



**He Arotakenga o Ngā Tuhinga
E Pā Ana ki Ngā Marautanga Māori**

Literature Review

***Te Anga Marautanga o Aotearoa
Contract 323-1768***

E kimi ana i ngā kāwai i toro ki tawhiti¹

Final Report to the Ministry of Education

*Dr Colleen McMurchy-Pilkington
Te Puna Wānanga
Faculty of Education
The University of Auckland*

18 October, 2004

¹ *Seeking the shoots that stretch far out* Mead & Grove (2001, p. 29).
Arotakenga Tuhinga

He mihi

Whakarongo ake ki te tangi a te manu

E karanga nei, Tui, tui, tuituia.

Tuia ki runga, tuia ki raro

Tuia ki roto, tuia ki waho

Ka rongo te ao, ka rongo te pō

Tuia ki te kāwai tangata

I heke mai i Hawaiki nui

I Hawaiki roa

I Hawaiki pāmamao

I te Hono ki Wairua

Ki te whaiao, ki te ao mārama

Tihei mauri ora!

Tēnā tātou i ō tātou tini mate e takoto tīraha nei i runga i ō tātou marae, i runga hoki i ō tātou papakāinga, huri noa i te motu. Kua uwhia rātou ki ngā taumata kōrero e tika ana nā reira tukuna rātou kia okioki i runga i te moenga roa.

Āpiti hono, tātai hono, koutou te hunga mate ki a koutou.

Āpiti hono, tātai hono, tātou te hunga ora ki a tātou. Tēnā tātou katoa.

E mihi kau atu ana ki te tokomaha i tutuki ai ngā marautanga hei aratohu mō ngā kura e whakaako ana mā te huarahi o te reo Māori. Tēnā koutou, nā koutou i para te huarahi. Ko te pūrongo e whai ake nei e whakawhāiti ana i ngā kitenga me ngā whakaaro o te hunga kua whai wāhi ki ngā marautanga i roto i ngā tau kua hipa atu. Ko te tūmanako kia noho ēnei kōrero hei tīmatanga mō tā tātou whiriwhiri i te āhua o ngā marautanga ā ngā tau kei te heke mai.

Kāti ake i konei, raurangatira mā, tēnā koutou, tēnā koutou, tēnā tātou katoa.

Ko tāu rourou, ko tāku rourou,

Ka ora ai tātou katoa

Acknowledgements

Acknowledgement and thanks to the following who contributed to this report in various ways:

Research assistant: Eliz Ngarimu

Te Puna Wānanga Staff:

Tony Trinick

Hemi Dale

Tauwehe Tamati

Sharyn Heaton

Ripeka Martin

Noki Martin

John McCaffery

Ngā Ihirangi - Contents

He Mihi	2
Ko tāu rourou, ko tāku rourou...	3
Acknowledgements	
Ngā Ihirangi; Contents	4
1. Kupu whakataki: Introduction	6
1.1. Research Literature & Questions	6
1.2. Introduction	7
1.3. Historical background	8
1.4. Critiques and commentary	10
1.5. Te Anga Marautanga o Aotearoa	12
1.6. Issues	14
1.7. Recommendations	15
2. Te Tāhu: Philosophy	15
2.1. Philosophy	15
2.2. Issues	18
2.3. Recommendations	18
3. Te Hanganga: Structure	19
3.1. Structure	19
3.2. Content areas	19
3.3. Issues	20
3.4. Recommendations	21
4. Te Ako me Te Whakaako: Pedagogy	21
4.1. Pedagogy	21
4.2. Issues	24
4.3. Recommendations	25
5. Te Hanga i Ngā Marautanga: Curriculum Development Process	25
5.1. Curriculum development process	25
5.2. Issues	26
5.3. Recommendations	26
6. Te Whakamahi i Ngā Marautanga me Ngā Mahi Whakapakari Mōhio: Implementation & Professional Development	27
6.1. Implementation	27
6.2. Professional Development	28
6.3. Issues	30
6.4. Recommendations	30
7. Te Aromatawai: Assessment	31
7.1. Assessment	31
7.2. Issues	33
7.3. Recommendations	33
8. Ngā Rauemi: Resources	33
8.1. Resouces	33
8.2. Issues	36
8.3. Recommendations	36

