnicity. I anticipated that this phase of the research process would be stress-free and the recruitment of six to eight teachers was planned. However, this process proved difficult and time-consuming with eleven early childhood centres declining to participate. I found that cold calling centres required a strong disposition to cope with rejection as numerous centre managers implied that I was looking for things to complain about. They also expressed concerns that teaching staff were going to be judged on their ability to meet the bicultural imperatives of *Te Whāriki*. Paradoxically, a key motivator cited by contributing centres was described as the opportunity to support their teachers in speaking te reo Māori. It became necessary to think beyond traditional research procedures and I approached teaching colleagues through social media. This informal communication led to expressions of interest by a number of colleagues who after speaking with their centre managers, invited me to visit and discuss my research.

As a Māori researcher, I considered the principles of kaupapa Māori research to be fundamental and upon my arrival at each centre, began by introducing myself to managers and potential participants while sharing kai. I reiterated my appreciation for the invitation to visit, and time was then spent engaging with one another enabling

connections to be made through whakapapa, this is an inherently Māori process (Marsden 2003). Following on from this, I clarified my research project to each centre manager. Once verbal approval was given, I gave them the Centre Manager Information Sheet (see Appendix B) and asked them to sign the Centre Manager Access Agreement (see Appendix C). I then approached the potential participants and outlined the research project with emphasis placed on acknowledging their right to withdraw until the completion of the data collection. Justification of my research and their role, should they choose to participate, was discussed in full. I invited teachers to disclose any misgivings they may have had at the time, while reiterating my willingness to engage in confidential discussions if desired. Duplicate copies of the Participant Information Sheets (see Appendix D) and the Participant Consent Forms (see Appendix E) were then left with each of those who were to be involved. Confirmation of four participants and their respective managers followed.

To recruit more participants a snow-ball sampling technique was used (Patton, 2015) and this enabled me to get six more participants. The introduction process described above was then used in each subsequent centre. Having gathered consent from all concerned, a time-line to begin my data collection was then confirmed for each centre; first with observations and then with semi-structured interviews. While a total of ten participants initially confirmed their participation in this research project, the ill health of one participant reduced the number to nine just prior to beginning the observation process.

### 3.6 Participant Teachers

The nine participating teachers in this research were located within three mainstream centres in South Auckland. Two centres were kindergartens and one was owned by a private corporation. Specifically, five teachers were located in Mahi Ngātahi Centre,

three in Tātaritanga Centre and one from Puāwaitanga Centre. In this way, the majority of teachers would be able to share experiences and support each other if they so desired. Each centre was licensed to care and educate children aged two to five years old, for a minimum of four hours a day. All centres were immersed within culturally diverse communities and this was evident in the wide range of children's ethnicities. All teachers were required to have a Bachelor of Early Childhood Education degree from tertiary institutions within Aotearoa New Zealand. Teachers were aged between 20 and 46 years old and as is the case across most early childhood centres, all were women. Only one teacher was raised in a home where te reo Māori was spoken, however, she recalled her grandparents advising her to refrain from speaking the language. None of the teachers identified as being fluent in te reo Māori and they represented a range of ethnicities as shown below: In line with teacher requests, all were given pseudonyms as represented in the following table.

Table 3.1. Teacher Ethnicity and Centre (Source: Holder, 2015).

Teacher (Pseudonym)	Ethnicity	Centre (Pseudonym)
Arataki	Māori	Mahi Ngātahi
Awhina	Māori	Mahi Ngātahi
Chantelle	Māori	Mahi Ngātahi
Ngaire	Māori	Mahi Ngātahi
Masina	Samoan	Mahi Ngātahi
Geeta	Fijian Indian/Māori	Puāwaitanga
Bashnee	Fijian Indian	Tātaritanga
Jenny	Pākehā	Tātaritanga
Syria	Fijian Indian	Tātaritanga

### 3.7 Data Collection: Running the Observations

The observations began with my greeting people: management, teachers, and children, and with an offering of kai to share. I placed importance on authentically engaging in conversations when spoken to and on occasion, some observation time frames were exceeded. Where relevant, I discussed this with centre manager/s who agreed this was

not a concern. Beginning the observations had me physically position myself near enough to record the spoken te reo Māori but not inhibit teachers working with children. Notably, all video recordings recognised both English and te reo Māori however, in line with this research, only the te reo Māori component of recordings was transcribed. Observation charts (See Appendix F) were prepared with predetermined te reo Māori words and phrases typically spoken within the early childhood sector (Mihaka, 2008). My role was then to check off words/phrase as they were observed and to hand scribe any additional spoken te reo Māori. The observation charts were inadequate when observing the five teachers located in Mahi Ngātahi Centre as their level of spoken te reo Māori far exceeded the predetermined words on the observation charts. The use of electronic recording devices was required so as to accurately record the level of te reo Māori that was being spoken. Galavotti (2003) points out that researchers who rely on gaze and memory alone, cannot conceivably recall and collate complex details that have occurred. He goes on to say video recording observations enables the researcher time to reflect upon unfamiliar words. Further to this, DeMunck and Sobo (1998) explain that reflecting upon recorded material increases the likelihood of the researcher understanding what has occurred so as to answer their research question. The observation data were translated then transcribed by me and this took place within AUT University. Copies of the transcribed observation data were checked for accuracy and following teacher approval, were collated and analysed. The findings are reported in Chapter four.

### 3.8 Data Collection: Running the Semi-Structured Interviews

Semi-structured interviews were chosen for this research as they are suited to small-scale qualitative studies and are considered a more relaxed forum to gain truthful data (Bryman, 2012). Gomm (2004) explains “The argument is that only by developing

intimate, trusting and empathetic relationships will respondents feel able to disclose the truth” (p.230). He goes on to say a friendlier rapport between researcher and participants will encourage in-depth responses. Upon starting the semi-structured interviews in the third week of data collection, two teachers requested to forgo the interview process due to changes in their work and/or personal commitments. As an alternative, they requested they complete a questionnaire from home. Central to kaupapa Māori research specifically, whanaungatanga and manaakitanga, their requests were accommodated in a respectful manner. In meeting their requests, I recognised this prevented further verbal interactions, so the semi-structured interview questions (See Appendix G) were altered to increase the likelihood of gaining more insight. The interview via email (See Appendix H) was then emailed to the teachers and returned via email five days later. The remaining seven teachers participated in semi-structured interviews guided by the original questions. The interviews were anticipated to be 1.5 hours in length, however, this was at the discretion of the teachers subsequently, six interviews ranged from 1 hour to 2 hours in length. All semi-structured interviews were held after hours in the respective teacher centres. Five semi-structured interviews were electronically recorded and one was hand scribed at the teacher’s request.

My role was to listen, pause, and engage in a level of appropriate prompting, as this created the opportunity for teachers to share their own perspectives, while also increasing the probability of attaining information freely (Charmaz, 2006). Graham (2000) emphasises the need for researchers to be mindful of who is being interviewed, what factors contribute to participant perspectives, and how their perspective contributes to your overall research. Ethical consideration must be given toward the nature of the information shared particularly concerning issues of confidentiality. In line with kaupapa Māori research, it was imperative that control of the process concerning what was shared or not shared, belonged to the teachers. Cram (2003) writes that

participants should have control of what they are prepared to share in response to the questions being asked. The semi-structured interview data for five teachers was transcribed by me at AUT University then electronically returned to teachers for member checking. Two teachers requested to make small changes to elaborate on their comments.

### 3.9 Kai and Koha

Ritchie and Rau (2006) explain an integral aspect of kaupapa Māori is whanaungatanga particularly the sharing of kai. This is highly regarded in research practises that involve Māori as it is considered to move proceedings from the formal to the informal paving the way for relationship building and authentic discussions (Mead, 2003). I provided kai for teachers and management to share each time I visited a centre. Upon the conclusion of the data gathering period, koha relevant to the centre of approximately \$150 was given in thanks for their time and contribution toward this research project. As a Māori researcher, I recognised how fortunate I was to have been permitted to share in teachers professional lives and hear their stories.

### 3.10 Data Management and Analysis

Data collected from four teacher observations were noted on observation charts, with the remaining five teacher observations recorded electronically, then transcribed by me. Recording five teachers electronically was necessitated as the teachers use of te reo Māori far exceeded my ability to handwrite. The data from each teacher were then analysed, and based on the complexity and quantity, categorised into three differing levels of te reo Māori usage. Data collected from six semi-structured interviews were recorded electronically then transcribed and one semi-structured interview was handwritten. Two teachers completed their interview via email. All data was analysed to

describe the phenomenon that had taken place. Qualitative analysis was then comprised through interpreting and re-interpreting the data gathered to identify similarities and differences. Typically, qualitative research does not rely solely upon strict predetermined systems for coding, hence a method for identifying emergent research findings was established (Flicker & Worthington, 2011). All data was managed in hard copy and electronic form using Microsoft word, Endnote and Inspiration version 8. Hard copies of observation charts, semi-structured interview questions, and interviews via email were stored in a locked cabinet at AUT University. Throughout the data analysis six emergent research findings were ascertained and then interpreted taking into account the literature. These are reported and discussed in the following chapter.

### 3.11 Researcher Accountability

Clarity surrounding my accountability as a researcher was attained through the following the principles of kaupapa Māori research. I focused on behaving ethically, and morally responsible throughout the entire research process (Bishop, 1998). I was verbally transparent about the level of teacher involvement and remained accessible to answer any questions that might arise. I sought for this research to promote Māori ways of knowing and being, so the research process followed both tikanga from kaupapa Māori and AUTEK standards.

### 3.12 Ethical Considerations: Tikanga Māori

The ethical considerations referred to as tikanga Māori, encapsulated the methods, techniques, and approaches of this research (Ritchie & Rau, 2008). Underpinned by Te Tiriti o Waitangi, tikanga Māori supports the foundation of kaupapa Māori research and as such, is considered obligatory for Māori and non-Māori. Mead (2003) describes tikanga Māori as “the set of beliefs associated with practices and procedures to be

followed in conducting the affairs of a group or individual” (p. 12). People are acknowledged as coming together and the rituals that underpin their encounter derive from tikanga. In essence, Māori provide a way for people to gather on Māori terms (Smith, 1999). Ritchie and Rau (2008) explain while research contributes to the developmental objectives of society, tikanga Māori has a specific role in guiding key behaviours, processes, and methodologies that are applied. Tikanga Māori is the framework for identifying Māori ethical issues in terms of; rights, roles, and obligations of researchers and Māori communities; the contribution that research makes in providing useful and relevant outcomes; and addressing inequalities (Cunningham, 2000). I offered the teachers the use of pseudonyms and they all choose this, I advised that despite my strict adherence to tikanga Māori I was unable to guarantee total confidentiality when this research is discussed in the public domain (Cardno, 2003).

**Table 3.2. Ethical Considerations of Kaupapa Māori (Source: Adapted from Cram, 2001).**

<b>Tikanga</b>	<b>Tikanga in Practice</b>	<b>Tikanga in my Research</b>
Aroha ki te tangata - A respect for people.	Participants define location and terms. This meets their logistical needs and shows they are validated. Researchers are seen as mediators of both the location and power differentials that exist between themselves and participants.	Semi-structured interview location chosen by teachers to ease accessibility. At two teachers requests, their semi-structured interviews were replaced with interviews via email. In this way, power was negotiated
Kanohi kitea - Present yourself to people face to face.	Participant meetings are underpinned by trust, essential for relationship building and active engagement.	Having confirmed teacher participation, all meetings and semi-structured interviews were held face to face. The exception to this was two interviews completed via email. An openness to answering teacher questions was highlighted throughout the research process as was acknowledging all teachers shared experiences and stories.
Titiro, Whakarongo, Kōrero - Looking, listening, learning, waiting.	Researcher recognises appropriate times to speak thus symbolising respect between themselves and the participants.	Teachers were allowed time to reflect and respond throughout all verbal exchanges and semi-structured interviews. In this way, power was negotiated between all involved.
Manaaki ki te tangata - A collaborative and reciprocal approach.	Researcher acknowledgement that learning and knowledge are reciprocal. Respect is placed on sharing, and being generous with	Having sought guidance from my Kaumātua, the differing world views of teachers were respected. The time frame of



	participant's time and expertise.	semi-structured interviews was extended at teacher discretion as was my time in the centre. This enabled teachers to share additional experiences at their discretion.
Kia tupato - Caution to be aware of ones processes.	Participants are culturally safe with prior collaboration having taken place with elders and others who can guide the research process.	Prior and ongoing consultation with my Kaumātua throughout the entire research process. This ensured I met with tikanga Māori when working with all participants.
Kaua e takahia te mana o te tangata - Draws together significance ideas.	Sharing research findings with participants.	Transcribed research data were approved by teachers. Any amendments were adhered to. Teachers will also have the opportunity to read thesis upon completion.
Kaua e māhaki - Researcher remaining humble	Researcher not flaunting knowledge but using it to benefit the community.	Teachers were informed this research was intended to benefit Māori within the early childhood sector and those of other ethnicities who live in Aotearoa New Zealand. Teachers were also informed that this research enabled me to gain a Masters of Education.

The methods of kaupapa Māori are underpinned by their own tikanga (Tahau-Hodges, 2010; Taki, 1996) which is aimed at ensuring “processes, procedures and consultation need to be correct so that in the end everyone who is connected with the research project is enriched, empowered, enlightened and glad to have been a part of it” (Mead, 2003, p.318).

Of significance to researchers working in Aotearoa New Zealand Hudson, Milne, Reynolds, Russell and Smith, (2010) state that all research should be considered as concerning Māori so recognition of tikanga Māori is imperative.

### 3.13 What I Would do Differently

In research there are always areas that in retrospect, would be done differently. In keeping with kaupapa Māori research specifically tino rangatiratanga, I accommodated the requests of two teachers to forgo semi-structured interviews in exchange for sending

the questions via email. The latter eliminated reciprocal conversations and the information gathered was minimal. In hindsight, I should have maintained the semi-structure interviews and instead, worked with the teachers to determine a more fitting time for the interviews to take place.

There is an expectation from children within early childhood education that adults present will interact with them. This can make collecting data through observations rather challenging. I compounded this by sitting on the floor and predisposing myself to responding to children when they engaged with me. On reflection, I should have chosen a more fitting location and sat on a chair. This would have enabled me to remain less involved.

### 3.14 Summary

This chapter has discussed both the theoretical and practical application of the research methodology of kaupapa Māori research. As a research methodology, it ensured both my role as a researcher and the practises I undertook were ethical and supportive of whānau Māori. In kaupapa Māori research it is appropriate to consult a Kaumātua prior to starting the research and this gave me assurance that I understood what was expected of me both personally and professionally. This guidance would also prove invaluable in supporting me through challenges of working in the area of research about Māori, with some participants whose world view differed from mine. In following kaupapa Māori research, I interpreted the research data to identify six emerging barriers teachers considered impeded their speaking te reo Māori to children, as well as solutions to address these. Indeed, the framework of kaupapa Māori research had done what is claimed, enabled me as the researcher to validate te reo Māori through tikanga Māori, and in doing so answer the research questions. The following chapter will now discuss the research findings identified from the collated data.

## 4 Chapter Four: Emergent Research Findings and Discussion

Mā whero mā pango ka oti ai te mahi.

With red and black the work will be complete.

### 4.1 Overview

In this chapter the findings and the literature are discussed in order to answer the following research questions:

*What level of te reo Māori are qualified mainstream early childhood teachers speaking with their children?*

*What are the implications of this?*

In the previous chapter it was explained that in order to answer the research questions nine teachers were observed working with children within their early childhood centres and I recorded te reo Māori spoken. Each teacher's data were then considered in terms of complexity and quantity of te reo Māori spoken. Using the data from the observations I roughly mapped these into the categories devised by Moorfield (2013). However, data gathered from some teacher observations necessitated the inclusion of a novice level. As Moorfield did not have a very beginning level of fluency, I, added this category and called it novice. The following table (Table 4.1) identifies each teacher, their level of spoken te reo Māori and clarification of the te reo Māori that was spoken (Moorfield, 2013).

**Table 4.1. Qualified Teachers Level of Spoken Te Reo Māori to Children** (Source: Adapted from Moorfield, 2013)

Teacher (Pseudonym)	Centre	Level of Te reo Māori	Identified Te reo Māori
Bashnee	Tātaritanga	Novice	Basic greeting and farewell, Māori song, insertion of te reo Māori word into English sentence for instructing children, karakia, colours.
Jenny	Tātaritanga		
Syria	Tātaritanga		
Geeta	Puāwaitanga		

Awhina Chantelle Masina Ngaire	Mahi Ngātahi Mahi Ngātahi Mahi Ngātahi Mahi Ngātahi	Beginner	All novice level with further sentence structure. Centre objects, Te reo Māori story books, and basic instructions.
No Teachers		Lower Intermediate	All novice and beginner level with extended sentence structure and confident flow in pronunciation.
Arataki	Mahi Ngātahi	Upper Intermediate	All novice, beginner and lower intermediate levels with advanced structure and complexity. Outdoor objects, animals/native birds, sounds, illnesses, feelings, weather, place locations, landscapes, and advanced instructions.
No Teachers		Advanced	This level encompasses each preceding levels. Use sentence structures about actions in the past, present and future. Use appropriate vocabulary.

As can be seen no teachers were considered to be at lower intermediate or advanced levels (Moorfield, 2013). While the novice level represents teachers with the least complexity and quantity of spoken te reo Māori, I propose, that teachers are still engaging in bicultural development. Apart from Bashnee, all the teachers at Tātaritanga Centre raised concerns about their challenges in speaking te reo Māori. They wanted to include te reo Māori and bicultural development in their curriculum but struggled to do so. All teachers at novice level shared an ongoing challenge to competently weave the bicultural imperatives of *Te Whāriki*, throughout their curriculum.

Unlike teachers located at higher levels, the novice teachers confused bicultural with multicultural. Broadly speaking, these teachers also considered their centre leaders had a lacklustre approach toward speaking te reo Māori and engaging in bicultural development.

It is important to recognise that the four teachers located at beginner level and the remaining teacher at upper intermediate level were all located within Mahi Ngātahi Centre. Positioned at upper level was Arataki who was the only teacher that considered her tertiary institution offered conducive learning environments for Māori coupled with a teacher education programme that validated tangata whenua and te reo Māori me ngā tikanga. With this in mind, Arataki had the knowledge and confidence to assume a leadership role whereby she engaged in ako, to support her peers spoken te reo Māori. Collectively, teachers in Mahi Ngātahi Centre embraced a team approach toward protecting and sustaining te reo Māori and they had independently voiced their aspirations to continue improving their proficiency in, and use of te reo Māori.

Teachers also shared their personal and professional perspectives of speaking te reo Māori. All data were then analysed for emergent findings, of which there were six.

1. Despite *all* teachers following the same national curriculum, their interpretation of the bicultural aspect of *Te Whāriki* varied.
2. Teachers agreed the bicultural framework of *Te Whāriki* failed to inform them on how governmental standards and the bicultural imperatives could be met.
3. Teachers placed significant importance on their centre leadership and management in acknowledging and reinforcing a commitment toward speaking te reo Māori and bicultural development.
4. The lack of relevant professional development to learn to speak te reo Māori is associated with teachers lacking the confidence to speak the language.
5. The implications surrounding teachers own upbringing and education impeding their desire and ability to meet the bicultural imperatives of *Te Whāriki*.
6. Lack of bicultural development training throughout their tertiary teacher training programme.

Each of these emergent findings is discussed, with teacher statements shown as evidence and linked to relevant literature.

## 4.2 Bicultural or Multicultural?

Chapter two considered the bicultural imperatives of *Te Whāriki* and a key finding of this research was that there are differences in teacher understanding surrounding the term bicultural. This is in contrast to 2004 research data collected by Jenkin (2009, 2010, 2012) who determined that early childhood teachers had a reasonable understanding of what bicultural meant in terms of *Te Whāriki* and their pedagogy. Offering a suggestion as to why this discrepancy has occurred over recent years is Chan (2011). She explains the shift toward multiculturalism is largely due to global migration which has led to the multicultural society that exists within Aotearoa New Zealand today. Irrespective of this Stuart (2002) draws attention to the fact that politically Aotearoa New Zealand is a bicultural country but descriptively is multicultural. Under Te Tiriti o Waitangi and *Te Whāriki* the obligation is to have a bicultural curriculum.

Statistics New Zealand (2014b) show that 39.1% of the Auckland population were born overseas. As is to be expected, this growth of immigrant families and children has resulted in an increase of spoken languages, cultures, and second language learning (Cochran, 2007). In an effort to create inclusive environments for all ethnicities, however, some teachers are perpetuating the social inequality of Māori and their place as tangata whenua of Aotearoa New Zealand (Waitangi Tribunal, 1986). Consideration must also be given to the fact that in 2014 qualified Asian teaching staff made up 11.5% of all teaching staff in teacher-led services, this is a 6.7% increase from 2004-2013 while Māori teaching staff accounted for 9.0% for the same period (Ministry of Education, 2014a).

To be clear, biculturalism reflects the partnership between Māori and British cultures represented by the Crown. This partnership is contained within Te Tiriti o Waitangi

(Warren, 2014), the *Graduating Teaching Standards* (Ministry of Education, 2015c), and *Registered Teaching Standards* (Education Council New Zealand, n.d, para. 5).

This partnership asserts equal validation of Māori and English language, culture and identity. The term bicultural development can also describe an educational programme where there is scope for bicultural development (Culpitt, 1994). This occurs through an on-going process of change towards an equitable bicultural society for Māori (Ritchie, 2003a). Teachers located in Mahi Ngātahi Centre collectively agreed with Arataki who said:

Te reo Māori underpins our centre and our practises with children. So biculturalism is everything we do acknowledging and respecting our Māori heritage, people and customs, every day. It's building our people up, which makes a change from where they have been. Māori deserve to be seen and heard equally and our children take the language home and teach their whānau ...this doesn't mean we are ignoring our other children. (Arataki)

Arataki presents a strong argument that teachers must speak te reo Māori with their children. It was clear from the data collection that her colleagues shared her commitment to provide an environment rich in te reo Māori and, therefore, conducive to Māori. To achieve this, they sustain a programme that is rich in Māori culture and spoken te reo Māori. In stark contrast to post-colonial transgressions; children in Mahi Ngātahi Centre are encouraged to speak te reo Māori. Generally speaking, all other teachers in this research seemed to confuse bicultural with multicultural, with one participant articulating this clearly:

Our centre prides itself on our bicultural curriculum, all our children and their families' cultures are valued and recognised equally, in doing that we follow *Te Whāriki* and the fact that we must respect and nurture all ethnicities equally. (Bashnee)

I agree *Te Whāriki* endorses a multicultural approach toward children's positive awareness of others by recognising the ethnic and cultural diversity within Aotearoa New Zealand (Banks, 2006). This approach alone, however, disregards teachers'

responsibilities toward Māori. Heta-Lensen (2005) explained it is not uncommon for teachers to prefer multiculturalism as this symbolised respect for all children while biculturalism was considered to be favouring Māori alone. This was articulated by Syria:

We have to treat all children fairly or equally. If we make allowances for one culture, aren't we showing favouritism? It's our job to ensure everyone is welcomed, nurtured and supported equally and that is most important rather than presenting one above others in all activities. (Syria)

The negative connotations surrounding the term bicultural derived from teachers considering it to be a replacement for multicultural rather than the two working collectively. Jenny said:

Offering the children an inclusive environment that is respectful and it empowers them. I think it has to have a holistic approach so all children feel they belong, by offering children and their whānau an environment that makes them feel like they belong to our kindergarten and that we support. Like, I acknowledge the whānau views and the hopes and aspirations they have for their children. We have many different nationalities in our centre and in New Zealand on the whole that brings a huge amount of different things that are valuable to whānau. I think as a teacher I have to have an awareness that is welcoming of all other cultures. (Jenny)

Adversely, teachers who facilitated a multicultural approach were disregarding Māori language and culture whereas teachers recognising the unique place of Māori as tangata whenua demonstrated a commitment toward Māori and Te Tiriti o Waitangi (Reedy, 2003; Waitangi Tribunal, 1986). It was argued by Metge (1990) that despite teachers understanding the significance of biculturalism and their partnership with Māori as tangata whenua; they still chose to overlook biculturalism so as to equally accommodate children of all ethnicities (Waitangi Tribunal, 1986). This was expressed by Geeta:

The world isn't a fair place to live in, the best we can do is treat our tamariki fairly and that means respecting all cultures equally and providing for all equally despite practises that expect us to do otherwise. Surely this is best for everyone? (Geeta)



I argue that a bicultural approach is not intended to disregard children of other ethnicities. Rather, Aotearoa New Zealand is a multicultural society underpinned by Te Tiriti o Waitangi and a bicultural heritage. Consequently, Māori are to share an equal platform alongside the Crown. With this in mind Awhina voiced the perspectives held by other teachers with whom she worked:

At no time does our bicultural intent undermine others. I mean we embrace and support all our children but Māori culture and language is obvious, just look around the centre. (Awhina)

Teachers in Mahi Ngātahi Centre provided an inclusive environment for both Māori and non-Māori children however; the unique perspectives of Māori were promoted with te reo Māori me ngā tikanga woven throughout their pedagogy and centre environment. In contrast, disregarding biculturalism imposes inequality upon Māori children. Ngaire explained:

Everyone's always going on about showing favouritism to Māori and how this is unfair to Pākehā, but they aren't considering how Māori have been the underdogs when they favour Pākehā. (Ngaire)

A concern held by Walker (1990) toward bicultural development, however, was that Māori and Pākehā had vastly different levels of acceptance of Māori language and culture and this was problematic. Walker (1990) also explained that it became widely accepted that western teaching and learning theories would be imposed upon Māori and equally accepted that Māori preferred pedagogies would be overlooked. This paradox undermines the centrality of biculturalism through practises that disregard Māori equality, language, and knowledge (Ramsden, 2000). O'Sullivan (2007) later contended that despite historical accounts of equal partnership between Māori and Pākehā, colonising attitudes and processes still remained. A suggestion by Jenkin (2010) to potentially avoid negative connotations surrounding biculturalism was "to

utilise the phrase Tiriti-based curriculum rather than biculturalism” (p.37). The shared opinion of several teachers was summed up by Arataki who said:

I found the need to justify our Māori songs and activities with one or two parents over the years and I share the story of the Treaty with them. This was so they could have some understanding as to why we do it, rather than it just being about what’s best for Māori (Arataki).

In sharing her knowledge with the wider community Arataki is justifying her centres bicultural curriculum and the place of Māori within society. Jenkin (2010) also writes that the intent to sustain and support all children underpins *Te Whāriki* but she adds that attention is drawn to the partnership between Māori and the Crown and the requirement by the Ministry of Education is that teachers will implement biculturalism. Hence, it can be argued that teachers who perceive biculturalism as problematic are addressing the concept from a deficit perspective.

Shifting their understanding toward biculturalism validating Māori ways of being and still recognising diverse values and beliefs, therefore, assumes paramount importance. While this would seem to be non-negotiable, another teacher articulated her belief that speaking one or two Māori words was sufficient in terms of bicultural development. She said:

I say a few things in Māori, a few in Hindi, and even a few Samoan words, so this is honouring biculturalism in terms of *Te Whāriki* (Bashnee).

Teacher misunderstanding surrounding the term biculturalism has resulted in teaching practises that disregard Māori. In the following section, therefore, I consider the document *Te Whāriki* for reasons as to why this may be occurring.

#### 4.3 *Te Whāriki*

The discussion of *Te Whāriki* in Chapter two established teachers were required to be familiar with current theories of tangata whenua (Bishop & Glynn, 2000) and

acknowledge their professional obligations to nurture and sustain te reo Māori and strengthen Māori bicultural aspirations (Carr & May, 1993; Ritchie, 2002). Collectively teachers in this research were aware Māori are tangata whenua of Aotearoa New Zealand (Waitangi Tribunal, 1986) with Masina saying:

Māori are the people of this country; this is where they originate from just as our people originate from Samoa. I think many people in New Zealand forget Māori have nowhere else to go, this is their home so if their culture and language are ignored here it's not like they can return home to their roots. (Masina)

Despite this consensus, however, some teachers were unable to speak te reo Māori and engage in Māori preferred practises. Based on their comments, it would seem *Te Whāriki* has done little in terms of informing their knowledge of spoken te reo Māori.

This was voiced by Syria:

If I have no pre-understanding of what supporting Māori looks like, how can I do it? I mean, I understand Māori are people of New Zealand but in terms of bicultural teaching, *Te Whāriki* doesn't help me with what I'm supposed to do so doing things differently to suit Māori isn't easy, it's really difficult. (Syria)

Clearly the requirement according to teachers was for instruction on how to teach biculturally via *Te Whāriki*. Jenny said:

Perhaps if I had a better understanding of what it was like to be Māori when there are so many other ethnicities around, then I could appreciate the importance of being more bicultural than I am now. Again, it doesn't teach us yet places huge expectations on us already knowing or having already learnt it. (Jenny)

Jenny has the potential to engage in bicultural development. However, this does not negate the concerns surrounding the non-prescriptive approach of *Te Whāriki*. When considering *Te Whāriki* teachers shared the viewpoint of Masina who said:

*Te Whāriki* has nothing specific for us to grasp or hold on to, it's like the overall concept is there but as a Samoan, I can easily overlook things beneficial for Māori and if I am not aware of what they are, or even if I am aware, how do I do them. (Masina)

Teachers need to understand that the document intentionally avoided recommending content or methods to achieve its bicultural vision. Jenkin (2010) wrote *Te Whāriki* is “predominantly a vision that lends itself to being an espoused philosophy, rather than a curriculum in action” (p. 53). Successful bicultural implementation is thus highly dependent upon the skill levels which teachers demonstrate in order to make sound decisions towards achieving effective planning for a bicultural education. It would seem, though, that in a lot of instances this ends up being ignored entirely (Carr & May, 1993; Cullen, 2003). The expectation that teachers can competently weave their own interpretation of the content has resulted in them placing emphasis on including all ethnicities rather than implementing the documents bicultural intent (Alvestad et al, 2009; Nuttall, 2003; May, 2010). Herein lays the problem which was best summed up by Jenny who said:

Why doesn't *Te Whāriki* teach us how to speak it, they tell us we have to [speak it], but they don't say what or how much? How do we know when we have reached a satisfactory standard or met the standards we have too?

Similar to earlier research from Jenkin (2010) and Ritchie and Rau (2006), teachers in my research were uncertain of how to apply the non-prescriptive approach of *Te Whāriki* into their practice, particularly in terms of sustaining Māori language and culture. If teachers initially lack a clear understanding of the bicultural imperatives, then implementing them is problematic (Jenkin, 2010). In response to this, one teacher said the following:

The ideals outlined in *Te Whāriki* are confusing, you can get lost in what's best for Māori, Pākehā and all other children. It's difficult to distinguish what is necessary and what's a suggestion. (Bashnee)

The ministerial assumption that *Te Whāriki* can guide teachers toward bicultural development is misplaced. Carr and May (1993), Cullen (2003) and Ritchie and Rau (2006) argue the intention of *Te Whāriki* was sound, however, Cullen (1996) who was

one of the few who critiqued *Te Whāriki* stated that exceptional, professional development surrounding bicultural curriculum planning and implementation for Māori was required for teachers. May and Carr (1996) argued that without this, the bicultural framework will likely impede, rather than support teachers. Ngaire described this clearly:

*Te Whāriki* is more like a wish list without a clear way to achieve it. Why isn't it telling us what we should actually be speaking like lists of the actual words, phrases and stuff like that? We do our best in this centre it's a big issue because without clear guidelines no one really knows what they're doing. (Ngaire)

The challenge seems to be in providing teachers with clear guidelines and support. A series of government initiatives intended to support teachers struggling with the bicultural framework have been introduced over the years with one of the more significant ones being *Kei Tua O Te Pae Assessment for Learning: Early Childhood Assessment Exemplars* (Ministry of Education, 2005). A valid point raised by Jenkin (2010), however, was that many teachers required additional support as they were immigrants to Aotearoa New Zealand. Jenkin (2010) said "What are needed are specific details which can provide teachers who have limited te reo Māori me ngā tikanga with achievable strategies for implementing Te Tiriti based curriculum" (p.46).

One benefit of *Te Whāriki*'s non-prescriptive curriculum though, is the flexibility of different services being enhanced within one ministerial curriculum (Alvestad et al., 2009). Jenkin (2010) explains the document has "not necessarily been followed by successful implementation" (p 22). Indeed, several teachers in this research were unsure of what level of bicultural development practises are acceptable both for the Ministry and Māori. Bashnee stated:

We need suggestions or ideas on what we could be doing, and then we would know what is expected of us and maybe take more interest in doing it. It doesn't even outline what things are not good to do and I have no clue on what to do.

That's probably the main reason that I encompass all children into my programme equally, I mean then I feel like I'm being fair to everyone. (Bashnee)

It would seem more descriptive measures are required if the gap between bicultural expectations and teacher realities is too narrow. Cullen (2003) stated fundamental practises intent on promoting teachers toward sustaining Māori language and culture are missing. With this in mind Ngaire said:

I can recall a Mum who just started here from another centre, she told us they went on a trip to a local Marae. The whole thing was organised by their Pākehā Head Teacher and she didn't think she should have to talk to any Māori whānau in the centre or read up on correct protocol before going. Needless to say, this Mum didn't go out of principle and had heard; one child ran in with their shoes and hat on, it was a disaster according to the one Māori whānau that went. (Ngaire)

Involving whānau Māori within decision making processes can eliminate circumstances like this occurring and avoid situations where Māori traditions are ignored. Blaiklock (2013) also held concerns with *Te Whāriki* when he said the document "had no required learning outcomes and no required assessments for any particular areas of learning" (p. 3). The probability of teachers facilitating any bicultural imperatives without exceptional professional development was problematic (Cullen, 1996; Jenkin, 2010).

Clearly, more needs to be done to ensure provisions are in place for Māori cultural priorities (Durie, 2003). Teachers need the orientation and vision of *Te Whāriki* defined, without this; they are lost and this is reflected in their practice (Dixon, Widdowson, Meagher-Lundberg, McMurchy-Pilkington & McMurchy-Pilkington, 2007).

#### 4.4 Centre Leadership

The third finding of this research considers the role of centre management and head teachers specifically toward ensuring teaching staff implement the bicultural imperatives of *Te Whāriki*.

McCauley (2008) emphasised leaders should be capable of motivating, influencing, and encouraging staff to freely undertake and implement ideas. In view of this, centre management and head teachers should be validating te reo Māori me ngā tikanga which in turn, has teachers actively speaking te reo Māori.

In Mahi Ngātahi Centre it was determined that while centre leaders were committed to validating te reo Māori me ngā tikanga, it was a teacher who had assumed responsibility to actively speak te reo Māori and lead her peers to do the same. Research by Jenkin (2010) highlights the truism that leadership toward sustaining a bicultural framework can stem from someone other than a centre's designated leader. The advantage of having a bicultural leader that is a colleague rather than centre leader is that it increases the likelihood of colleagues asking for support. In this research, the transformational leadership of one teacher, supported her colleagues to speak te reo Māori to children. Ngaire shared:

I think that we would still be active in speaking Māori but without her to lead us, I don't think we would have the knowledge like we do. She still attends te reo Māori at wānanga and comes in each week with what she learnt. We're a long way away from being as good as her, but she's so patient when she teaches us. The best thing about Arataki is that she is our friend, she understands us because we share the same issues about other work stuff. It's not a problem to tell her to repeat herself that she is going too fast when she talks because she doesn't get mad, she just slows down.... Then we laugh. (Ngaire)

Clearly, Arataki's fortitude in assuming the role of bicultural leader is working; however, this does not negate the responsibility of the Crown to provide extra support to enable teachers to speak te reo Māori to children. Other teachers said their senior staff

promoted a bicultural environment, however, they provided staff with little knowledge and skills to do so in practice. Jenny said:

We have all the right things on the wall of our centre, like we value Māori and the Treaty of Waitangi and that teachers speak Māori to children, but that's it in terms of what centre leaders do. With no-one at the top speaking it, we don't hear it so how can we be expected to do it or even remember to do it? (Jenny)

Clearly, some teachers recognised the significance of bicultural development for Māori but lacking strong leadership has left some teachers frustrated, while others are angry. With so many Crown provisos necessitating teachers speak te reo Māori to children it would seem those in senior positions should be responsible to set the tone and lead by example. Bushouse (2008) agrees saying leaders are able to influence staff and so hold a responsibility toward creating and sustaining the core values of an organisation insofar as te reo Māori is concerned. The following comment was from Geeta:

Our centre manager throws in the odd describing word or greeting in Māori but that was only when Māori parents were in the centre, I don't think it was sincere because she made no effort any other time. (Geeta)

This raises the question as to whether those in senior positions are committed to Te Tiriti o Waitangi and the survival of te reo Māori as a spoken language. It is crucial they accept and acknowledge their responsibility and establish te reo Māori within their centre's curriculum. One teacher described the bicultural leadership within Tātaritanga Centre as multicultural leadership and this lead to justification of her own multicultural practises. Bashnee said:

I think our manager changing her teaching toward bicultural teaching is too hard; she doesn't bother much and if she is fair to all children equally, rather than prioritising a few, then I can do it too. (Bashnee)

Without strong leadership several teachers questioned the need for them to implement bicultural practises. Ritchie and Rau (2006) placed importance on a team approach, arguing the likelihood of sustaining a bicultural curriculum increases when everyone



has a shared commitment toward collectively embracing bicultural development.

Research by Jenkin (2011) also identified the significance of a team approach as this enhanced the implementation of bicultural development. This was indeed the case in Mahi Ngātahi Centre with all teachers agreeing with Chantelle who said:

To succeed, all teachers have to be on the same page and want the same things for the children and the centre. When you're in a centre that everyone (staff) agrees and they work in as a team it's achievable, but if someone isn't interested or is all about themselves, it's really hard I think that's why our te reo Māori is so strong, we are all determined to speak it. (Chantelle)

Clearly, leaders and staff who shared a strong commitment towards speaking te reo Māori had a more effective implementation level of te reo Māori being spoken.

Nevertheless, Jenkin (2010) pointed out that it is unrealistic for this to be effective all the time and I think it is important for teachers to be independently responsible for learning and speaking the language.