9.	Ngā Take Reo: Linguistic Issues	37
9.1.	Linguistic issues	37
9.2.	Dialects and standardisation	41
9.3.	Issues	42
9.4.	Recommendations	42
10.	Te Wāhi ki te Reo Pākeha: The Place of English	43
10.1.	Place of English	43
10.2.	Issues	44
10.3.	Recommendations	44
11.	Etahi whakautu ki Ngā Pātai Rangahau: Answering the Research Questions	44
12.	Whakawhāititanga: Concluding Summary	47
12.1	Summary	47
12.2	Issues	48
12.3	Recommendations	48
13.	Etahi Atu Pātai: Further questions	49
14.	He Whakarāpopototanga o Ngā Take me Ngā Tūtohutanga: Summary of Issues & Recommendations	50
	Ngā korero whakapā: References	57
	Papakupu Glossary	63

He arotakenga o ngā tuhinga e pā ana ki ngā marautanga Māori

Literature Review

1. Kupu whakaraki: Introduction

1.1 Research Literature & Research Questions

This literature review covers the following areas of New Zealand Māori Immersion Education contexts:

- 1) The rationale for a Marautanga o Aotearoa for Māori immersion contexts
- 2) Māori pedagogy
- 3) Māori immersion curriculum development and issues
- 4) The content and structure of Māori immersion marautanga
- 5) Linguistic issues in Māori immersion education contexts
- 6) Issues around content knowledge of Māori, Māori epistemology
- 7) Achievement of Māori immersion learners in Kura Kaupapa Māori and Māori immersion contexts

Research Questions

Research questions for this review are as follows:

What does the literature tell us about what we have learned 10 years on from the national Māori marautanga development?

Sub-questions

- What are some of the unique features of the Māori marautanga?
- What are some of the issues emerging from teachers in Māori immersions regarding the implementation of marautanga Māori? In what way do the current marautanga drive the pedagogy of Māori immersion teachers?
- What are some of the issues from working in Māori immersion contexts?
- Are the issues likely to be the same for all immersion schools/units?
- What might the Marautanga o Aotearoa need to address in order to meet the needs of teachers and learners in Māori immersion?
- Does the marautanga meet the aims and aspirations of Kura Kaupapa Māori?
- What does the literature tell us about the achievement of learners in Kura Kaupapa Māori and Māori immersion education contexts?
- Do the whāinga paetae need to be more specific to guide teachers or should they be broader to allow for school based whānau/hapū/iwi input?

1.2 Introduction

This literature review concerning contexts of Māori medium education² is set out under a number of themes that arise from the literature. Most of the themes identified concern the Māori medium curriculum documents rather than *Te Anga Marautanga* as it appears that is what most Māori medium educators are concerned about. Each section in this review addresses a theme, identifies some of the issues, and suggests some recommendations surrounding that theme. It is somewhat artificial to separate out the themes because in practice they overlap and impact on each other. The concluding section (*Section 12*) draws together the big picture ideas from the themes, addresses the research questions. *Section 13* raises further questions from the research that need consideration for future developments in Māori medium education. *Section 14* contains a repeat of the issues and recommendations from each of the themes.

The official curriculum policy for teachers in New Zealand schools to guide teaching, learning, and assessment is the New Zealand Curriculum Framework (NZCF), *Te Anga Marautanga*. The NZCF signalled “a series of supporting statements” that under the terms of the Education Amendment Act 1991 were defined as the “national curriculum statements” (MOE, 1993, p. 3). The NZCF, and the seven New Zealand Curriculum statements (Ngā Marautanga o Aotearoa) have been published in both English and Māori. It could be argued therefore that

The publication of these Māori curriculum guidelines signals to New Zealanders that this country is seriously interested in maintaining and strengthening its social, economic, and political commitment to the preservation and maintenance of Māori language (MOE, 2003a, p. 3).

This report covers a review of the literature that has been written about, or makes reference to, *Te Anga Marautanga* (Te Tāhuhu o te Mātauranga, 1993) or Ngā Marautanga o Aotearoa, the New Zealand Curriculum statements written in the medium of Māori. In the short time available for the completion of this contract every endeavour has been made to access the available material. However given the limited timeframe there is every possibility that there will be omissions. Two points worth noting include - overall the literature in the above areas (1.1) are patchy and thin; pāngarau in Māori medium contexts seems to have more literature than most of the other subject areas.

An official curriculum can be defined as a selection of the valued and interrelated knowledge, skills and experiences that is undertaken by the learner in the formal context of the school. However Marsh and Willis (1999) distinguish between the planned curriculum, the enacted curriculum, and the experienced curriculum.