Another concern held by some teachers was that representatives from the Education Review Office monitor early childhood centre performances on average, once every three years. Teachers considered this time frame was insufficient if the Ministry was to identify the challenges teachers had in implementing the bicultural imperatives of *Te Whāriki*. Particularly, concerning their inability to speak te reo Māori to children. Their frustrations were escalated when it was revealed that Education Review Office visits could be held yearly if there were academic or safety risks to children. However, I argue that teacher's disregarding bicultural practises which include speaking te reo Māori to children, are posing a risk to the well-being of Māori children and their whānau. Secondly, all children living in Aotearoa New Zealand should be exposed to the countries heritage, language and culture. This was summed up by Ngaire who said:

I don't think that enough is done to monitor what teachers are actually doing in terms of speaking Māori. I mean when I'm talking with these guys here and teachers from other centres we have the same question, who checks on whether

we speak Māori? I know that some don't bother to speak Māori because no one is checking. Why is the Ministry not taking an interest in teacher's ability or lack of ability to meet the needs of our Māori tamariki and their whānau? (Ngaire)

Recognition that there were few checks in place has impeded teacher's motivation and commitment to do so. Reedy (2003) stated a leadership void in bicultural development and monitoring of staff, leads to noncompliance of Ministerial regulations and their teaching staff's inability to provide an environment rich in spoken te reo Māori. This is supported by Davidman and Davidman (1997) who said that culturally responsive leadership and teaching is ongoing and demands cultural competency. Until this is evident and teaching staff are committed to a team approach, bicultural teaching practises will remain elusive (Thornton, Wansbrough, Clarkin-Phillips, Aitken, & Tamati, 2009).

In contrast to this, Te Kopae Piripono, a Māori immersion centre in Taranaki identified an official approach of leadership is undesirable for all involved and, moreover, such a strategy resulted in disappointing outcomes. This is due in the most part to leadership being attached to a formal title and position when in fact; it should involve *all* those within the centre and community, including children. In contrast, a kaupapa Māori model of leadership is both an individual and a collective responsibility (Te Kopae Piripono, 2006). The values of a kaupapa model of leadership are accorded four domains of responsibilities: having responsibility, being responsible, taking responsibility, and sharing responsibility. This is consistent with discussion in Chapter three concerning kaupapa Māori research which seeks to position learning within a whānau context with all becoming involved.

Robinson and Hohepa (2010) acknowledged a kaupapa Māori model of leadership was preferable as all participating teaching staff, children, whānau and the community were responsible for achieving desired objectives. It was suggested the Tu Rangatira Model

was pivotal in attaining both leadership accountability and staff willingness to contribute. The overall objective of this leadership model is to collectively protect and advance te reo Māori through the following:

- Ensuring staff are competent and confident in teaching in te reo Māori
- Ensuring resources reflect the key learning goals of high-quality language education
- Implementing recruitment policies that prioritise the necessary competencies in and commitment to te reo Māori
- Engaging learners and making sure they love learning in te reo Māori (Robinson & Hohepa, 2010, p. 19).

The leaders of some teachers in this research called into question their own proficiency and use of te reo Māori. In spite of this, there is insufficient literature focusing on the value of Māori leadership models within the mainstream early childhood sector and so this remains subjective. Research by Jenkin (2010) also showed that teachers held concerns surrounding the role modelling of te reo Māori by those who were not tangata whenua. That said, teachers in this research identified the need for bicultural leadership as being pivotal but in conjunction with this, they noted their lack of confidence in speaking the language.

#### 4.5 Relevant Professional Development

Similarly to research by Ellis (2008), teachers in my research demonstrated frustration with what they deemed to be the assumption and expectation they had sufficient knowledge to be able to speak another language. Teachers considered that their inability to speak te reo Māori in the first instance, stemmed from the unavailability of relevant professional development to learn te reo Māori. Moreover, teachers who attended professional development still continued to struggle (May, 2012; Ritchie 2003b; Sheriff, 2010). Indeed, Woodrow (2006) draws attention to the fact that insufficient training of a second language will predictably result in teachers lacking the confidence to attempt speaking it at all. Bashnee articulated this clearly:

I have never had formal training in Māori and I struggle with even the basics. It's like they think that we have had exceptional training to speak the language when we haven't, nor do we receive any now...I am so afraid of getting it wrong or offending someone that I rarely speak it. (Bashnee)

Teachers described how their lack of training impeded their confidence in speaking te reo Māori. They were, therefore, unable to take advantage of any opportunities to speak te reo Māori to children. Professional development is described as high quality training intended to improve teacher knowledge and practice while ultimately supporting their learners (Ministry of Education, 2008). Literature suggests that the limited level of professional development available in Aotearoa New Zealand was misguided and, moreover, supported a Pākehā culture (Sheriff, 2010). Awhina said:

There is a massive void of on-going training or PD in learning to speak te reo Māori and the one time we did go to a workshop, tikanga Māori was ignored. Like teachers were sitting on desks which is rude and the lady taking it didn't even pronounce the language properly. (Awhina)

It follows then, that teachers are frustrated at Ministerial assumptions they have sufficient knowledge to speak te reo Māori. Increasing the availability of relevant professional development training is admirable but in light of this teacher's comment, thought and consideration must be given toward the level of te reo Māori me ngā tikanga knowledge held by those leading the event. Research by Murrow, Kalafatelis, Fryer, Hammond and Edwards (2006) highlighted that if programme providers were to produce effective results, they must conduct themselves professionally and exhibit proficiency in the subject. Professional development focused on te reo Māori must also focus on tikanga Māori as they are considered by Māori to be inseparable (Ministry of Education, 2009). One teacher who had attended professional development through an independent forum described her programme providers as being confident in their use of the language and they weaved tikanga Māori throughout the sessions. Arataki voiced the following:

The teacher's knowledge and confidence about Māori culture was awesome, you know, like the grass roots of what makes Māori, Māori. We didn't just learn to speak Māori; we learnt why it is important to speak it. So, when she was teaching us reo we were engaged and excited to learn. I think that's why it was such a hit with everyone that went. (Arataki)

Arataki associated te reo Māori as being pivotal to knowledge of the Māori world and Māori identity. She was also identified as the most competent speaker of te reo Māori in this research and showed leadership skills that had her encourage and support her peers to speak te reo Māori also. Ellis (2008) clarified that gaining holistic knowledge surrounding the culture of the language being taught will increase one's self-confidence and subsequent ability to both speak the language and support others to do so. Several teachers shared that their confidence in speaking te reo Māori increased when their peer, Arataki, supported them and this was clearly described by Masina who said:

I have learnt so much Māori from Arataki. Hearing her speak it all day, helps me remember to speak it, and not to be shy if I get it wrong because she teaches us to say it right. (Masina)

It seems fair to say that even one teacher attending relevant professional development from providers competent in te reo Māori me ngā tikanga can increase the knowledge and confidence of colleagues. Further to this, Macdonald (2011) considers professional development workshops can inform attendees about the significance of other Māori concepts such as ako, and whanaungatanga, both of which embody cooperative learning and understanding for all. Ngaire shared similar thoughts:

I think it's one thing to be taught how to speak te reo Māori but it's also important to realise that a language is part of a culture; there are so many other factors that have to be taken into consideration, especially for Māori. We learn together and in a supportive environment, it's not like someone can just stand before us, we listen and then they have taught us, it's much more different than that. (Ngaire)

This reinforces the need for the Ministry of Education to provide relevant professional development from providers competent in te reo Māori me ngā tikanga, especially if teachers are to overcome their lack of confidence in speaking the Māori language.

Another issue concerning teacher confidence was identified as being an increased reluctance to their speaking te reo Māori when whānau Māori were present. Geeta said:

I do try on occasion, but I'm so self-conscious that everyone is listening to me and waiting for me to make a mistake and I think I'll offend someone if I pronounce it wrong. I haven't had any training and there is no way I'm even going to try to speak Māori if we have our Māori parents here. (Geeta)

As tangata whenua my response to this is simple: it is pleasing to hear others speak te reo Māori in a learning environment and of course, their ability to try far outweighs mistakes that may be made. My perspective was shared by Chantelle who said:

You know, it doesn't matter if someone makes mistakes, we all make mistakes. It's about a process of bringing our language back, for the children to hear. Its speaking it that is important and the more you speak it, the better you get at it. There is no denying though, that more professional development is needed. (Chantelle)

Jenkin (2010) pointed out that whānau Māori feel valued when te reo Māori is spoken albeit at a beginner level. Generally, in this research, it was found that teachers held a positive attitude toward attending professional development if this was available.

In contrast, two other teachers who had attended private institutions to learn te reo Māori, considered the content ill-fitting for engaging with preschool children.

Likewise, Jenkin (personal communication, June 19, 2015) found that despite teachers undertaking three independent courses to learn to speak te reo Māori, the content, while clearly meeting the course overview, had not provided sufficient, relevant te reo Māori to use when working in early childhood education. Professionally facilitated training

programmes, such as Mātauranga Māori professional development were highlighted by some teachers in this research and summed up in the following comment:

Mātauranga professional development is a good way to teach foundational aspects of Māori culture and it's also the perfect medium for teaching te reo Māori. I think too, a lot of the value comes with the environment; it is one that has everyone positioned equally rather than a teacher student thing where let's face it, there's not much respect between teachers and students. (Arataki)

Mātauranga Māori professional development is aimed at supporting teachers to speak te reo Māori along with their comprehending tikanga Māori (Reynolds, 2004).

With this in mind it seems prudent for the Ministry of Education to offer Mātauranga Māori professional development to increase teacher knowledge of Māori culture and ability to speak te reo Māori (Bishop & Glynn, 1999; Murrow et al., 2006; Royal, 2007). Bishop and Glynn (1999) explained that Mātauranga Māori professional development teaches te reo Māori while placing emphasis on the importance of teacher interactions with learners (Murrow et al., 2006; Royal, 2007).

While some teachers in this research wanted professional development that began with the basics, others wanted to extend beyond their current level of knowledge being greetings, basic instructions and naming words. This was summed up by Chantelle:

We should have the option of 'choosing' a professional development workshop in line with our current level of understanding. With the Ministry of Education [currently]doing nothing, I suppose that's expecting a lot. (Chantelle)

Teacher requests should have the Ministry of Education offer professional development programmes which focus on the current, differing levels of teacher proficiency in te reo Māori. Teachers could then make an informed decision as to which workshop they attended thus maximising their time and level of knowledge. Setting aside the fact that teachers are speaking te reo Māori at differing levels, one teacher expressed frustration

at teachers speaking te reo Māori within English sentences highlighting this was common when instructing children to do something, she said

The problem for me is they became complacent and think this is all they have to do to meet the expectations *Te Whāriki* and biculturalism (Arataki)

Jenkin (2010) however, proposes that the insertion of English words into Māori and vice versa could be considered bicultural development. I agree with Jenkin (2010) and this was also the perspective of Jenny who said:

Does it really matter that I'm not fluent in Māori; at least I'm trying. I mean, isn't better for me to say them some Māori words if I can, rather than not say them at all? (Jenny)

The fact that Jenny has to defend her application of Māori language into English sentences is objectionable and I too agree that at least she is trying. Literature written by Ritchie (2002), and Skerrett (2007), however, state that for te reo Māori to be on the same level of English, it needed to be applied equally. Despite this though, other teachers in this research considered this method of speaking te reo Māori increased both the frequency of the te reo Māori they spoke while also improving their pronunciation. This was articulated by Chantelle:

While I have long way to go before I am fluent in te reo Māori, using Māori to describe things around the centre or the kid's feelings, the weather and stuff like that, it becomes easier to say and I remember the words. (Chantelle)

It is important to recognise the current lack of professional development and in doing so surely the above strategy of inserting Māori words into English sentences could be acceptable. One teacher described her level of te reo Māori as poor, highlighting this approach was the only way she could integrate the language into the curriculum. Geeta said:

I speak Māori in conjunction with English, if I didn't do this, I wouldn't be able to speak it at all. (Geeta)



In the hopes that te reo Māori is spoken, Johnson and Houia (2005) assert that the learner has to start somewhere irrespective of delivery method, as this is still using the language and building the confidence of the speaker. Under these circumstances Jenkin (2010) reinforces that bicultural aspects of a programme may be seen as “tokenism rather than absolute commitment” (p.46). However, it was still considered a start.

Thus far, ongoing, relevant, training such as Mātauranga Māori professional development is considered viable in increasing not only knowledge, confidence, and ability to speak te reo Māori to children, for teachers, but also for centre leaders (Bishop & Glynn, 1999; Reynolds, 2004). While this is promising, research by Hunzicker (2011) implied that professional development outcomes are mediocre at best, arguing that teacher practises can be manipulated in the moment, however; permanent changes necessitate shifting teacher mind-set and beliefs. Until this occurs, Hunzicker claims teachers merely endure professional development quickly returning to their initial teaching practice upon completion. In line with this and teacher concerns, we now discuss the next theme which considers the implications surrounding teachers’ dispositions.

#### 4.6 Personal Considerations

Terreni and McCallum (2003) consider a teacher’s personal cultural beliefs and assumptions heavily impact upon their teaching practice. Research by Mitchell and Cubey (2003) noted deficit assumptions were more prevalent when teachers had a differing ethnic background to that of the child, particularly surrounding ethnicity, economic status and the child’s use of another language (Te Puni Kokiri, 2010). The reported growth in global migration to Aotearoa New Zealand is likely to increase the diverse ethnicities of teachers, each bringing with them their own cultural identity. A report by the Ministry of Education (2014a) shows a steady increase of immigrant

teaching staff from 2004-2013. Irrespective of this, all early childhood teachers must be aware that Māori are tangata whenua and Crown partners under Te Tiriti o Waitangi. They must also comprehend that as teachers in Aotearoa New Zealand, they have an obligation to protect and sustain te reo Māori me ngā tikanga (Ministry of Education, 2014b; Waitangi Tribunal, 1986).

While research by Murrow et al. (2006) determined 89% to 90% of teachers recognised the significance of learning and speaking te reo Māori, one teacher in this research considered speaking te reo Māori disregarded her own language:

I am Fijian Indian, it is how I have been raised and is what I know, it is me. I can appreciate other cultures of course, but is it wrong to just be me? I don't want to accommodate other cultures at the expense of my own and I shouldn't have too. I ask, why I can't speak my own language instead of Māori (Bashnee)

Comparable to concerns surrounding biculturalism replacing multiculturalism, teachers must recognise sustaining Māori culture does not negate their own belief system or that of other ethnicities. I believe their antipathy toward bicultural development undermines Māori not to mention their professional obligations. With this in mind, Davis, Gunn, Purdue, and Smith (2007) emphasised teachers must recognise they bring with them personal bias but despite this they must still embrace Māori. Another teacher considered her colleagues opinion of Māori was affecting the disposition of teachers in trying to work toward bicultural development. Geeta said:

While I don't think I do well speaking Māori, I do try but it doesn't matter what we are discussing or planning she disagrees. Like the time we organised Māori dances with the children wearing Māori outfits. She had to say something negative that made us feel like we were ignoring the Fijian Indian. (Geeta)

Clearly, teachers who work against the collective approach of others can cause conflict. In contrast to this, teachers in Mahi Ngātahi Centre worked collectively in achieving a team approach in speaking te reo Māori with children. This resulted in a learning environment that had teachers speaking te reo Māori throughout all centre activities.

Mentioning the value of engaging in a team approach to sustain Māori was Ngaire a teacher from Mahi Ngātahi Centre who said:

We [teaching staff] share the same belief of Māori and the need to speak their language. It is much easier when everyone is on the same page and can work toward the same thing. It even makes our work fun and less stressful because we support each other when one of us is unsure what to do next. (Ngaire)

The teachers in Mahi Ngātahi Centre have embraced their differing levels of spoken te reo Māori and willingly support one another, however, this was not always the case with one teacher initially having reservations.

It was hard at first because I wanted to speak Samoan at every possible moment. Not just to the Samoan children, but because it is my language, the language I speak away from the centre. But, hearing te reo Māori has made me realise its beauty and importance for Māori in New Zealand (Masina)

With the ongoing support of her colleagues this teacher transitioned her reluctance of embracing te reo Māori which was prevalent during mat time activities. Isenberg and Jalongo (2009) explain the value of teachers using relevant resources for children's learning. Furthermore teachers in this research repeated phrases at children's requests and allowed them time to respond. Drawing on children's real life experiences where possible also supports children's learning (Pere, 1994) and this was outlined in the following:

If we're reading a story in te reo Māori one the kids are familiar with, they will often relate it [the story] to something they've done with their family or brothers and sisters. Then they ask, Whaea, what's the Māori word for such and such? Like we read one yesterday and, oh I can't remember who it was, but they asked what the Māori word for rollercoaster was because they had just been to Rainbows End. No-one knew it, so Awhina looked it up, wrote it down and we all learnt it together. (Chantelle)

Dixon et al. (2007) emphasised that providing children with the opportunity to learn and speak te reo Māori is invaluable for children's learning and also whānau Māori.

Collectively the teachers are working toward the regeneration of Māori language and culture (Skerrett, 2007).

Another personal consideration raised by several teachers was the negative perception of Māori taught by teachers throughout their own schooling. Arataki expressed the following:

Nothing throughout my primary or intermediate school acknowledged Māori that's saying something isn't it. It was like Māori didn't exist but there I was, with my brother going every day, so what were we? Seriously, how could tangata whenua be ignored? (Arataki)

The impacts of colonisation upon Māori took decades to marginally improve. Arataki likened her own experiences during the 1960's to Brown (2014), who described an era where Māori were generally overlooked although he could recall "A Pākehā teacher who had his kids build a matchstick and papier-mache pa each year" (para, 2). It was not until the early 1970's that acknowledging Māori and te reo Māori were introduced into schools (Higgins & Keane, 2013). Some teachers recalled the option of learning te reo Māori in high school, however, it was not well received by students. This was summed up by Ngaire:

It [learning Māori] was offered later in high school. I'm not sure if anyone actually took advantage of it though and it wasn't like a regular thing. It wasn't promoted as a big deal ... learning Māori was presented as a token thing, nothing that anyone would find useful in the future and the classes themselves had no recognition of Māori culture. (Ngaire)

Similarly, te reo Māori was offered in my own high school education. While this may have been a milestone for Māori, other teachers agreed their earlier schooling firmly positioned Māori as inferior with much work necessitated to reverse this deficit thinking. Geeta expressed the following:

We were told Māori willingly gave away their land and then they asked for its return. How can it be returned all these years later and what would happen to

families that lived there now. It wasn't their fault that Māori swapped land for things Europeans bought with them. (Geeta)

Such historical inaccuracies have resulted in widespread invalidation of Māori within society. It is hardly surprising that some teachers in this research struggle with bicultural teaching. Mitchell and Cubey (2003) argued such deficit assumptions lead to teachers having low expectations for children and their whānau. In such circumstances, teachers do not recognise the children's contributions nor can they support their well being, and sense of belonging. Equally, the Crown's lacklustre approach in reinforcing teacher obligations toward Māori perpetrated such deficit mindsets. Irrespective of current legislation directing teachers to protect and sustain te reo Māori me ngā tikanga, these earlier factors are clearly associated with teacher disinterest toward the bicultural imperatives of *Te Whāriki* (Ministry of Education, 2015a; 2015c).

Such inaccuracies become entrenched in one's belief system and Dweck (2006) argued this is difficult, if not impossible, to change. The author outlines that one's learned experiences are generally accepted and they then become highly resistant to change. According to Williams et al., (2012) teacher reluctance towards changing their own mindset is problematic especially with respect to their acceptance of equality for Māori.

Ritchie (2003a) claims that attitudes of teachers are a fundamental component of preparing student teachers to deliver bicultural early childhood education programmes. She recommended supporting teachers to create a genuine commitment to bicultural development as being essential. For one teacher, the desire to sustain her own language surpassed the need for her to speak te reo Māori. Bashnee asserted:

For me, it's important to recognise my own language and culture first, this is who I am, who I have been raised to be, it's only natural to put this first through everything I do. (Bashnee)

To overcome this attitude, McCarthy (1998) took a firmer approach arguing teachers must relinquish their own cultural norms if they were to meet their bicultural obligations toward Māori. Rameka (2003) agreed reasoning that without doing so, te reo Māori me ngā tikanga will remain insignificant and in some instances, irrelevant. Ritchie and Rau (2006) also pointed out that the likelihood of teachers developing and sustaining bicultural competency through obligatory means is highly unlikely. According to Te Puni Kokiri (2010), the survival of te reo Māori lays in the hands of those who speak it, with the negative attitude of non-speakers impeding the use of the language. Comparatively, Awhina described some teachers as frustrating, their unreasonable attitude interfering with her own teaching practice she said:

I think the only way teachers will respect Māori is if we [in turn] overlook their culture and traditions.... they might begin to appreciate what it feels like for Māori. Sometimes, it's really difficult to advocate 24/7 for Māori. (Awhina)

All things considered, teacher commitment toward bicultural development and speaking te reo Māori with children is influenced by their learned experiences (Terreni & McCallum, 2003). Teachers should work toward dispelling their past negative accounts of Māori while reflecting upon their own values, beliefs, and assumptions, particularly concerning how these sit within their pedagogy, and the ministerial requirements they should abide too (Warren, 2013). This increases the likelihood of teachers having a desire to embrace new concepts and their being willing to change their teaching towards supporting Māori (Ritchie & Rau, 2006). The next finding looks at the learned experiences of teachers throughout tertiary teacher education programmes.

#### 4.7 The Role of Tertiary Institutions

Early childhood teacher education programmes offered by tertiary institutions in Aotearoa New Zealand, have a bicultural vision for equipping their students to implement *Te Whāriki* (Ritchie, 2002). Generally speaking student teachers will

explore te ao Māori, concepts of te reo and tikanga Māori, and Te Tiriti o Waitangi.

Focus is on their building an awareness of teaching practises that support the inclusion of te ao Māori in children's learning. The programmes appear to validate the bicultural imperatives of *Te Whāriki* so why then are some teachers unable to recognise Māori are tangata whenua and reflect quality te reo Māori me ngā tikanga throughout their practice? (Waitangi Tribunal, 1986).

A report by Cameron and Baker (2004) determined that tertiary institutions were inadequately preparing early childhood graduates toward bicultural competency.

Particularly in terms of ensuring student teachers recognised the role of Māori as tangata whenua and Crown partners under Te Tiriti o Waitangi and their role being to protect te reo Māori me ngā tikanga (Ministry of Education, 2014b; Waitangi Tribunal, 1986). This would indeed seem true with only one teacher in this research considering her student teacher programme met Crown obligations and supported her to speak te reo Māori. Arataki explained:

From start to finish of my training programme there was a strong emphasis on te reo me nga tikanga Māori. Every year has a Māori component so by the third year, we were using 8 word sentences, writing books in te reo and using a range of waiata and tikanga in our practice. (Arataki)

In attending a teacher education programme that firmly validated the place of Māori as tangata whenua, it is unsurprising that Arataki's use of te reo Māori and awareness of tikanga Māori, was more advanced than that of the other teachers. Arataki also considered her tertiary institution offered a wide support network for Māori students both academically and socially thus replicating traditionally preferred practises of Māori which were holistic in nature. My role as Kaihāpai within the School of Education AUT University has me recognise first-hand how such support services are instrumental in Māori retention and subsequently Māori students qualifying. Arataki also associated her bicultural awareness to her tertiary institution, who facilitated learning environments

that were culturally appropriate for Māori. Such environments are deemed critical for the success of Māori learners, as they feel validated and achieve a sense of belonging (Marshall, Baldwin & Peach, 2008). In stark contrast to this the remaining teachers considered their tertiary institution had failed to build links between te ao Māori and the early childhood sector, and they had not emphasised the significance of Māori as tangata whenua and tikanga Māori (Waitangi Tribunal, 1986). This was summed up by Chantelle who said:

No language, no recognition, just Pākehā teachers, continuing the cycle of ignoring Māori and before long, we graduated....I mean we learnt a few describing words and greetings but our mahi was all about Pākehā theories and practises. Māori knowledge was just a flash in the pan. (Chantelle)

It is unreasonable for the Ministry of Education to expect both student and qualified teachers to speak te reo Māori to children if their tertiary institutions have not prepared them to do so. Equally concerning were teacher accounts that recognition of tikanga Māori was absent throughout their teacher education programmes. While my own teacher education programme merged aspects of te reo Māori me ngā tikanga throughout, I argue that the programme lacked the depth of knowledge necessary for me to speak te reo Māori once qualified. This was similar to the opinion of Awhina who said:

We kind of touched on Māori greetings and learnt how to ask each other how we were, now that I think of it, it was really basic stuff. There was not much follow up on this either, let me think, throughout the 3 ½ years of study I did, that was pretty much it, only a small bit at the beginning. I can remember finishing and thinking, so now I'm qualified to teach and my level of reo wouldn't see me string more than two words together, how is that acknowledging Māori? (Awhina)

It is recommended that tertiary institutions deliver “opportunities for students to gain the commitment, knowledge, competence, confidence, and receptivity that will enable them to facilitate bicultural development in early childhood centres” (Ritchie, 2002, p.



334). However, I argue my tertiary institution lacked staff with the aptitude to instruct students in te reo Māori me ngā tikanga. Frankly, tertiary institutions should be able to teach students to speak te reo Māori fluently. Learning environments are also another consideration as they should be conducive for Māori students. Several teachers recalled their tertiary class environments as strict and theory driven, rather than allowing time for active engagement. Ngaire summed this up:

There wasn't a commitment by our lecturers to build a rapport or relationship with us; it was like they were always teaching down to us like we were stupid. As Māori's my friends and I needed that connection that real 'handle' on things. Then I would have felt comfortable sharing from my heart and feeling that I was truly being listened to. (Ngaire)

In neglecting the significance of Māori preferred pedagogies such as ako, the learning environment is discouraging for Māori students rather than validating them and ensuring that they feel a sense of belonging (Marshall et al., 2008). Ritchie (2003a) emphasises reciprocal partnerships between Māori students and Pākehā lecturers, should be a non-negotiable. This could potentially increase the programmes Māori content positioning it equally alongside western content.

According to Te Puni Kokiri (2009), nowhere should bicultural development be more recognised, than within teacher training programmes. Equally important, several teachers reasoned tertiary institutions should be held responsible for ensuring student teachers practising in Aotearoa New Zealand firmly recognise their teaching obligations toward Māori. Geeta summed this up saying:

It didn't know at the time that understanding the Treaty would justify why we all should speak Māori. There wasn't really much emphasis on how important this was for Māori people or that this was a big part of our teaching. (Geeta)

Unsurprisingly, this lack of knowledge has graduate teachers then experience ongoing challenges toward implementing the bicultural aspects of *Te Whāriki* (Ritchie, 2008).

The New Zealand Teachers' Council asserts that graduate teachers within Aotearoa

New Zealand must recognise their obligations toward Māori and, therefore, be competent to reflect quality te reo Māori me ngā tikanga throughout their practice (Dalli, 2008). Teaching within the early childhood sector I have witnessed many graduate teachers yet to acknowledge their obligations toward Māori so holding tertiary institutions accountable may alleviate bicultural apathy. In the past there has been confusion surrounding who is responsible for the bicultural aspects of the tertiary institutional curriculum (Stucki, 2010), however, the message from the Hon Steven Joyce Minister of Tertiary Education is clear: tertiary institutions must meet Crown obligations toward protecting and sustaining te reo Māori (Ministry of Education, 2010c). Ritchie (2003a) pointed out that teacher education programmes must move beyond “a mechanical, technical process of preparing teachers with the requisite skills” (p.1). She argued bicultural competence is inconsequential if student teachers lack a commitment in aspiring to implement bicultural development in their early childhood education centres.

Thaman (1993) explains training programmes should encompass “aspects which are regarded as so valuable that their survival is not left to chance but is entrusted to teachers for expert transmission” (p. 249). Failure in doing so has undervalued Māori language, knowledge, and cultural practises (Walker, 1996). Similar to the teachers in my research, Bishop (2000), Durie (2003), and Morehu, Lolesio, Piper and Pomare (2009) agree not enough is being done within tertiary institutions to sanction biculturally equitable teaching and learning for Māori.

A report by Chauvel and Rean (2012) for the Tertiary Education Commission, however, specifically recognises the disparity between Māori, non-Māori and other ethnic groups at higher levels of education. Consequently, the *Tertiary Education Strategy 2014-2019* (Ministry of Education, 2014b) has prioritised the educational success of Māori to

ensure equitable learning environments. In addressing this, it is strongly suggested that tertiary education providers abide by their professional obligations. It is reasonable to suggest that this should be a priority, especially if tertiary institutions are to prepare early childhood graduates to speak te reo Māori to children. Presently, te reo Māori me ngā tikanga can be seen woven throughout early childhood teacher training programmes offered by some tertiary institutions. Future research is recommended to determine whether these teacher education programmes are effectively and adequately equipping early childhood graduates to implement bicultural teaching with emphasis placed upon their proficiency in, and use of, te reo Māori. A proposed approach to measure this would be regular and comprehensive Education Review Office reports.

#### 4.8 Summary

Given these emergent findings and the literature, a tenable conclusion is that most early childhood teachers are indeed on a bicultural journey which has them speaking te reo Māori to children. Notwithstanding the multicultural society that now exists within Aotearoa New Zealand, it would seem that raising teacher awareness of Māori as tangata whenua, coupled with ensuring they are aware of their professional obligations would be a strong starting point (Waitangi Tribunal, 1986). Generally speaking, Ministerial training programmes facilitated by professionals versed in te reo Māori me ngā tikanga, could address the barriers identified as impeding teachers to speak te reo Māori to children. Teachers require assistance to comprehend the bicultural imperatives of *Te Whāriki* and how to weave them throughout their curriculum. Next, tertiary institutions could dispel the confusion (that was apparent from some participants in this study) surrounding biculturalism and multiculturalism, particularly in terms of teachers who consider biculturalism negates other ethnicities in favour of Māori. Those who hold leadership roles could also attend such programmes. Based on the principles of

tikanga Māori and the preferred pedagogy of ako, such programmes not only validate bicultural development and speaking te reo Māori, but can be an opportunity to bring leaders and teaching staff together. This is especially important as evidence suggests a collective vision toward speaking the language, will indeed, have the language spoken. Following on from this, the next chapter will consider the research questions and implications of teachers speaking te reo Māori to children. Recommendations for future research are outlined, as are the strengths and challenges of this research. The concluding comments then draw this stage of the research to a close.

## 5 Chapter Five: Conclusion

Ko koe ki tēnā, ko ahau ki tēnei kīwai o te kete.

You take that handle of the kete and I will take this one.

### 5.1 Overview

This research investigated early childhood teachers speaking te reo Māori to children within their centres. In doing so, implications considering the viability of teachers achieving this legislative mandate were identified. Solutions that could potentially support qualified teachers, and student teachers in training, were suggested. The overall intent of this research was to facilitate an authentic connection between the early childhood sector and Māori, through teachers speaking te reo Māori to children. Teachers in this research were located within three mainstream centres in South Auckland, and covered a range of ability from monolingual to bilingual, however; as was explained in Chapter four, none were fluent in te reo Māori.

This chapter begins by revisiting the research questions, primarily concerning the implications of teachers speaking te reo Māori to children, and includes potential solutions to address these. The role of those within the Ministry of Education and Tertiary Education sector are considered, with particular emphasis on their recognising the partnership between Māori and the Crown as evidenced within Te Tiriti o Waitangi (Ministry of Education, 2014b; Waitangi Tribunal, 1986). The research contribution looks at the unforeseen barrier of misinterpretation by teachers, regarding the term biculturalism.

A recommendation toward future research focuses on the Tertiary Education Sector, more specifically, the bicultural content of early childhood education teacher training programmes. One of the challenges of this research was securing participants for this

research project, as was amending data collection methods to suit teachers' schedules. A further challenge was my concern about my biases surrounding teachers and their speaking te reo Māori to children. It was here that the guidance of both my supervisor and Kaumātua would prove invaluable.

## 5.2 Revisiting the Research Questions

Validation in answering the research questions posed in this thesis, lay within the context of the history of post colonisation. Prior to this, te reo Māori was the only method of engaging in everyday conversations and transferring all social, religious, commercial, and political knowledge among Māori people (Jellie, 2001; Pere, 1997; Pihama et al., 2004). Undoubtedly, this method was pivotal in sustaining not only te reo Māori me ngā tikanga but the very existence of Māori people (Paki, 2007; Ratima & May, 2011; Waitangi Tribunal, 1986). In view of this, the research questions asked in this thesis were:

*What level of te reo Māori are qualified mainstream early childhood teachers speaking with their children?*

*What are the implications of this?*

In considering the first research question, a system of measuring and identifying the quantity of te reo Māori spoken by teachers, was achieved by adapting John Moorfield's (2013) *Te Whanake* series of Māori learning resources. Specifically, the framework of *Te Whanake* suggests four stages of te reo Māori proficiency, beginner, lower intermediate, upper intermediate and advanced. Data in answering the first research question were ascertained from observing nine teachers working with children, their spoken te reo Māori was documented. Due to the very low level of te reo Māori used it was necessary to include a novice stage. It could be concluded that four teachers were at novice stage, speaking small, repetitive levels of te reo Māori, four teachers were at

beginner stage, and one teacher was at upper intermediate stage, speaking te reo Māori and English equally (See Table 4.1).

### 5.3 Implications of this Research

The implications of teachers speaking te reo Māori to children, arose from the data gathered throughout seven semi-structured interviews, and two interviews via email. It is important to recognise that the sample of teachers in this research is small and may not be indicative of the early childhood education sector.

The data was transcribed and analysed to identify similarities and differences within the transcripts. Barriers that were identified were discussed in Chapter four along with possible solutions. What was unexpected amongst these barriers to speaking te reo Māori, was the confusion surrounding the term bicultural, whereby some teachers had collapsed the meaning with that of multiculturalism. Teachers clearly struggled to interpret and implement the bicultural imperatives of *Te Whāriki* believing the government has continually failed to inform them on how to meet their legislative obligations.

Strong bicultural leadership within early childhood centres was considered pivotal if teaching staff were to engage in bicultural development, and speak te reo Māori to children. The lack of professional development in supporting teachers to do so, was also a concern. Collectively, teachers agreed this has resulted in their lacking the confidence and ability to speak te reo Māori to children. Personal considerations from teachers' own background and education left some teachers with a deficit perspective of Māori. This impeded both their speaking te reo Māori and willingness to engage in bicultural development.

Findings of this research suggests that if qualified teachers, and student teachers in training are to speak te reo Māori with children, institutional support from both the Ministry of Education and the Tertiary Education Commission is needed.

#### 5.4 Potential Solutions

Significantly, the solutions aimed at addressing the aforementioned implications could potentially derive from ongoing and relevant professional development from the Ministry of Education. It was within this forum that facilitators with sound knowledge of te reo Māori me ngā tikanga could facilitate a bicultural foundation for teachers. Following on from this, it is suggested (Jenkin, 2009) that teachers adopting a team approach toward speaking te reo Māori to children is also pivotal. In addressing teacher training programmes it was strongly suggested that tertiary education providers prioritise addressing and improving their bicultural responsibilities as outlined in the *Tertiary Education Strategy 2014-2019* (Ministry of Education, 2014b).

##### **The Ministry of Education**

There is much literature highlighting the lack of bicultural support the Ministry of Education provides to early childhood education teachers (Sheriff, 2010; Stucki, 2010). In view of this, and the findings in my research, it would seem little has been done to improve the status quo. Consequently, I argue that the Ministry of Education must make available Mātauranga Māori professional development for early childhood teachers. Given that facilitators of Mātauranga Māori are experienced in te reo Māori me ngā tikanga, they can validate the role of Māori as tangata whenua and Crown partners in Te Tiriti o Waitangi (Ministry of Education, 2014b). This knowledge can potentially support teachers to accurately interpret the bicultural curriculum within the context of *Te Whāriki* and increase the likelihood of engagement in bicultural development. While Dweck (2006) considers one's negative beliefs are difficult to



change, it is irresponsible not to try. Facilitators demystifying inaccuracies concerning the colonisation of Aotearoa New Zealand, and the societal stigma of Māori that followed, are at least laying the foundation for all teachers to speak te reo Māori with children.

Another key point identified is the need for the Ministry of Education to review their role in evaluating and reporting on the current bicultural practises within an early childhood centre. Having personally viewed Education Review Office report inaccuracies, the Ministry of Education should allow more time to thoroughly investigate the level of bicultural practises at each centre. This would increase the likelihood of representatives reporting accurately. Report inaccuracies have long-term implications on whānau Māori who have selected a centre based on the aspirations they hold for their child/dren. In fact, it could be said that the Ministry of Education are breaching their own legislation and commitment to protecting and sustaining te reo Māori me ngā tikanga

### **The Tertiary Education Sector**

My focus now shifts to tertiary institutions, whom the majority of teachers in this research described as having done little to encourage bicultural practises, in addition to preparing them to meet their professional obligations toward Māori. Tertiary education agents must meet Crown mandates (Ministry of Education, 2010c). The Tertiary Education Strategy 2014–2019 states:

A key aspiration of Māori is that Māori knowledge, te reo Māori, Māori ways of doing and knowing things – in essence, Māori ways of being – are validated across the tertiary education sector, whilst also recognising the specific responsibility that tertiary education has to contribute to the achievement of Māori aspirations and development. (Ministry of Education, 2014b, p. 7)

Current teacher education programmes must teach conventional aspects of the early childhood education sector. In addition to this, I argue that they should *emphasise* the role of Māori as tangata whenua and Crown partners under Te Tiriti o Waitangi (Ministry of Education, 2014b). Graduate teachers need to demonstrate their commitment and obligation to promote te reo Māori me ngā tikanga and speak te reo Māori with children (Waitangi Tribunal, 1986). Drawing on the findings in Chapter four, I argue that my tertiary institution lacked staff with the aptitude to competently instruct students in te reo Māori me ngā tikanga once qualified. In fact, in 2010, Jenkin pointed out that the majority of tertiary teacher educators are not fluent in te reo Māori, so improving the role modelling of effective practice was unlikely. Indeed five years later, this could still be the case.