² Māori medium education will be used interchangeably with the term Māori immersion in this report.

This review focuses largely on the planned curriculum, that is, what should be taught and learned in classrooms, including what knowledge is considered most worthy of being known. However there are links to the enacted curriculum, which relates to the process of how the curriculum should be decided by the teacher, and how this decision making is carried out in the classroom. There are a limited number of Ministry of Education reports and evaluations that include Māori teachers' voices about the enacted curriculum. These have been considered in this report. If a teacher decides that knowledge and learning that is 'worthy of being known' is missing from the planned curriculum then there are implications for the third area, that which is experienced in the classroom. How the curriculum is experienced in the classroom, that is, the learners' views are not included in this report as no literature was found in that area.

According to Mary Chamberlain (MOE, 2004)³,

In New Zealand the national curriculum broadly sets out what it is intended that our students will value, understand, and be able to do by the time they leave school. In other words, the national curriculum sets the direction for learning for all New Zealand students.

The taught curriculum involves opening doors for students. It involves schools and teachers engaging and motivating their particular students and providing opportunities that help students see themselves as scientists, problem solvers, thinkers, writers, artists, mathematicians and so on (p. 4).

This explanation suggests that if the national curriculum is taught as prescribed each student will have the values and understandings that will give him/her opportunities to open door upon leaving school. There appears to be an assumption all our students will value the same things, that cultural values do not matter, and that the world is acultural.

Another view of curriculum regards it as "a social and political construct that changes over time in response to a wide range of factors and influences" (McCulloch, 1992, p. 9). McCulloch argues that curriculum is not merely responsive to the internal workings of the education system but curriculum must also be seen as part of the wider society, making curriculum development processes as historical in character. It is therefore necessary to briefly consider the historical background that led up to the development of national curriculum statements.

1.3 Historical Background

Up until the late 1980s, curriculum policy was developed centrally in Aotearoa by the Curriculum Division of the Department of Education. There was input from teachers and representatives of the specialised subject committees and teacher unions. This process of consultation was designed to ensure the expertise of teachers was utilised and "to win their acceptance and ownership of curriculum reform" (O'Neill, 1996, p. 4). Curriculum development was therefore

³ Manager, Learning Outcomes and Assessment in the Curriculum Teaching and Learning Group at the Ministry of Education

largely a bottom-up process. Teachers felt some ownership in the process and the outcomes, as they were involved at all levels of the curriculum development and implementation. There were no formal curriculum statements written in te reo Māori at this time. Although *Tihē Mauri Ora* (MOE, 1990) the national Māori language syllabus was translated into Māori in 1990. If Māori were involved in curriculum development, it was usually as a minority member of a consultative group, or working under supervision and direction of non-Māori MOE policy makers.

With the re-election of Labour in 1987 came a major shift in educational policy that included a changed process for curriculum development. As a result of state reforms⁴ many state bureaucracies shed permanent staff in favour of consultants or staff on short-term contracts. These contractors or consultants undertook a range of services previously carried out by the state, within a defined time, in what Boston (1995) describes as a shift from providing contracts *of* service, to providing contracts *for* service. Subsequently educational policy advice and policy development became a service provided to the state through the mechanism of contracting. Whereas a collective Māori voice was once absent from policy processes this shift became enabling for Māori as contract writers in curriculum development (McKinley, 1995; McMurchy-Pilkington, 2004).

The establishment of Kura Kaupapa Māori based on *Te Aho Matua*⁵ and recognised under the 1989 Education Act as a new form of state education, coincided with the education reforms of the late 1980s, early 1990s. The decision by the Minister of Education at the time, Lockwood Smith, to establish a national curriculum in English required the government to address the issue of programmes of instruction for the new state Kura Kaupapa Māori. As the result of submissions from Māori communities the minister agreed to the development of Māori medium curriculum documents (Ohia, 1993b), although it appears there was no “detailed overview statement from the government about their purpose” (Barker, 1999, p. 51). No Māori were involved in the development processes of the first national curriculum document to be written, the English medium mathematics curriculum. (McMurchy-Pilkington, 2004). Consequently there was no Māori input to the philosophy and framework of the English medium mathematics curriculum, which was used as the prototype for the Māori medium curriculum pāngarau. The appointment of a Māori writing party for the development of the Māori medium curriculum pāngarau then found themselves constrained by earlier decisions over which they had had no input or control.

⁴ These reforms began with the core state sector in 1984. For a fuller explanation see Jesson, 2001; Olssen & Morris Mathews, 1997; Boston, 1995.