## 5.5 Contribution and Strengths Research

I believe the contribution of this research was identifying teacher misinterpretation of the term bicultural, within the context of *Te Whāriki*. Generally speaking, teachers considered multicultural a comparative term. Evidence would suggest that this misinterpretation resulted in teachers discounting bicultural practises, which includes speaking te reo Māori to children. Rather, teachers engaged in multicultural practises, firm in their belief that accommodating the ethnicities of all children equally was fundamental to bicultural practice. Such was their misperception that teachers were willingly disregarding Māori and their professional obligations.

One strength of this research is that it adds to the small body of literature concerning early childhood teachers' bicultural development and their speaking te reo Māori to children. It could potentially result in teachers reflecting upon, and improving, their bicultural practises whereby they speak more te reo Māori to children. In doing so, this

research could strengthen the relationship between Māori and the early childhood education sector.

It is fair to say that research intent on revitalising and strengthening te reo Māori has the potential to strengthen the circumstances of Māori, not only for present generations, but generations of Māori to follow. Ironically, my journey in completing this thesis required me to suspend my own lessons in te reo Māori. This paradox was indicative of navigating life with challenges of family. Correcting the deficit view of Māori taught to me throughout my own education journey now has me acknowledging the difficulties faced by my ancestors. These reflections may be useful for other Māori researchers on a similar journey.

The significance of regenerating te reo Māori me nga tikanga for our people is a given and I am resuming lessons in the coming year. This research has enhanced my personal growth as Māori with my perspective changing considerably from the viewpoint expressed in Chapter one. I now consider being Māori is of paramount importance to me despite not growing up with Māori tikanga and te reo. Again, this research journey and my immersion within the framework of kaupapa Māori for the past few years has re-positioned my thinking, and I now identify the significance and validity of whanaungatanga. My hope moving forward is to build on this.

## 5.6 Challenges of this Research

When I was teaching in the early childhood education sector, discussions with whānau Māori revealed their concerns at the lack of spoken te reo Māori from teachers to their children. Despite passing this on to teaching colleagues, there was little improvement and this disconnection resulted in Māori reluctance to engage with my colleagues, and actively participate in their children's learning. Such experiences have led me to the

beliefs I have today, that early childhood education teachers must understand the commitment to honour their legal obligation to Te Tiriti o Waitangi. One of these is to protect and sustain te reo Māori language and therefore, speak te reo Māori to children. It was only through sharing my concerns with both my Kaumātua and research supervisor that my challenges and biases could be circumnavigated through the framework of kaupapa Māori research. Such discussions draw my attention to the fact that I had a responsibility toward all those involved in this research process, and for whom the research was about. The principles of kaupapa Māori research reinforced my obligation to respect and validate the differing world views held by others. With this in mind, tino rangatiratanga, whanaungatanga and manaakitanga ensured my engagement with others remained respectful, despite my biases. At no time did this negate my own aspirations which are to have early childhood teachers speaking te reo Māori to children.

A further challenge encountered in this research was securing teacher participation. Throughout the recruitment process eleven centres declined due to management concerns that teaching staff would be judged on their bicultural competency. This was time consuming and the results of this delay, impacted on the research journey. In hindsight, I was always trying to recoup the lost time, and this was never realised. More importantly though, the inclusion of additional participants would have contributed greatly to the depth of knowledge and experiences shared by those who did participate.

Another challenge was navigating a request by two teachers to forgo the interview process due to work and personal commitments. Again, drawing upon the principles of kaupapa Māori research, I willingly accommodated their requests. Consequently, they engaged in interviews via email. It is fair to say that while their responses were highly appreciated and valued, this change in the data collection method impacted on the

knowledge and stories that were shared and meant I was unable to probe for deeper understandings.

## 5.7 Recommendations and Future Research

It is important to recognise that this research has not investigated the bicultural aspects of teacher training programmes currently offered by tertiary institutions; rather the information has arisen from participants' critique of their own education provider. Indeed further research is recommended to identify the viability of teacher education programmes equipping students with the skills necessary to meet their professional obligations concerning Māori as tangata whenua which include their speaking te reo Māori with children.

Specifically, deeper analysis of the cultural, contextual, and legislative knowledge of programmes is necessary so teachers recognise the role of Māori as tangata whenua as governed by Te Tiriti o Waitangi. Programmes need to enable teachers to be competent in working alongside whānau Māori and promoting the aspirations they hold for their children (Kane, 2005). The revitalisation of te reo Māori me ngā tikanga is fundamental and programmes should reflect this with teachers having the skills and confidence to speak te reo Māori with children.

Teachers have been struggling to implement the bicultural imperatives of *Te Whāriki* since 1996 and previous research (Jenkin, 2009, 2010, 2011, 2012; Ritchie, 2002, 2003b; Ritchie & Rau, 2006) has highlighted this. Further research should, therefore investigate what is still missing that would have teachers able to effectively implement the bicultural imperatives of *Te Whāriki*. It is this aspect that will form the investigations for my doctoral research, starting with considering the place of

accountability, both internal from the teachers and external such as management, tertiary providers, and the Ministry of Education in particular ERO.

## 5.8 Concluding Comments

This research aligned with the bicultural orientation and vision of the early childhood curriculum *Te Whāriki*, and investigated the level of te reo Māori that was spoken by early childhood teachers to children within their centre. In doing so, the mandate imposed upon teachers to speak te reo Māori with children, and the viability of them achieving this, was considered. Findings showed that teachers are speaking te reo Māori to children, albeit at varying levels. The barriers considered to impede teachers speaking te reo Māori, such as confusion between biculturalism and multiculturalism, challenges with implementation, the place of leadership, teachers' personal considerations, and the importance of provision by tertiary institutions and the Ministry of Education, were identified and solutions to potentially address these were suggested. Those within the Ministry of Education and tertiary education sector have a pivotal role to play in ensuring regeneration of te reo Māori me ngā tikanga and biculturally equitable learning for Māori within Aotearoa New Zealand.

It is my hope that this thesis has emphasised that te reo Māori is the very soul of Māori people. Embedded within tikanga Māori, the language was sustained through everyday use however, the colonisation of Aotearoa New Zealand would forever change this, and the lives of Māori people. Generations of Māori have passed away and so has the medium by which tikanga Māori has shared the knowledge and language from one generation to the next. Despite having te reo Māori acknowledged as one of the official languages of Aotearoa New Zealand the amount that this is happening is currently insufficient to make Aotearoa New Zealand a truly bicultural country.

Current legislation is aimed at protecting and sustaining te reo Māori, however, the regeneration process is long and dependent upon many variable factors. The challenge I set for both the Ministry of Education and tertiary education sector is to consider the suggestions in this thesis. They are aimed at supporting bicultural development toward proficiency in, and use of, te reo Māori for both qualified teachers and teachers in training. Tertiary institutions should be graduating truly bicultural teachers whom recognise the significance of, while having the ability to, speak te reo Māori to children. This could begin, changing the deficit theories of Māori that are embedded within the everyday language of many New Zealanders. Such changes cannot happen overnight, however, they have to begin somewhere. The most appropriate place is with teaching our youngest generation the significance of tikanga Māori and spoken te reo Māori.

## References

- Alvestad, M., Duncan, J., & Berge, A. (2009). New Zealand ece teachers talk about Te Whāriki. *New Zealand Journal of Teachers' Work*, 6(1), 3-19.
- Banks, J. A. (2006). Improving race relations in schools: From theory and research to practice. *Journal of Social Issues*, 62(3), 607-614.
- Banister, P., Bunn, G., Burman, E., Daniels, J., Duckett, P., Goodley, D., & Whelan, P. (2011). *Qualitative methods in psychology: A research guide* (2nd ed.). London, England: McGraw Hill
- Barlow, C. (1991). *Tikanga Whakaaro: Key concepts in Māori culture*. Auckland, New Zealand: Oxford University Press.
- Barnes, H. (2000). Kaupapa Māori: Explaining the ordinary. *Pacific Health Dialog*, 7(1), 13–16.
- Barrett, M., & Connolly-Stone, K. (1998). The Treaty of Waitangi and social policy. *Social Policy Journal of New Zealand*, 11, 29-47.
- Barrington, J. (2008). *Separate but equal? Māori schools and the Crown 1867-1969*. Wellington, New Zealand: Victoria University Press.
- Barrington, J. M., & Beaglehole, T. H. (1974). *Māori schools in a changing society: An historical review*. Wellington, New Zealand: New Zealand Council for Educational Review.
- Bellm, D., Gomby, D., Kipnis, F., Sakai, L., & Whitebook, M. (2009). *Preparing teachers of young children: The current state of knowledge and a blueprint for the future. (Part I)*. Berkeley, CA: University of California.
- Berryman, M. (2008). Te kotahitanga: Kaupapa Māori in mainstream classrooms. In N. Denzin, Y. Lincoln, & L. Smith (Eds.), *Handbook of critical and indigenous methodologies* (pp. 285-458). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.



- Berryman, M., Kerr, K., Macfarlane, A., Penetito, W., & Smith, G. (2013). *Education for Māori: Implementing ka hikitia: Managing for success*. Wellington, New Zealand: Office of the Auditor-General.
- Bishop, R. (1994). *Collaborative stories: Addressing kaupapa Māori research issues*. Paper presented at the New Zealand Association for Research in Education Conference, Christchurch, New Zealand.
- Bishop, R. (1996). *Collaborative research stories: Whakawhanaungatanga*. Palmerston North, New Zealand: Dunmore Press.
- Bishop, R. (1997). Maori people's concern about research into their lives. *History of Education Review*, 26(1), 25-40.
- Bishop, R. (1998) Freeing ourselves from neo-colonial domination in research: A Māori approach to creating knowledge. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, 11(2), 199-219.
- Bishop, R. (1999). Kaupapa Māori research: An indigenous approach to creating knowledge. In N. Robertson (Ed.), *Māori and psychology: Research and practice* (pp.1-6). Hamilton, New Zealand: University of Waikato.
- Bishop, R., Berryman, M., Cavanagh, T., & Teddy, L. (2009). *Te Kotahitanga: Addressing educational disparities facing Maori students in New Zealand*. Retrieved from <http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.577.7337&rep=rep1&type=pdf>
- Bishop, R. & Glynn, T. (1992). He kanohi kitea: Conducting and evaluating educational research. *New Zealand Journal of Education Studies*, 27(2), 3-13.
- Bishop, R., & Glynn, T. (1999). *Culture counts: Changing power relations in education*. Palmerston North, New Zealand: Dunmore Press Limited.
- Bishop, R. & Glynn, T. (2000). Kaupapa Māori messages for the mainstream. *Research Information for Teachers*, 1, 4-7.
- Blaiklock, K. (2013). *Yes, we do need evidence to show whether Te Whāriki is effective: A reply to Anne Smith's discussion paper, Does Te Whāriki need evidence to show it is effective?* Retrieved from <http://unitec.researchbank.ac.nz>

- Booth, J. M., & Hunn, J. K. (1962). *Integration of Māori and Pākehā* (Special Studies No. 1). Wellington, New Zealand: Department of Māori Affairs.
- Bristowe, J. (2009). *Indigenising the screen: Screenplay and critical analysis for the prophet*. (Unpublished master's thesis). University of Waikato, Hamilton, New Zealand.
- Brown, R. (2014, July, 23). *Te reo Māori in schools let's just start*. Retrieved from <http://publicaddress.net/hardnews/te-reo-maori-in-schools-lets-just-start/>
- Bryman, A. (2012). *Social research methods*. (4<sup>th</sup> ed.). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Bushouse, B. K. (2008). *Early childhood education policy in Aotearoa New Zealand: The creation of the 20 Hours free programme*. Wellington, New Zealand: Fulbright New Zealand.
- Calman, R. (2015). *Māori education the native schools system, 1867 to 1969*. Retrieved from <http://www.TeAra.govt.nz/en/Māori-education-Mātauranga/>
- Cameron, M. & Baker, R. (2004). *Research on initial teacher education in New Zealand: 1993-2004: Literature review and annotated bibliography*. Ministry of Education and New Zealand Teachers Council, Wellington, New Zealand.
- Cardno, C. (2003). *Action research: A developmental approach*. Wellington, New Zealand: Council for Educational Research.
- Carey, E. (1997). I dance for me. In A. Garrod, & C. Larrimore, (Eds.), *First person, first peoples: Native American college graduates tell their life stories* (pp. 115-135). Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Carr, M., & May, H. (1993). Celebrating te whāriki. In NZEI Te Riu Roa (Eds.), *Early childhood education: Papers presented at the CECUA National Curriculum Conference* (pp. 10-19). Wellington, New Zealand: NZEI Te Riu Roa.
- Carroll, P., Casswell, S., Huakau, J., Howden-Chapman, P., & Perry, P. (2011). The widening gap: Perceptions of poverty and income inequalities and implications for health and social outcomes. *Social Policy Journal of New Zealand* 37, 1-12.

- Chan, A. (2011). Critical multiculturalism: Supporting early childhood teachers to work with diverse immigrant families. *International Research in Early Childhood Education*, 2(1), 63-75.
- Charmaz, K. (2006). *Constructing grounded theory: A practical guide through qualitative analysis*. London, England: Sage Publications.
- Chauvel, F., & Rean, J. (2012). *Doing better for Māori in tertiary settings: Review of the literature*. Wellington, New Zealand: Tertiary Education Commission.
- Clark, B. (2005). *Private speech: A window into the self-talk of kindergarten children from diverse language backgrounds* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of Auckland, Auckland, New Zealand.
- Cleary, J. (2007). *Outrageous fortune: Capital and culture in modern Ireland*. Dublin, Ireland: Field Day Publications.
- Cloher, D.U & Hohepa, M. (1996). Te tu a te kōhanga reo i waenga i te whānau me te tikanga poipoi tamariki: Māori families child socialisation and the role of the kōhanga reo. *He pukenga reo*. 1(2), 33-41.
- Cochran, M. (2007). *Finding our way: The future of American early care and education*. Washington, DC: Zero to Three.
- Codd, J. (2005). Politics and policy making in education. In P. Adams, K. Vossier, & C, Scrivens (Eds.), *Teachers work in Aotearoa New Zealand* (pp. 28-38). Victoria, Australia: Thomson Dunmore.
- Colbung, M., Glover, A., Rau, C., & Ritchie, J. (2007). Indigenous peoples and perspectives in early childhood education. In H. Hedges & L. Keesing-Styles (Eds.), *Theorising early childhood practice: Emerging dialogues* (pp. 137–161). Sydney, Australia: Pademelon.
- Cooper, G., Arago-Kemp, V., Wylie, C. & Hogen, E. (2004). *Te rerenga ā te Pīrere: A longitudinal study of kōhanga reo and kura kaupapa Māori students*. (Phase I report). Wellington, New Zealand: New Zealand Council for Educational Research.
- Cram, F. (2001). Rangahau Māori : Tōna tika, tōna pono. In M. Tolich (Ed.), *Research ethics in Aotearoa* (pp.35-52). Auckland, New Zealand: Longman Publishing Ltd.

- Cram, F. (2003). *Preliminary discussions with Māori key informants*. Paper prepared for NEAC: The National Ethics Advisory Committee. Wellington, New Zealand: Katoa Ltd.
- Cram, F. (2009). Maintaining indigenous voices. In D. Mertens & P. Ginsberg (Eds.), *Handbook of social science research ethics* (pp. 308–322). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.
- Cram, F. (2013). *He rangahau kaupapa Māori: A guide to undertaking a kaupapa Māori research project*. Auckland, New Zealand: Katoa Ltd.
- Cram, F., Philips, H., Sauni, P., & Tuagalu, C. (2014). *Māori and Pasifika higher education horizons*. Bingley, United Kingdom: Emerald Group Publishing.
- Cullen, J. (1996). The challenge of te whāriki for future developments in early childhood education. *Delta*, 48 (1), 113-126.
- Cullen, J. (2003). The challenge of te whāriki: Catalyst for change? In J. Nuttall (Ed.), *Weaving te whāriki Aotearoa New Zealand's early childhood curriculum document in theory and in practice* (pp. 55-57). Wellington, New Zealand: Council for Educational Research.
- Culpitt, I. (1994). Bicultural fragments A Pākehā perspective. *Social Policy Journal of New Zealand*, 2(7), 48-62.
- Cunningham, C. (2000). A framework for addressing Māori knowledge in research, science and technology. *Pacific Health Dialog*, 7(1), 62-69.
- Cushner, K. (2009). *International perspectives on intercultural education*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Dalli, C. (2008). Pedagogy, knowledge and collaboration: Towards a ground-up perspective on professionalism. *European Early Childhood Education Research Journal*, 16(2), 171-185.
- Davidman, L., & Davidman, P.T. (1997). *Teaching with a multicultural perspective: A practical guide* (2nd ed.). New York, NY: Longman Publishing.
- Davis, K., Gunn, A., Purdue, K., & Smith, K. (2007). Forging ahead: Moving towards inclusive and anti-discriminatory education. In L. Keesing-Styles & H. Hedges (Eds.), *Theorising*

- early childhood practice: Emerging dialogues* (pp. 99-116). New South Wales, Australia: Pademelon Press.
- DeMunck, V. & Sobo, E. (1998). *Using methods in the field: A practical introduction and casebook*. Walnut Creek, CA: AltaMira Press.
- Dixon, R., Widdowson, D., Meagher-Lundberg, P., McMurchy-Pilkington, A., & McMurchy-Pilkington, C. (2007). *Evaluation of promoting early childhood education (ECE) participation project* (Report to the Ministry of Education). Wellington, New Zealand: Ministry of Education.
- Durie, M. (1997). Te aka matua: Keeping a Māori identity. In: P. Te Whairi, M. McCarthy, & M. Durie (Eds.), *Mai i rangiatea: Māori wellbeing and development* (pp. 46-59). Auckland, New Zealand: Auckland University Press with Bridget Williams Books.
- Durie, M. (1998). *Te mana, te kawanatanga: The politics of Māori self-determination*. Auckland, New Zealand: Oxford University Press.
- Durie, M. (2003). *Ngā kāhui pou: Launching Māori futures*. Wellington, New Zealand: Huia Publishers.
- Dweck, C. (2006). *Mindset: The new psychology of success*. New York, NY: Random House.
- Dyck, I., & Kearns, R. (1995). Transforming the relations of research: Towards culturally safe geographies of health and healing. *Health and Place*, 1(3), 137-147.
- Earle, D. (2009). *Labour market outcomes of skills and qualifications* (Tertiary education occasional paper 2010/05). Wellington: Ministry of Education.
- Education Council New Zealand. (n.d). *Practicing teacher criteria*. Retrieved from <http://www.educationcouncil.org.nz/content/registered-Teacher-criteria>
- Education Review Office. (n.d). Retrieved from <http://www.ero.govt.nz>
- Ellis, R. (2008). *The study of second language acquisition* (2nd ed.). Oxford, United Kingdom: Oxford University Press.
- Fishman, J.A. (1991). *Reversing language shift*. Clevedon, United Kingdom: Multilingual Matters.

- Fishman, J.A. (2001). *Can threatened languages be saved? Reversing language shift, revisited: A 21st century perspective*. Clevedon, United Kingdom: Multilingual Matters.
- Flicker, S., & Worthington, C. A. (2011). Public health research involving aboriginal peoples: Research ethics board stakeholder's reflections on ethics principles and research processes. *Canadian Journal of Public Health*, 103(1), 19-22.
- Fournier, S. & Crey, E. (1997). *Stolen from our embrace*. Vancouver, Canada: Douglas & McIntyre.
- Gadd, B. (1976). *Cultural differences in the classroom: The special needs of Māori in Pākehā schools*. Auckland, New Zealand: Heinemann Educational.
- Galavotti, M. (2003). *Observation and experimentation in the natural and social sciences*. Boston, MA: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Genesee, F., & Cloud, N. (1998). Multilingualism is basic. *Educational Leadership*, 55(6), 62–65.
- Gibbs, M. (2001). Toward a strategy for undertaking cross-cultural collaborative research. *Society and Natural Resources*, 14, 673-687.
- Gomm, R. (2004). *Social research methodology: A critical introduction*. Hampshire, England: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Gorinski, R., & Fraser, F. (2006). *Literature review on the effective engagement of Pasifika parents and communities in education* (Report to the Ministry of Education). Wellington, New Zealand: Ministry of Education.
- Graham, B. (2000). *The research interview*. New York, NY: Continuum.
- Grieshaber, S., & Cannella, G. S. (Eds.). (2001). *Embracing identities in early childhood education: Diversity and possibilities*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
- Harmsworth, G. (2005). *Good practice guidelines for working with tangata whenua and Māori organisations: Consolidating our learning*. (LC0405/091 Report). Palmerston North, New Zealand: Landcare Research New Zealand Ltd.
- Hemara, M. (2000). *Māori pedagogies: A view from the literature*. Wellington, New Zealand: New Zealand Council for Educational Research.

- Henare, M. (1998). *Te tangata, te taonga, te hau: Māori concepts of property*. Paper presented at the Conference on Property and the Constitution, Wellington for the Laws and Institutions in a Bicultural Society Research Project, Waikato, New Zealand.
- Heta-Lensen, Y. (2005). *Ko te whānau te kupenga o te mātauranga: Kaupapa whānau approaches in mainstream educational management*. (Unpublished master's thesis). Unitec Institute of Technology, Auckland, New Zealand.
- Higgins, R. (2014). *The value of the Māori language: Te hua o te reo Māori*. Wellington, New Zealand: Huia Publishers.
- Higgins R & Keane B. (2013) *Te reo Māori: Revitalising te reo 1970s and 1980s*. Retrieved from <http://www.TeAra.govt.nz/en/te-reo-Māori-the-Māori-language/page-5>
- Hokowhitu, B. (2004). Physical beings: Sport and the physical education of New Zealand Māori. In J. A. Mangan & A. Ritchie (Eds.), *Ethnicity, sport, identity: Struggles for status* (pp.192-218). London, England: Frank Cass Publishers.
- Hook, G. (2007). A future for Māori education Part II: The reintegration of culture and education. *MAI Review*, 1, 1-17.
- Hook, G. (2010). A national Māori university. *MAI Review*, 2, 1-16.
- Howe, K. (2003). *The quest for origins*. Auckland, New Zealand: Penguin.
- Hudson, M., Milne, M., Reynolds, P., Russell, K., & Smith, B. (2010). *Te ara tika. Guidelines for Māori research ethics: A framework for researchers and ethics committee members*. Auckland, New Zealand: Health Research Council of New Zealand.
- Hunn, J. K. (1961). *Report on department of Māori affairs*. Wellington, New Zealand: Government Printer.
- Hunzicker, J. (2011). Effective professional development for teachers: A checklist. *Professional Development in Education*, 37(2), 177-179.
- Irwin, K. (1991). Māori education in 1991: A review and discussion. *New Zealand Annual Review of Education* (pp. 77-112). Wellington, New Zealand: Victoria University of Wellington.

- Isenberg, J. P., & Jalongo, M. R. (2009). *Creative thinking and arts-based learning: Preschool through fourth grade*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson.
- Jackson, M. (1996). Māori research and Te Tiriti o Waitangi. In Hui Whakapiripiri: *A hui to discuss strategic directions for Māori health research* (pp. 8–11). Wellington, New Zealand: Te Ropū Rangahau Hauora a Eru Pomare.
- Jackson, M. (1988). *The Māori and the criminal justice system: A new perspective: He whaipanga hou*. (Part 2). Wellington, New Zealand: Department of Justice.
- Jahnke H. & Taiapa, J. (2003). Māori research. In C. Davidson & M. Tolich (Eds.), *Social science research in New Zealand: Many paths to understanding* (pp. 39-50). Auckland, New Zealand: Longman Publishing.
- Jenkin, C. (2009). Bicultural meanings: What do practitioners say? *New Zealand Research in Early Childhood Education*, 12, 95-108.
- Jenkin, C. (2010). *Supporting tiriti-based curriculum delivery in mainstream early childhood education* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Auckland University of Technology, Auckland, New Zealand.
- Jenkin, C. (2011). Who will inspire the team? Leadership for bicultural development. *Journal of Educational Policy and Practice*, 26(2), 48-61.
- Jenkin, C. J. (2012). Supporting tiriti-based curriculum delivery in mainstream early childhood education. In J. Hansen, & B. Hagan (Eds.), *Fresh provocations: Rethinking practices in early childhood education* (pp. 9-26). Auckland, New Zealand.
- Jenkins, K., & Matthews, K. (1988). Knowing their place: The political socialisation of Māori women in New Zealand through schooling policy and practice 1867-1969. *Women's History Review*, 7(1), 85-105.
- Jellie, M. (2001). *The formation of Pākehā identity in relation to te reo Māori and te ao Māori* (Unpublished master's thesis). University of Canterbury, Christchurch, New Zealand.
- Johnson, D. & Houia, W. (2005). The Māori language curriculum for mainstream New Zealand schools: Spiral lesson: Lesson sequence design. *Journal of Māori and Pacific Development*, 6(2), 42-66.



- Jones, K.L. (2015). *Partial immersion te reo Māori education: An investigative study about the forgotten other of Māori education* (Unpublished master's thesis). University of Canterbury, Christchurch, New Zealand.
- Ka'ai-Mahuta, R. (2011). The impact of colonisation on te reo Māori: A critical review of the state education system. *Te Kaharoa*, 4(1), 196-225.
- Ka'ai, T.M., Moorfield, J.C., Reilly, M.J.P., & Mosely, S. (2004). *Ki te whaiiao: An introduction to Māori culture and society*. Auckland, New Zealand: Pearson Education.
- Kane, R. (2005). Initial teacher education policy and practice: Final Report. Wellington, New Zealand: New Zealand Teachers Council, Ministry of Education. Retrieved from <http://www.teacherscouncil.govt.nz/sites/default/files/itepolicyandpractice>.
- Kaplan, R.B. & Baldauf, R.B. Jr. (1997). *Language planning from practice to theory*. Clevedon, United Kingdom: Multilingual Matters.
- Kawharu, M. (2014). *Maranga mai te reo and marae in crisis?* Auckland, New Zealand: Auckland University Press.
- Koopmans, R., Statham, M., Giugni, M, & Passy, F. (2005). *Contested citizenship, immigration and cultural diversity in Europe: Social movements, protest, and contention*. Minneapolis, University of Minnesota Press.
- King, M. (2007). *The penguin history of New Zealand illustrated*. Auckland, New Zealand: Penguin.
- Kruger, T., Pitman, M., Grennell, D., McDonald, T., Mariu, D., Pomare, A., Lawson-Te Aho, K. (2004). *Transforming whānau violence: A conceptual framework*. Wellington, New Zealand: Te Puni Kokiri: Second Māori Taskforce on Whānau Violence.
- Lee, J. (2005). *Cultural sustainability: Māori teachers in mainstream schools*. Paper presented at The International Diversity Conference, Beijing, China.
- Lee, G., & Lee, H. (2007). Schooling in New Zealand. In G. Campbell & G. Sherington (Eds.), *Going to school in Oceania* (pp. 133-192). Westport, CT: Greenwood Publishing Group.

- McCarthy, C. (1998). *The uses of culture: Education and the limits of ethnic affiliation*. London, England: Routledge.
- McCauley, C. D. (2008). *Leader development: A review of research*. Greensboro, NC: Center for Creative Leadership.
- McIntosh, T., & Mulholland, M. (Eds.). (2011). *Māori and social issues*. Wellington, New Zealand: Huia Publishers.
- Macdonald, J. (2011). *A collaborative exploration of ako Māori and its impact on Māori learners in legal studies* (Unpublished master's thesis). Victoria University of Wellington, Wellington, New Zealand.
- Mahuika, R. (2008). Kaupapa Māori theory is critical and anti-colonial, *MAI Review*, 3(4), 1-16.
- Mallinson, C., Childs, B., & Van Herk, G. (2013). *Data collection in sociolinguistics: Methods and applications*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Manning, R. (2000). History never repeats itself? Colonial historical trends confront national administrative guidelines. *New Zealand Annual Review of Education*, 9, 63-81.
- Marriott, L., & Sim, D. (2014). *Indicators of inequality for Māori and pacific people* (Working Paper 09/2014). Wellington, New Zealand: Victoria University of Wellington.
- Marsden, M. (2003). God, man and the universe. In Royal, T.A.C. (Ed.), *The woven universe: Selected writings of Rev. Māori Marsden* (pp.2-23). Masterton, New Zealand: The estate of Rev. Māori Marsden.
- Marshall, J., Baldwin, K., & Peach, R. (2008). *Good practice examples of Māori and Pasifika private training establishments*. Paper presented at the New Zealand Association for Research in Education Conference, Palmerston North, New Zealand.
- Matahaere-Atariki, D. (2000). *Māori children in the next five years*. Paper presented at the Seminar on Children's Policy, Wellington, New Zealand.
- Matamua, R. (2006). *Te reo pāho: Māori radio and language revitalisation* (Unpublished doctoral thesis). Massey University, Palmerston North, New Zealand.

- May, H. (2001). *Politics in the playground: The world of early childhood in post-war New Zealand*. Wellington, New Zealand: Bridget Williams Books with the New Zealand Council for Educational Research.
- May, H (2002). Early childhood care and education in Aotearoa New Zealand: An overview of history, policy and curriculum, *McGill Journal of Education*, 37(1), 19-36.
- May, H. (2010). Reframing some windows on early childhood education: An unlikely career. In J. Kidman & K. Stevens (Eds.). *Looking back from the centre: A snapshot of contemporary New Zealand education* (pp.139-160). Wellington, New Zealand: Victoria University Press.
- May, H., & Carr, M. (1996). *The ideals and realities of the implementation of the New Zealand national early childhood curriculum*. Paper presented at the Weaving Webs Conference, Melbourne, Australia.
- May, H., & Mitchell, L. (2009). Strengthening community-based early childhood education in Aotearoa New Zealand. Report of the Quality Public Early Childhood Education Project. Wellington, New Zealand: NZEI Te Riu Roa.
- May, S. (1999). *Indigenous community based education*. Toronto, Canada: Multilingual Matters.
- May, S. (2012). *Language and minority rights: Ethnicity nationalism and the politics of language*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Mead, H. (1997). *Landmarks, bridges and visions: Aspects of Māori culture*. Wellington, New Zealand: Victoria University Press.
- Mead, H. (2003). *Tikanga Māori: Living by Māori values*. Wellington, New Zealand: Huia Publishers.
- Merritt, A. (2015). *Why learn a foreign language? Benefits of bilingualism*. Retrieved from <http://www.telegraph.co.uk/education/educationopinion/10126883/Why-learn-a-foreign-language-Benefits-of-bilingualism.html>
- Metge, J. (1980). *The Māoris of New Zealand: Rautahi*. London, England: Routledge & Kegan Paul Books

- Metge, J. (1984). *He tikanga Māori: Learning and teaching*. Wellington, New Zealand: Department of Education.
- Metge, J. (1990). *Te kohao o te ngira: Culture and learning*. Wellington, New Zealand: Learning Media.
- Metge, J. (1995). *New growth from old: The whānau in the modern world*. Wellington, New Zealand: Victoria University Press.
- Mihaka, R. (2008). *Te reo Māori can be easily learned through waiata tamariki*. Retrieved from <https://akoaoTearoa.ac.nz/download/ng/file/group-3300/Te-reo-mori-can-be-easily-learned-through-waiata-tamariki.pdf>
- Ministry of Culture & Heritage. (2015). *History of the Māori language*. Retrieved from <http://www.nzhistory.net.nz/culture/māori-language-week/history-of-the-māori-language>
- Ministry of Education (n.d). *Teachers in early childhood education*. Retrieved from [https://www.educationcounts.govt.nz/\\_data/assets/pdf\\_file/0013/54202/Teachers-in-early-childhood-education-20140314.pdf](https://www.educationcounts.govt.nz/_data/assets/pdf_file/0013/54202/Teachers-in-early-childhood-education-20140314.pdf)
- Ministry of Education. (1996). *Te whāriki: He whāriki mātauranga mo ngā mokopuno o Aotearoa: early childhood curriculum*. Wellington, New Zealand: Learning Media.
- Ministry of Education. (2002). *Learning languages: A guide for New Zealand schools*. Wellington, New Zealand: Learning Media.
- Ministry of Education (2005) *Kei tua o te pae assessment for learning: Early childhood exemplars*. Wellington, New Zealand: Learning Media.
- Ministry of Education (2008). *Supporting professional development for teachers*. Wellington, New Zealand: Ministry of Education.
- Ministry of Education. (2009). *Te aho arataki marau mō te ako i te reo Māori: Kura auraki curriculum guidelines for teaching and learning te reo Māori in English-medium schools: Years 1-13*. Wellington, New Zealand: Learning Media.
- Ministry of Education. (2010a). *Ngā haeata mātauranga: Annual report on Māori in 2008/09*. Wellington, New Zealand: Author.

Ministry of Education. (2010b). *Easing the transition from primary to secondary schooling: Helpful information for schools to consider* (Research Division). Wellington, New Zealand: Research and Evaluation Unit.

Ministry of Education. (2010c). *Statement of intent 2010/2015*. Wellington, New Zealand: Author.

Ministry of Education. (2013). *Ka Hikitia: Accelerating Success 2013-2017*. Retrieved from <http://www.education.govt.nz/assets/Documents/Ministry/Strategies-and-policies/Ka-Hikitia/KaHikitiaAcceleratingSuccessEnglish.pdf>

Ministry of Education. (2014a). *Annual early childhood education (ECE) census summary report 2014*. Wellington, New Zealand: Ministry of Education.

Ministry of Education. (2014b). *Tertiary education strategy 2014-2019*. Retrieved from <http://www.education.govt.nz/assets/Documents/Further-education/Tertiary-Education-Strategy.pdf>

Ministry of Education. (2015a). *Tau mai te reo: The Māori language in education strategy 2013-2017*. Retrieved from <http://www.education.govt.nz/assets/Documents/Ministry/Strategies-and-policies/TauMaiTeReoFullStrategy-English.pdf>

Ministry of Education. (2015b). *Māori language in education*. Retrieved from <https://www.educationcounts.govt.nz/statistics/māori-education/māori-in-schooling/6040>

Ministry of Education. (2015c). *Graduating teaching standards*. Retrieved from <http://www.educationcouncil.org.nz/conTent/graduating-Teacher-standards>

Ministry of Education. (2015d). *Centre based ece services*. Retrieved from <http://www.lead.ece.govt.nz/ServiceTypes/CentreBasedECEServices.aspx>

Ministry of Education. (2015e). *Biculturalism in te whāriki*. Retrieved from <http://www.educate.ece.govt.nz/learning/exploringPractice/BiculturalPractice/BiculturalismTeWhāriki.aspx>

- Ministry of Health. (2015). *Māori health models: Te whare tapa whā*. Retrieved from <http://www.health.govt.nz/our-work/populations/maori-health/maori-health-models/maori-health-models-te-whare-tapa-wha>
- Ministry of Research, Science and Technology. (2007). *Vision mātauranga: Unlocking the innovation potential of Māori knowledge, resources and people*. Wellington, New Zealand: Author.
- Mitchell, L., & Cubey, P. (2003). *Characteristics of professional development linked to enhanced pedagogy and children's learning in early childhood settings: Best evidence synthesis*. Wellington, New Zealand: Ministry of Education.
- Moorfield, J. (2013). *Te whanake resources*. Retrieved from <http://resources.tewhanake.maori.nz>
- Moorfield, J. (2015). *Māori dictionary*. Retrieved from <http://maoridictionary.co.nz/>
- Morehu, C. (2005). *A Māori perspective of whānau and childrearing in the 21st century* (Unpublished master's thesis). Te Whare Wānanga o Waikato, Hamilton, New Zealand.
- Morehu, T. R., Lolesio, V., Piper, D., & Pomare, S. (2009). Benefits of Māori immersion programme at tertiary level, *MAI Review 1*, 1-7.
- Museum of New Zealand Te Papa Tongarewa. (n.d.). *Missionary Impact*. Retrieved from <http://www.treasure2u.govt.nz/maori-and-the-British/missionary-impact/index.htm>
- Murrow, K., Kalafatelis, E., Fryer, K., Hammond, H., & Edwards, H. (2006). *Te reo Māori in the mainstream professional development (PD) pilot programmes for primary school teachers: An Evaluation*. Wellington: Ministry of Education.
- New Zealand Government. (2014). *Bills digests*. Retrieved from <http://www.parliament.nz/en-nz/pb/legislation/bills/digests/50PLLaw21351/m%C4%81ori-language-te-reo-m%C4%81ori-bill-2014-bills-digest-2135>
- New Zealand Ministry of Justice. (2011). *Te taura whiri i te reo Māori: Māori language commission*. Retrieved from <http://www.justice.govt.nz/publications/global-publications/d/directory-of-official-information-archive/directory-of-official-information-december-2011/alphabetical-list-of-entries-1/t/te-taura-whiri-i-te-reo-Māori>

- Nepe, T. (1991). *E hao nei e tenei reanga: Te toi huarewa tipuna kaupapa Māori : An educational intervention system* (Unpublished master's thesis). University of Auckland, Auckland, New Zealand.
- Nuttall, J. (2003). *Weaving te whāriki Aotearoa New Zealand's early childhood curriculum document in theory and practice*. Wellington, New Zealand: New Zealand Council for Educational Research.
- Nuttall, J., & Edwards, S. (2007). Theory, policy and practice: Three contexts for the development of Australasia's early childhood curriculum documents. In L. Keesing-Style & H. Hedges (Eds.), *Theorising early childhood practice: Emerging dialogues* (pp. 3-22). Castle Hill, NSW: Pademelon Press.
- Oh, M., (2005). *The Treaty of Waitangi principles in he korowai oranga: Māori health strategy: An effective partnership?* (Unpublished master's thesis). University of Auckland, Auckland, New Zealand.
- Orange, C. (2004). *An illustrated history of the Treaty of Waitangi*. Wellington, New Zealand: Bridget Williams Books Ltd.
- O'Sullivan, D. (2007). *Beyond biculturalism: The politics of an indigenous minority*. Wellington, New Zealand: Huia Publishers.
- Paki, V. A. (2007). *Kimihia, rangahaua ngā tikanga heke iho: He taonga huahua e riro mai: Exploring whakapapa as a tool towards a kaupapa Māori assessment framework in early childhood education* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). The University of Waikato, Hamilton, New Zealand.
- Pauls, E. (2015). *Assimilation*. Retrieved from <http://www.britannica.com/topic/assimilation-society>
- Penn State. (2015). *Juggling languages can build better brains*. Retrieved from <http://news.psu.edu/story/160653/2011/02/18/juggling-languages-can-build-better-brains>
- Patton, M. (2015). *Qualitative research & evaluation methods: Integrating theory and practice* (4th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

- Pere, R. (1994). *Ako: Concepts and learning in Māori traditions*. Wellington, New Zealand: National Te Kōhanga Reo Trust.
- Pere, R. R. (1997). *Te wheke: A celebration of infinite wisdom*. Wellington, New Zealand: National Library of New Zealand.
- Perry, B. (2009). *Household incomes in New Zealand: Trends in indicators of inequality and hardship 1982 to 2008*. Wellington, New Zealand: Ministry of Social Development.
- Phillips, H., & Mitchell, M. (2010). *It is all about feeling the aroha: Successful Māori and Pasifika providers* (Report No. 7). Auckland, New Zealand: New Zealand Council for Educational Research.
- Piggot-Irvine, E., Aitken, H., Ritchie, J., Ferguson, B., & McGrath, F. (2009). Induction of newly qualified teachers in New Zealand. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Teacher Education*, 37(2), 175-98.
- Pihama, L. (2001). *Tīhei mauri ora: Honouring our voices* (Doctoral thesis, University of Auckland, Auckland, New Zealand). Retrieved from [http://www.kaupapaMāori.com/assets/PihamaL/tiheimauri\\_ora\\_chpt1.pdf](http://www.kaupapaMāori.com/assets/PihamaL/tiheimauri_ora_chpt1.pdf)
- Pihama, L., Cram, F., & Walker, S. (2002). Creating methodological space: A literature review of kaupapa Māori research. *Canadian Journal of Native Education*, 26, 30-43.
- Pihama, L., Smith, K., Taki, M. & Lee, J. (2004). *A literature review on kaupapa Māori and Māori education pedagogy*. Auckland, New Zealand: International Research Institute for Māori Indigenous Education.
- Rameka, L. (2003). *Cultural values and understandings as quality outcomes for early childhood*. Paper presented at the Reconceptualising Early Childhood Education Conference, Tempe, Arizona.
- Rameka, L. (2012). Whakapapa: Culturally valid assessment in early childhood. *Early Childhood Folio*, 16(2), 33-37.
- Ramsden, I. (2000). *Māori cultural safety in health*. Wellington, New Zealand: Mental Health Foundation of New Zealand.