⁵ *Te Aho Matua* is the philosophical document for Kura Kaupapa Maori

Most Kura Kaupapa retained Te Aho Matua as their guiding curriculum philosophy, eventually moving towards the use of the new Māori medium versions of the curriculum. Likewise Mead (1996), Nepe (1991), and Kāretu (1998) have argued that Māori interactions with the world are underpinned with a Māori world-view that is unique, arising from “very different epistemology and metaphysical foundations” (Nepe, 1991). This helps explain why the existing Māori medium curricula are not widely perceived by Māori as being fully inclusive of all Māori medium contexts and settings (MOE, 2003a).

Like the English medium curriculum documents the Māori medium curricula were developed to meet the achievement objectives described in *The New Zealand Curriculum Framework* (1993). The early curriculum documents were in large part translations of the English medium curriculum (McMurchy-Pilkington, 2004; MOE, 2003a).

Although *Pāngarau* was the first curriculum to be contracted out in 1992, two further writing groups began developing *Pūtaiao* and *Te Reo Māori* shortly after. For example an expression of interest for the development of the Māori medium mathematics curriculum was advertised in the *New Zealand Education Gazette* on 16 June 1992 while the advertisement for the development of the Māori medium science curriculum was advertised on 15 September 1992. These three curricula were launched together as drafts on the television programme *Marae* on 16 October 1994 (McKinley & Waiti, 1995). It was agreed that the mana should lay in the Te Reo Māori curriculum so it would be the first to be released. *Hangarau* was issued in 1999, *Tikanga ā Iwi* and *Ngā Toi* in 2000. *Hauora* was issued as a draft in 2000 but not distributed to schools until a year later (Goulton, 2004). Currently *Hauora* is still in draft form.

In the early national curriculum developments the contracted writers worked separately from their English medium peers. Initially the writers were not allowed to meet their advisory groups, which they found frustrating (McKinley & Waiti, 1995; McMurchy-Pilkington, 2004). However as the curriculum developments progressed there were process changes. For example there was some interchange between the writers of Technology and *Hangarau*, and Arts and the *Ngā Toi* development process started simultaneously. These processes allowed for some cross fertilisation of the documents and between the writing groups.

1.4 Critiques and Commentary

A review of the literature found several significant commentaries and critiques of Māori education at that time, the state of Māori language, and most importantly the Māori medium curriculum developments, processes, and structures. These include conference papers, masters and doctoral theses, journal articles, chapters in texts, unpublished papers and reports. The more significant ones are referenced below:

Aspin, (1994); Jacques, (1991); Barton & Fairhall, (1995); Barton, Fairhall, Trinick, (1998); Bishop, (2001); Bishop, Berryman, & Richardson, (2001); Dale, McCaffery, & McMurchy-Pilkington, (1997); Dewes, (1993); Goulton, (2004); Harlow, (1993); Joseph (2003); Ka'ai-Olman, (1995); Keegan, (2004); McCaffery, McMurchy-Pilkington, & Dale, (1998); McKinley, (1995, 2003); McKinley & Waiti, (1995); McMurchy-Pilkington, (2001, 2004); Mead, (1996); Nepe, (1991); Ohia, (1993a, 1993b); Rata, (1991); Smith, (1997, 2003); Timutimu, (1995); Trinick, (1999).

This list is not exhaustive and in spite of a comprehensive search we acknowledge that there may well be further material in dissertations, theses, conference papers, and unpublished material.

In general, conclusions drawn by researchers and writers indicate that Māori took part in the Māori medium curriculum process but felt their voices were often marginalised by the central controlling processes used at that time. A sense of frustration was expressed about the processes and the outcomes. They would have wished for a more Māori centred process whereby Māori ownership was able to shape the outcomes to meet Māori aspirations in education for their children. In addition several researchers explored tensions of Māori language quality in the development of new vocabularies and discourses for engagement in the Māori medium curriculum. A further group researched structural issues pertaining to the control and development of Māori education especially Kura Kaupapa Māori and Kaupapa Māori theory. The work of these writers provides a necessary macro context for understanding Māori response to the curriculum initiatives of the 1990s and beyond. They all argued for Māori tino rangatiratanga, control of education for Māori by Māori. This theme underpins all these researchers' responses to education initiatives with curriculum being just one of the areas of focus. These writers are all likely to agree that Māori want their tamariki and mokopuna to achieve the same or similar outcomes and to the same standards as non-Māori learners, as educational success is an important pathway to future careers (Ohia, 1993b).