- Rangitane o Wairarapa Incorporated. (2010). *Basic te reo Māori: Resource for early childhood education centres and primary schools*. Auckland, New Zealand: Author.
- Ratima, M. T., & May, S. (2011). A review of indigenous second language acquisition: Factors leading to proficiency in te reo Māori (the Māori language). *MAI Review 1*, 1-21.
- Rau, C., & Ritchie, J. (2005). From the margins to the centre: Repositioning Maori at the centre of early childhood education in Aotearoa/New Zealand. *International Journal of Equity and Innovation in Early Childhood*, 3(1), 50-60.
- Reedy, T. (1993). *I have a dream*. Paper presented at the Proceedings of the Combined Early Childhood Union of Aotearoa Early Childhood Conference Christchurch, New Zealand.
- Reedy, T. (1994). *Te whāriki*. Paper presented at Teacher's Refresher Course Committee, Palmerston North, New Zealand.
- Reedy, T. (2003). Toku rangatiratanga na te mana-mātauranga: Knowledge and power set me free. In J. G. Nuttall (Ed.), *Weaving te whāriki Aotearoa New Zealand's early childhood curriculum document in theory and practice*. (pp. 51-75). Wellington, New Zealand: New Zealand Council for Educational Research.
- Renton, Z., & Butcher, J. (2010). Securing a sustainable future for children and young people. *Children & Society*, 24, 160–166.
- Reynolds, P. (2004). *Nga puni whakapiri: Indigenous struggle and genetic engineering* (Unpublished doctoral thesis). Simon Fraser University, BC. Canada.
- Rice, G. (1992). *Oxford history of New Zealand* (2nd ed.). Auckland, New Zealand: Oxford University Press.
- Ritchie, J. (2002). *It's becoming part of their knowing: A study of bicultural development in an early childhood teacher education setting in Aotearoa /New Zealand*. (Unpublished doctoral thesis). University of Waikato, Hamilton, New Zealand.
- Ritchie, J. (2003a). Te whāriki as a potential lever for bicultural development. In J. Nuttall (Ed.), *Weaving te whāriki Aotearoa New Zealand's early childhood curriculum document in theory and practice* (pp. 79-109). Wellington, New Zealand: New Zealand Council for Educational Research.

- Ritchie, J. (2003b). Bicultural development within an early childhood teacher education programme. *International Journal of Early Years Education*, 11(1), 43-56.
- Ritchie, J. (2005, May). *It's the controlling still: Power effects in the implementation of the bicultural/ bilingual early childhood curriculum in Aotearoa/New Zealand*. Paper presented at the 1st International Conference on Language and Education, Brazil.
- Ritchie, J. (2008). Honouring Māori subjectivities within early childhood education in Aotearoa. *Contemporary Issues in Early Childhood*, 9(3), 202–210.
- Ritchie, J., & Rau, C. (2006). Enacting a whakawhanaungatanga approach in early childhood education. *Early Childhood Folio*, 10, 16-20.
- Ritchie, J., & Rau, C. (2008). *Te puawaitanga: Partnerships with tamariki and whānau in bicultural early childhood care and education*. Wellington, New Zealand: Teaching and Learning Research Initiatives.
- Ritchie, J., & Rau, C. (2011). Ahakoa he iti: Early childhood pedagogies affirming of Māori children's rights to their culture. *Early Education and Development*, 22(5), 795-817. doi: 10.1080/10409289.2011.596459
- Ridge, T., & Wright, S. (Eds.). (2008). *Understanding inequality, poverty and wealth: policies and prospects*. Bristol, United Kingdom: Policy Press.
- Robinson, V., & Hohepa, M. (2010). *Tu rangatira: Māori medium educational leadership*. Wellington: Ministry of Education.
- Rose S. (2012). Gender violence: Using culture as a resource in the process of decolonisation. *Te Awatea Review: The Journal of Te Awatea Violence* 10(1 & 2), 3-7.
- Royal, P. (2007). *The purpose of education, perspectives arising from mātauranga Māori: A discussion*. Wellington, New Zealand: Ministry of Education.
- Royal-Tangaere, A. (1997). *Learning Māori together kōhanga reo and at home*. Wellington, New Zealand: New Zealand Council for Educational Research.
- Salmond, A. (2003). To the social policy research and evaluation conference. *Social Policy Journal of New Zealand*, 20, 1-5.

- Scheurich, J., & Young, M. (1997). Coloring epistemologies: Are our research epistemologies racially biased? *Educational Researcher*, 26(4), 4-16.
- Sharp, A. (2004). The trajectory of the Waitangi Tribunal. In J. Hayward & N.R. Wheen (Eds), *The Waitangi Tribunal: Te roopu whakamana i Te Tiriti o Waitangi* (pp. 195-206). Wellington, New Zealand: Bridget Williams Books.
- Sheriff, J. (2010). *Investigating factors influencing the retention of Māori students within secondary education in Aotearoa-New Zealand*. (Unpublished master's thesis), Unitec Institute of Technology, Auckland, New Zealand.
- Simon, J. A., & Smith, L. T. (Eds.) (2001). *A civilising mission? Perceptions and representations of the native schools 1867 to 1969*. Chicago, IL: Independent Publishers Group.
- Skerrett, M. (2007) Kia tū heipū: Languages frame, focus and colour our worlds, *Childrenz Issues*, 11(1), 6-14.
- Sleeter, C. E. 1996. *Multicultural education as social activism*. Albany, NY: SUNY Press.
- Smith, A. (2013). *Does te whāriki need evidence to show that it is effective? A discussion paper*. Retrieved from <http://www.listener.co.nz/wp-content/uploads/2014/04/Evidence1.pdf?4f708e>
- Smith, G. H. (1990). *Research issues related to Māori education*. Paper presented to NZARE Special Interest Conference, Palmerston North, New Zealand: Massey University.
- Smith, G. H. (1997). *The development of kaupapa Māori: Theory and praxis*. (Unpublished doctoral thesis). University of Auckland, Auckland, New Zealand.
- Smith, G. H. (2003). *Kaupapa Māori theory: Theorising indigenous transformation of education and schooling*. Paper presented at NZARE/AARE Joint conference, Kaupapa Māori Symposium, Auckland, New Zealand.
- Smith, G. (2012). Interview: Kaupapa Māori: The dangers of domestication. *New Zealand Journal of Educational Studies*, 47(2), 10–20.

- Smith, L.T. (1992). Māori women: Discourses, projects and mana wāhine. In S. Middleton, & A. Jones, (Eds.), *Women and education in Aotearoa* (pp.33-51). Wellington, New Zealand: Bridget Williams Books Ltd.
- Smith, L. T. (1999). *Decolonising methodologies*. Dunedin, New Zealand: University of Otago Press.
- Smith, P. (2005). *A concise history of New Zealand*. Cambridge, United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press.
- Spolsky, B. (2003). Reassessing Māori regeneration. *Language in Society*, 32, 553-578. doi:10.1017/S0047404503324042.
- Spolsky, B. (2005). Māori lost and regained. In A. Bell, R. Harlow, & D. Starks (Eds.), *Languages of New Zealand*. Wellington, New Zealand: Victoria University Press.
- Statistics New Zealand. (2012). *New Zealand's prison population*. Retrieved from [http://www.stats.govt.nz/browse\\_for\\_stats/snapshots-of-nz/yearbook/society/crime/corrections.aspx](http://www.stats.govt.nz/browse_for_stats/snapshots-of-nz/yearbook/society/crime/corrections.aspx)
- Statistics New Zealand. (2013). *2013 Census quick stats about culture and identity*. Retrieved from <http://www.stats.govt.nz/Census/2013-census/profile-and-summary-reports/quickstats-culture-identity/tables.aspx>
- Statistics New Zealand. (2014a). *Measuring te reo Māori speakers: A guide to different data sources*. Retrieved from [www.stats.govt.nz/browse\\_for\\_stats/people\\_and\\_communities/maori/measuring-te-reo-maori-speakers/data-sources.aspx](http://www.stats.govt.nz/browse_for_stats/people_and_communities/maori/measuring-te-reo-maori-speakers/data-sources.aspx)
- Statistics New Zealand (2014b). *Half a million Aucklanders born overseas*. Retrieved from <http://www.stats.govt.nz/Census/2013-census/profile-and-summary-reports/qstats-culture-identity-auck-mr.aspx>
- Stiglitz, J. (2013). *The price of inequality*. London, England: Penguin Books.
- Stuart, I. (2002). Māori and mainstream: Towards bicultural reporting. *Pacific Journalism Review*, 8(42-58).

- Stucki, P (2010). *Māori pedagogy, pedagogical beliefs and practices in a Māori tertiary institution*. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation), Massey University, New Zealand.
- Tahau-Hodges, P. (2010). *Kaiako pono: Mentoring for Māori learners in the tertiary sector*, Retrieved from <http://akoaoTearoa.ac.nz/download/ng/file/group-4/kaiako-pono-mentoringfor-Māori-learners-in-the-Tertiary-sector>
- Taki, M. (1996). *Kaupapa Māori and contemporary iwi resistance*. (Unpublished master's thesis). University of Auckland: Auckland, New Zealand.
- Te Awekotuku, N. (1991). *He tikanga wakaaro: Research ethics in the Māori community*. Wellington, Ministry of Māori Affairs.
- Te Kōhanga Reo National Trust. (2015). *History*. Retrieved from <http://www.kohanga.ac.nz/history/>
- Te Kopae Piripono. (2006). *Ngā ta kōhanga e whā. The four responsibilities*. Retrieved from <http://www.lead.ece.govt.nz/CentresOfInnovation/COIDocsAndResources/SrvcSpecif icDocsAndResources/NgāTaKōhangaeWhaTheFourResponsibilities.htm>
- Temm, P. (1990). *The Waitangi tribunal: The conscience of the nation*. Auckland, New Zealand: Random Century New Zealand Limited.
- Te One, S. (2003). Te whāriki: Contemporary issues of influence. In J. Nuttall (Ed.). *Weaving te whāriki: Aotearoa New Zealand's early childhood curriculum document in theory and in practice* (pp. 17-49). Wellington, New Zealand: New Zealand Council for Educational Research.
- Te Puni Kokiri. (1998a). *The national Māori language survey*. Wellington, New Zealand: Author.
- Te Puni Kokiri (1998b). *Making education work for Māori: Report on consultation*. Wellington, New Zealand: Author.
- Te Puni Kokiri. (2003). *Te rautaki reo Māori: The Māori language strategy*. Wellington, New Zealand: Author.
- Te Puni Kokiri. (2008). *Te oranga o te reo Māori 2006: The health of the Māori language in 2006*. Wellington, New Zealand: Author.

- Te Puni Kokiri (2009). *Rangahau tūkino whānau; Māori research agenda on family violence*. Wellington, New Zealand: Author.
- Te Puni Kokiri. (2010). *Arotake tūkino whānau: Literature review on family violence*. Wellington, New Zealand: Author.
- Te Puni Kokiri. (2012). *Māori youth in education and employment, Fact sheet 022-2012*. Wellington, New Zealand: Author.
- Te Puni Kokiri. (2014). *Te rautaki reo Māori: Māori language strategy*. Wellington, New Zealand: Author.
- Te Rito, J.S. (2008). Struggles for the Māori language: He whawhai mo te reo Māori. *MAI Review*, 2(6), 1-8.
- Terreni, L. & McCallum, J. (2003). *Providing culturally competent care in early childhood services in New Zealand. Part one: Considering culture*. Wellington, New Zealand: Early Childhood Development Unit.
- Thaman, K.H. (1993). Culture and the curriculum. *Comparative Education*, 29(3), 249-260.
- Thomas, D. R., & Nikora, L. W. (1992). From assimilation to biculturalism: Changing patterns in Māori-Pākehā relationships. In D. R. Thomas & A. Veno (Eds.), *Community psychology and social change: Australian and New Zealand perspectives* (Chapter 15). Palmerston North, New Zealand. Dunmore.
- Thornton, K., Wansbrough, D., Clarkin-Phillips, J., Aitken, H., & Tamati, A. (2009). *Conceptualising leadership in early childhood education in Aotearoa New Zealand*. Wellington, New Zealand: New Zealand Teachers Council.
- Timutimu, N. (1995). *Kei ngaro tō tātou reo rangatira: Middle generation Māori language crisis*. (Unpublished master's thesis). University of Auckland, Auckland, New Zealand.
- Tooley, C. (2000). *Māori education policy in the new millennium: Political rationality & government mechanisms*. (Unpublished master's thesis). University of Auckland, Auckland, New Zealand.
- Trinder, L., Feast, J., & Howe, D. (2004). *The adoption reunion handbook*. Chichester, United Kingdom: John Wiley & Sons.

- United Nations. (2012). *United Nations declaration on the rights of indigenous peoples*. United Nations.
- Waitangi Tribunal. Department of Justice. (1986). *Report of The Waitangi Tribunal on the te reo Māori claim*. Retrieved from [https://forms.justice.govt.nz/search/Documents/WT/wt\\_DOC\\_68482156/Report%20on%20the%20Te%20Reo%20Maori%20Claim%20W.pdf](https://forms.justice.govt.nz/search/Documents/WT/wt_DOC_68482156/Report%20on%20the%20Te%20Reo%20Maori%20Claim%20W.pdf)
- Walker, S., Eketone, A., & Gibbs, A. (2006). An exploration of kaupapa Māori research, its principles, processes and applications. *International Journal of Social Research Methodology*, 9(4), 331–344.
- Walker, R. (1990). *Ka whawhai tonu matou: Struggle without end*. Auckland, New Zealand: Penguin Books Ltd.
- Walker, R. (1991). *Liberating Māori from educational subjection*. Paper presented at Matawhanui Hui-a-tau, University of Canterbury, Christchurch, New Zealand.
- Walker, S. (1996). *Kia tau te rangimarie: Kaupapa Māori theory as a resistance against the construction of Māori as the other*. (Unpublished master's thesis), University of Auckland, Auckland, New Zealand.
- Walsh, M., & Yallop, C. (2007). *Language and Culture in Aboriginal Australia*. Canberra, Australia: Aboriginal Studies Press.
- Ward, A. (1995). *A show of justice: Racial amalgamation in nineteenth century New Zealand*, Auckland, New Zealand; Auckland University Press.
- Warren, A. (2013). *He aha tēnei mea te tuakiri o te tangata? He kimianga kore mutunga: Discourses of bicultural teacher education practice in Aotearoa New Zealand: A Pākehā early childhood teacher educator explores her subjectivities*. Wellington, New Zealand: Te Tari Puna Ora o Aotearoa/ NZ Childcare Association.
- Warren, A. (2014). Negotiating discourses: A Pākehā teacher educator's exploration of bicultural teaching practice. *New Zealand Journal of Teachers' Work*, 11(1), 127-140.
- Weiner, R. P. (2000). *Creativity beyond culture: Values and change*. New York, NY: State University of New York.

- Whānau Ora Taskforce. (2010). *Whānau ora: Report of the taskforce on whānau-centred initiatives*. Auckland, New Zealand: Blue Star Group.
- White, J. P. (2013). Policy research: Good or bad (Editorial)? *The International Indigenous Policy Journal*, 4(3), 1-3.
- Williams, N., Broadley, M.E., & Lawson Te-Aho, K. (2012). *Ngā taonga whakaako: Bicultural competence in early childhood education*. Wellington, New Zealand: Ako Aotearoa National Centre for Tertiary Teaching Excellence.
- Woodrow, L. (2006). Anxiety and speaking English as a second language. *RELC Journal* 37(3), 308-328. DOI: 10.1177/0033688206071315
- Woodward L. (2014). *Māori proverbs*. Retrieved from [http://www.Māori .cl/Proverbs.htm](http://www.Māori.cl/Proverbs.htm).