It is evident that significant lessons have been learnt and documented by Māori in these writings. The lessons learnt and the expertise developed by these researchers should be drawn on in any future curriculum review or development.

1.6 *Te Anga Marautanga o Aotearoa*⁶

The draft of *The National Curriculum of New Zealand (Te Anga Marautanga o Aotearoa)* was issued as a discussion document in May, 1991 (Ministry of Education, 1991), although it had a

limited print run thus raising questions about any real intention to consult. When the final document *The New Zealand Curriculum Framework* (MOE, 1993) was released in 1993 it proposed reducing knowledge to skills that are quantifiable. *Te Anga Marautanga o Aotearoa* (Te Tāhuhu o te Mātauranga, 1993) was a “Māori language equivalent of the framework, as a translation rather than a document drawn from Māori knowledge frames” (Durie, 2003, p. 17).

Some critics argued that the curriculum framework reflected “a curriculum of [individual] enterprise and competition” implying that the purpose of education was to serve economic ends, and enabling New Zealand to compete on a global market (Lee & Hill, 1996, p. 24).

It then becomes difficult to see how a translated framework encouraging enterprising individuals can be inclusive of tikanga Māori, Māori knowledge, and reflective of Māori pedagogical practices. In essence a policy document based on western ways of viewing the world, and translated into Māori cannot reflect Māori epistemologies. Moreover as *Te Anga Marautanga o Aotearoa* (Te Tāhuhu o te Mātauranga, 1993) underpins the structures and philosophy of all the other marautanga or essential learning areas a similar claim can be made about each of them. Further as the NZCF was released in 1993, nearly two years after the English medium mathematics was begun, and after the science, and the three Māori medium curricula were started it seems an empty claim to make that the NZCF contains the underpinning philosophy for each of the marautanga.

The NZ Curriculum Framework and its translation *Te Anga Marautanga o Aotearoa* articulates a recognition that

Māori is the language of the tangata whenua of New Zealand. It is a taonga under the terms of the Treaty of Waitangi and is an official language of New Zealand (MOE, 1993, p. 10).

Ko te reo Māori te reo o te tangata whenua o Aotearoa. He taonga i roto i te Tiriti o Waitangi, he reo whai mana i raro i ngā ture o Aotearoa (Te Tāhuhu o te Mātauranga, 1993, wh. 10).

If *Te Anga Marautanga o Aotearoa* is deemed to be an inclusive document, it is assumed that through the principles of the Treaty of Waitangi there would be “acknowledgement and inclusion of Māori values, selections of knowledge, and pedagogical strategies...” in the framework (Durie, 2003, p. 17). However ‘allowing for’ does not necessarily ensure the values are included. According to Durie, (2003, p. 17). “the actual wording of the [primary] statement avoids responsibility for the inclusion of Māori values by not referring to Māori at all”.

⁶ *Te Anga Marautanga o Aotearoa* may be used interchangeably with the term *New Zealand Curriculum Framework* or NZCF in this report.

Pacific and Asian languages also receive a special mention as these languages are deemed to be “important to New Zealand’s regional and international interests” (MOE, 1993, p. 10). However Ohia (1993b, p. 110) argues Māori are the most untapped potential resource in Aotearoa and that their advancement in the political, economic, social, and educational areas “will augur well for the economic progress at both the local and national levels ... [and] be extremely advantageous for New Zealand.” It could be strongly argued then that the maintenance of te reo Māori is more than a matter to be addressed under the Treaty of Waitangi, it is also an important factor ‘to New Zealand’s regional and international interests’. This is further confirmed in Te Puni Kokiri’s claim that “The Māori language ... supports a unique New Zealand identity within a global society” (Te Puni Kokiri, 2003a, p. 1).

However as Durie argues (1998, p. 52) access to participation in New Zealand society would have little meaning for Māori if “ ... no room were left for the strengthening of a Māori identity and the continuing expression of Māori culture – the advancement of Māori peoples as Māori”. Mason Durie (2003) also has the following to say which we think is worth repeating here as it **adds to the rationale for why Māori as indigenous people of Aotearoa should have a separate curriculum framework underpinned by Māori epistemology**. One of the features of Māori value systems “is the valuing of indigeneity, and indigeneity as a value. Together these distinguish Māori claims for inclusion ... ” (Durie, 2003, p. 17).