## Glossary

---

Ako	Reciprocal learning
Aotearoa	New Zealand
Hapū	Tribe
Iwi	Sub tribe
Kai	Food
Kāihapai	Mentor
Karakia	Prayer
Kaumātua	Elder
Kaupapa Māori	Maori aspirations, values, beliefs
Koha	Donation
Kōrero tawhito	Ancient verb
Kura Kaupapa	Primary school
Mahi ngātahi	Co-operation, working collaboratively
Mana	Prestige, authority, control
Manaakitanga	Māori culture
Māori	Indigenous people of New Zealand
Marae	Front of the meeting house
Mātauranga Māori	Māori body of knowledge
Mā te wā e hoa	Bye for now friend
O rātou taonga katoa	Tangible or intangible item and matter of special cultural significance
Pākehā	English, European people
Puāwaitanga	Blossoming
Tangata whenua	Indigenous people of Aotearoa
Taonga	Treasure
Tapu	Sacred
Tātaritanga	Thinking, making meaning
Te ao Māori	Maori world
Te Kōhanga Reo	Māori Language Nest
Te reo Māori	Language of Māori
Te reo Māori me ngā tikanga	Māori language and customs
Te tino rangatiratanga o rātou taonga katoa	The full chieftainship of all their possessions
Te Tiriti o Waitangi	The Treaty of Waitangi
Te Whare Tapa Whā	Māori Health Model
Tikanga	Custom, correct procedure, ethics
Tino Rangatiratanga	Sovereignty, principle of self-determination
Tiriti-based	Treaty-based
Tohunga	Māori priests, skilled people, experts
Waiata	Song
Wānanga	A place to learn
Whaea	Mother, aunty
Whaikōrero	Formal speech
Whakapapa	Genealogy
Whakataukākī	Proverb, quote
Whānau	Immediate and extended family
Whanaungatanga	Relationship

---

(Source: Moorfield, 2015)

## Appendices

### Appendix A: Bicultural Imperatives of *Te Whāriki*

Principle	Bicultural Imperative
Whakamana Empowerment	Particular care should be given to bicultural issues in relation to empowerment. Adults working with children should understand and be willing to discuss bicultural issues, actively seek Māori contributions to decision making, and ensure that Māori children develop a strong sense of self-worth
Kotahitanga Holistic Development	To address bicultural issues, adults working in early childhood education should have an understanding of Māori views on child development and on the role of the family as well as understanding the views of other cultures in the community. Activities, stories, and events that have connections with Māori children's lives are an essential and enriching part of the curriculum for all children in early childhood education settings
Whānau Tangata Family and Community	New Zealand is the home of Māori language and culture: curriculum in early childhood settings should promote te reo and ngā tikanga Māori, making them visible and affirming their value for children from all cultural backgrounds. Adults working with children should demonstrate an understanding of the different iwi and the meaning of whānau and whanaungatanga. They should also respect the aspirations of parents and families for their children.
Ngā Hononga Relationships	The curriculum should include Māori people, places, artefacts, and opportunities to learn and use the Māori language through social interaction

(Source: Ministry of Education, 2015e)

## Appendix B: Centre Manager Information Sheet



**Date Information Sheet Produced:** 19/09/2013

**Project Title:** *Te Kōrero Māori ki ngā Tamariki: I roto i ngā karu o ngā kaiako hou: Speaking Te reo Māori to Children: Through the eyes of early childhood teachers*

**An Invitation:** Kia Ora,

My name is Rachel Holder and I have invited teacher/s within your centre to participate in my research. I am investigating how early childhood teachers implement a bicultural curriculum and speak te reo Māori to children. I hope to gain an insight of their perspective, regarding tertiary education specifically toward te reo Māori, and if this has impacted on their ability and confidence when speaking to children. Sharing these experiences will contribute to me obtaining a Master of Education degree. From this research I anticipate I will present the findings at a conference and write a journal article. Their participation in this research is voluntary and they may withdraw at any time prior to the completion of data collection. The teacher/s have agreed for me to discuss this with you as I wish to observe them during their time at work as a teacher in your centre. They may also choose to use a pseudonym, rather than their own name for the documentation.

**How they were identified and why they are being invited to participate in this research?**

The participant criterion for this research was the need for participants, to be working within the early childhood sector. Participants were identified from teachers sharing informal communication, concerning te reo Māori throughout the early childhood sector.

**What will happen in this research and how will any discomfort be alleviated?**

I will be using the methodological approach of kaupapa Māori which centres on Ata, (respectful relationships) and relates specifically to research which nurtures relationships. Kaupapa encourages active participation of all those involved through the sharing of knowledge, and is intent on ultimately benefiting all those who participate and for whom the research is about. I will be forthright with both the research process and my intentions, and available to answer any queries or concerns they or you may have. This will assist in minimisation of any discomfort or risk.

**What are the costs of participating in this research?**

The total participation time I am asking your teacher to commit to this research, is 5.5 hours. This will be carried out as follows:

Data gathering involves 1 hour observations of your teacher, while they teach children within your centre. This will take place over two chosen weekdays alternating between am and pm over two consecutive weeks.

I will be recording the te reo Māori component of their teaching. I will not be observing or noting any of the children's responses. I will share with the participants the observation summaries after the week, enabling them to check for accuracy.

Teachers will also engage in a 1.5 hour meeting in the third week of data collection. This will enable them to share their perspectives of te reo Māori within the early childhood sector. This will take place outside working hours.

### **What is the purpose and benefit of this research?**

The benefit of participating in this research is to collectively identify and develop strategies that support the delivery of effective te reo Māori with children. Potentially, knowledge and confidence that enable teachers to authenticate te reo Māori and meet the directives outlined in *Te Whāriki*. Previous research of early childhood teachers and Māori children concluded, that for them to achieve equity within the learning environment, te reo Māori language, customs, traditions, and beliefs must be validated.

### **Will I receive feedback on the results of this research?**

Yes, I will provide you with a summary of the thesis.

### **What opportunity do I have to consider this invitation?**

I sincerely hope you will agree to my observing in your centre. The knowledge and experiences they have to share will support both your staff and your children. Ensuring our children are exposed to authentic, te reo Māori is paramount and the journey starts with us

### **What do I do if I have concerns about this research?**

Any concerns regarding the nature of this project should be notified in the first instance to the Project Supervisor, *Dr. Chris Jenkin* [chris.jenkin@aut.ac.nz](mailto:chris.jenkin@aut.ac.nz) + 64 9 921 9999 extension 7911. Concerns regarding the conduct of the research should be notified to the Executive Secretary of ATEC, Kate O'Connor, [ethics@aut.ac.nz](mailto:ethics@aut.ac.nz), 921 9999 extension 6038. If at any time you would like further information regarding this research, you're welcome to contact myself or the project supervisor on the following:

#### *Researcher Contact Details:*

Rachel Holder  
[rachel.holder@aut.ac.nz](mailto:rachel.holder@aut.ac.nz)

#### *Project Supervisor Contact Details*

Dr. Chris Jenkin  
[chris.jenkin@aut.ac.nz](mailto:chris.jenkin@aut.ac.nz)  
+ 64 9 921 9999 extension 7911

*Approved by the Auckland University of Technology Ethics Committee 7 October 2013, ATEC Reference number 13/269*

## Appendix C: Centre Manager Access Agreement



**Project title:** *Te Kōrero Māori ki ngā Tamariki: I roto i ngā karu o ngā kaiako hou: Speaking Te reo Māori to Children: Through the eyes of early childhood teachers*

**Project Supervisor:** Dr. Chris Jenkin

**Researcher:** Rachel Holder

I have read and understood the information sheet dated 25/11/2013 regarding this research process.

I agree to the researcher accessing our centre for the sole purpose of gathering data intended for this research project.

At no time shall information be gathered about other staff members or children.

Centre Manager Signature.....

Centre Manager Contact Details.....

.....

Date:.....

*Approved by the Auckland University of Technology Ethics Committee 7 October 2013, AUTEK Reference number 13/269*

## Appendix D: Participant Information Sheet



**Date Information Sheet Produced:** 19/09/2013

**Project Title:** *Te Kōrero Māori ki ngā Tamariki: I roto i ngā karu o ngā kaiako hou: Speaking Te reo Māori to Children: Through the eyes of early childhood teachers*

**An Invitation:** Kia Ora,

My name is Rachel Holder and I would like to invite you to participate in my research, where I am investigating how early childhood teachers implement a bicultural curriculum and speak te reo Māori to children. I hope to gain an insight of your perspective, regarding preparation from your tertiary education specifically toward te reo Māori, and if this has impacted on your ability and confidence when speaking to children. Sharing these experiences will contribute to me obtaining a Master of Education degree. From this research I anticipate I will present the findings at a conference and write a journal article. Your participation in this research is voluntary and you may withdraw at any time prior to the completion of data collection. You may also choose to use a pseudonym, rather than your own name for the documentation.

### **How was I identified and why am I being invited to participant in this research**

The participant criterion for this research was the need for teachers to be working within the early childhood sector. I am requesting your participation, as you had previously shared your interest in contributing to research which focused on te reo Māori within the early childhood sector. Other participants were identified from teachers sharing informal communication, concerning te reo Māori throughout the early childhood sector.

### **What will happen in this research and how will any discomfort be alleviated?**

I will be using the methodological approach of kaupapa Māori which centres on ata, (respectful relationships) and relates specifically to research which nurtures relationships. Kaupapa encourages active participation of all those involved through the sharing of knowledge, and is intent on ultimately benefiting all those who participate and for whom the research is about. I will be forthright with both the research process and intentions, and available to answer any queries or concerns you may have. This will assist in minimisation of any discomfort or risk.

### **What are the costs of participating in this research?**

The total participation time I am asking you to commit to this research, is 5.5 hours. This will be carried out as follows:

Data gathering involves 1 hour observations of you, while you teach children within your centre. The observations will take place over two chosen weekdays alternating between am and pm, over two consecutive weeks. I will be recording the te reo Māori

component of your teaching, but not any responses from the children. I will post you the observation summaries enabling you to check their accuracy.

Finally, a 1.5 hour meeting in the third week of data collection. This enables you to share your perspectives of te reo Māori within the early childhood sector. This process is guided by key questions and I welcome any experiences or opinions you may have to share.

### **What is the purpose and benefit of this research?**

The benefit of participating in this research is to collectively identify and develop strategies that support the delivery of effective te reo Māori with children. Potentially, knowledge and confidence will enable teachers to authenticate te reo Māori and meet directives outlined in *Te Whāriki*. Previous research of early childhood teachers and Māori children concluded, that for them to achieve equity within the learning environment, te reo Māori language, customs, traditions, and beliefs must be validated.

### **Will I receive feedback on the results of this research?**

Yes, I will provide you with the completed thesis outlining the findings and summary.

### **What opportunity do I have to consider this invitation?**

I sincerely hope you will agree to participate, and would like to offer you three days to consider my request and I will then call you for your response. I am confident the knowledge and experiences you have to share will support both your colleagues and our children. Ensuring our children are exposed to authentic, te reo Māori is paramount and the journey starts with us

### **Centre Managers**

As discussed, once you have agreed to participate I will need to obtain permission from your Centre Manager to observe and record the te reo Māori component of your teaching. I will therefore share this Information Sheet with your Centre Manager which outlines my research and your subsequent participation. They in turn, will sign a consent form which explains the research and your participation is to remain confidential throughout the process.

### **What do I do if I have concerns about this research?**

Any concerns regarding the nature of this project should be notified in the first instance to the Project Supervisor, *Dr. Chris Jenkin* [chris.jenkin@aut.ac.nz](mailto:chris.jenkin@aut.ac.nz) + 64 9 921 9999 extension 7911. Concerns regarding the conduct of the research should be notified to the Executive Secretary of ATEC, Kate O'Connor, [ethics@aut.ac.nz](mailto:ethics@aut.ac.nz), 921 9999 extension 6038. If at any time you would like further information regarding this research, you're welcome to contact myself or the project supervisor on the following:

#### *Researcher Contact Details:*

Rachel Holder  
[rachel.holder@aut.ac.nz](mailto:rachel.holder@aut.ac.nz)

#### *Project Supervisor Contact Details*

Dr. Chris Jenkin  
[chris.jenkin@aut.ac.nz](mailto:chris.jenkin@aut.ac.nz)  
+ 64 9 921 9999 extension 7911

Approved by the Auckland University of Technology Ethics Committee on 7 October 2013, ATEC Reference number 13/269

## Appendix E: Participant Consent Form



**Project title:** *Te Kōrero Māori ki ngā Tamariki: I roto i ngā karu o ngā kaiako hou: Speaking Te reo Māori to Children: Through the eyes of early childhood teachers*

**Project Supervisor:** Dr. Chris Jenkin

**Researcher:** Rachel Holder

- ☐ I have read and understood the information provided about this research project in the Information Sheet dated 19/09/2013
- ☐ I have had an opportunity to ask questions and to have them answered.
- ☐ I understand that notes will be taken during both the observations and interviews and that they will also be audio-taped and transcribed.
- ☐ I understand that I may withdraw myself or any information that I have provided for this project at any time prior to completion of data collection, without being disadvantaged in any way.
- ☐ If I withdraw, I understand that all relevant information including tapes and transcripts, or parts thereof, will be destroyed.
- ☐ I agree to take part in this research.
- ☐ I wish to receive a copy of the report from the research (please tick one): Yes ☐ No ☐

Participants Signature: .....

Participants Name: .....

Date: .....

*Approved by the Auckland University of Technology Ethics Committee 7 October 2013, AUTEK Reference number 13/269*



## Appendix F: Observation Chart

Participant Name		Date
<b>Greetings</b>		<b>Identified</b>
Kia ora	Hello	
Tēnā koe	Hello to one	
Tēnā kōrua	Hello to two	
Tēnā koutou	Hello to three or more	
Ata marie / Morena	Good morning	
Haere mai	Welcome	
<b>Farewells</b>		
Haere rā	Goodbye to someone leaving	
E noho rā	Goodbye to someone staying	
Ka kite anō	See you again	
Hei apopo	See you tomorrow	
Kia pai tō rā	Have a nice day	
<b>Praises</b>		
Ka rawe! Tino pai kē!	Too much	
Tūmeke	Choice	
Ka mau te wehi!	Awesome	
Ka pai	Great	
Tino pai	Very good	
Kia kaha	Be strong	
Tino pai o mahi “name”	Your work is great “name”	
<b>Cautions</b>		
Hoihoi	Be quiet	
Kāti	Stop	
Kei te whakarongo koe	Are you listening ?	
Waiho tēnā	Leave that alone	
Kia ngawari o ringa	Gentle hands	
Kua mutu koe?	Are you finished?	
Koa	Please	
Āta noho	Sit nicely	
<b>Instructions</b>		
E noho	Sit down	
E tū	Stand up	
Aroha mai	Sorry	
Pupuri ringa ringa	Hold hands	
Āta whakarongo	Listen carefully	
Titiro	Look	
Taiho	Stop	
E kai	Eat up	
Horoia o ringaringa	Wash your hands please	
<b>Questions and responses</b>		
He aha tēnei?	What is this?	
He ... tēnā	This is a ...	
He aha te kara o tēnei?	What colour is this?	
He ... te kara o tēnā	It is ...	
<b>Everyday words</b>		
Ae	yes	
Aua	I don't know	
Hari	Happy	
Hia kai	Hungry	
Inu	Drink	
Kao	No	
Kiri-pani	Sunscreen	
Mahana	Warm	
Māku	Wet	

Makariri	Cold	
Ngege	Tied	
Pēke	Bag	
Pō	Night	
Pouaka kai	Lunchbox	
Pouri	Sad	
<b>Indoor Items</b>		
Karaka	Clock	
Pene hinu	Crayons	
Pene rākau	Pencil	
Pikitia	Paper	
Pukapuka	Book	
Rākau	Tree	
Rorohiko	Computer	
Tēpu	Table	
Tūru	Chairs	
<b>Outdoor Items</b>		
Kari	Dig	
Kirikiri	Sand	
Ngono wai	Hose	
Pahikara	Bike	
Paoro	Ball	
Pātiti	Grass	
Retireti	Slide	
Taraka	Truck	
Wai	Water	
<b>Colours</b>		
Kahurangi	Blue	
Kākāriki	Green	
Karaka	Orange	
Kōwhai	Yellow	
Mā	White	
Pango	Black	
Whero	Red	
<b>Days</b>		
Rahina	Monday	
Ratu	Tuesday	
Raapa	Wednesday	
Rapare	Thursday	
Ramere	Friday	
Rahoroi	Saturday	
Ratapu	Sunday	

Source: Rangitane o Wairarapa Incorporated (2010)

#### Additional Words and Phrases:

Pakipaki tamariki mā  
Peke tamariki mā  
Hikoi tamariki mā  
Oma tamariki mā  
Kanikani tamariki mā  
Huri tamariki mā  
Kia pai ko korero  
Kia pai to korero ki o hoa  
Whakapai tamariki  
Taukiri e  
Ko .....tēnei  
Aroha ana

Clap children  
Jump children  
Walk children  
Run children  
Dance children  
Turn children  
Please speak nicely  
Speak nicely to your friends  
Tidy up children  
Surprise  
This is[name]  
Thank you

Te makariri hoki o te rangi  
 Tino pai te rangi, nē rā  
 Kei te pupuhi te hau  
 He aha te kupu Māori mō .....  
 Waiho ki reira  
 Me whakarongo koutou  
 Me kōrero koe ki a ia  
 Kōrero Māori mai  
 Whakahokia tēnei pukapuka  
 Hē tino mahana  
 Kia Tūpato  
 Kawea atu ki waho  
 Rārangi mai  
 Rārangi atu  
 He rā tino ātaahua tenei  
 Tangohia ō hū  
 Whakamaui tō potae  
 Huakina te kūaha  
 Waiho  
 Katia te kūaha  
 He maha ngā kapua  
 Kuhu mai ki roto  
 Haere mai ki konei  
 Whakapaingia te rūma  
 Kei hea te wharepaku?  
 Ko wai te ingoa o tērā kaiako?  
 Nā wai tēnei pukapuka?  
 Tēnā koa, kōrero mai anō  
 Kua reri ngā kai  
 Kei te mā aku ringa  
 E koa ana ia

It's really cold  
 Lovely day isn't it  
 The wind is blowing  
 What is the Māori word for .....  
 Leave it there  
 You should listen  
 You should speak to him/her  
 Speak to me in Māori  
 Return this book  
 It is very warm  
 Be careful  
 Take it outside  
 Line up here near me  
 Line up over there  
 This is a lovely day  
 Take off your shoes  
 Put on your hat  
 Open the door  
 Leave it alone  
 Shut the door  
 There are lots of clouds  
 Come inside  
 Come over here  
 Tidy the room  
 Where's the toilet  
 What's that teacher's name?  
 Whose is that book?  
 Please say that again  
 The food is ready  
 My hands are clean  
 She/he is happy

## Appendix G: Semi Structured Interview Questions

What does biculturalism in early childhood education mean to you?

Do you think you achieve this objective?

What prepared you within your tertiary education programme to speak te reo Māori?

Do you think your training programme increased your ability to teach biculturally?

Do you consider you were adequately prepared to teach the bicultural vision of *Te Whāriki*?

What supports you to speak te reo Māori in your teaching practice?

Why?

Why Not?

What hinders you to speak te reo Māori in your teaching practice?

Why?

Why not?

What do you think would encourage the teachers you work with to speak te reo Māori to children?

Why?

Why not?

Is there anything else you'd like to tell me about this matter?

## Appendix H: Interview via Email

What does biculturalism in early childhood education mean to you?

How is this reflected in your practice?

How much preparation did you have within your tertiary education programme to speak te reo Māori once qualified?

Was this enough and if not, what more could have been done?

Considering the emphasis placed on bicultural teaching in Aotearoa New Zealand, what else could support your speaking te reo Māori to children?

Within your centre, what or who supports you to speak te reo Māori throughout your teaching practice?

Why?

What currently hinders you to speak te reo Māori in your teaching practice?

Why?

What do you think would encourage the teachers you work to speak te reo Māori to children?

Is there anything else you'd like to tell me about this matter?