One of the contentious issues for education in New Zealand is whether the teaching of Māori language and culture has any place in the public education system. The argument brings into focus two sometimes conflicting rights: the democratic rights of all citizens and the rights which Māori assert by virtue of being tangata whenua in Aotearoa New Zealand. The principle of indigeneity highlights the point. Indigeneity is about a set of rights that indigenous peoples might reasonably expect to exercise in modern times (p. 204).

If *Te Anga Marautanga o Aotearoa* underpins the structures and philosophy of all the other marautanga then the implications of this are that it should be developed or rewritten first with the seven marautanga to follow. A report that investigated Māori teachers’ experiences in teaching from the Māori medium national curriculum documents (MOE, 2003a) highlighted a concern expressed by both Kura Kaupapa Māori teachers and teachers in Māori immersion units that Māori philosophical approaches to education were not reflected in the national curricula. Both groups of teachers (64 in the total study) recommend “a revisiting of the curriculum documents in terms of their adherence to and promotion of Māori world-views and ways of knowing” (MOE, 2003a, p. 3). Additionally they rejected the idea of following curriculum that was structured on, and a translation of, the English medium curriculum, which is what they thought was the case, particularly for pāngarau. The beliefs and values underpinning such documents did not therefore arise from Māori epistemology, nor are they inclusive of *Te Aho Matua*.

A report to the Minister of Education (MOE, 2002) concerning a curriculum stocktake includes a recommendation proposing a modified curriculum framework that arises from a process of consultation and trialing. We believe there needs to be a new curriculum framework for Māori learners.

Informants have suggested that historically *Te Anga Marautanga* and many of the curriculum documents were developed before the memorandum of understanding concerning consultation was agreed with Te Rūnanga Nui o Ngā Kaupapa Māori and the Ministry of Education (MOE). In effect this meant that the principles of *Te Aho Matua* were neither incorporated into the curriculum framework nor the individual marautanga statements. The imposition of national curricula on Kura Kaupapa Māori results in losing some control over knowledge and skills to be taught in schools (McKinley, 1995). This is a matter that needs to be revisited in any future curriculum review if there is to be an inclusive approach to Māori medium curriculum development and implementation. Questions that should be considered in a stocktake include, should there be a separate *Te Anga Marautanga* for Kura Kaupapa, for Māori medium contexts, or should local iwi develop their own schemes of work as part of the overarching marautanga? Goulton (2004, p. 16) after talking to teachers contends that the notion of a national document for local use was seen to be contrary for use by both iwi and kura.

There does appear to be a general agreement that for a healthy Māori future, that if there are to be national curricula they must “validate who we are and how we are” (Goulton, 2004, p. 16) if we are to live as Māori (Durie, 2001). Such a consideration would involve asking such questions as ‘What knowledge should go in the curriculum’? This raises further considerations like ownership, what knowledge should go into the ‘public’ arena, intellectual and cultural property, and questions of knowledge being treated as a commodity?

1.6 Issues

Māori were not involved with the development of The National Curriculum Framework or the translated version, therefore they do not reflect Māori epistemologies. Māori were involved in the development of the marautanga, the seven essential learning areas, but as these were largely parallel documents to the English medium curricula these too did not reflect Māori traditional and contemporary epistemologies. Should there be a separate curriculum framework for Kura Kaupapa Māori, for Māori medium contexts and for local iwi? What is the place of *Te Aho Matua*? What should go in a curriculum framework?

1.7 Recommendations:

- That a new curriculum framework⁷ be written to inform the development of the essential learning areas and that it consist of statements about beliefs and values, key skills or competencies, Māori language development across curriculum, mātauranga Māori, tikanga underpinning pedagogy, language acquisition.
- That key stakeholder groups with expertise and an interest in Māori medium education, in te reo Māori, curriculum writing, assessment, pedagogy, and Māori mātauranga be established to develop an appropriate new curriculum framework.
- That discussions be held with Te Rūnanga Nui o Ngā Kura Kaupapa Māori concerning a new curriculum framework that best suits the needs of Kura Kaupapa Māori.

2 Te Tāhu: Philosophy

2.1 Philosophy

In this section both the philosophy of the existing *Te Anga Marautanga* and the Essential Learning Areas (national curriculum statements) will be discussed. Essentially the philosophy of these curriculum statements do not reflect Māori ways of viewing the world.

As noted in the previous section, *Te Anga Marautanga* “gives direction to the development of the more specific **national curriculum statements**” (MOE, 1993, p. 4, original emphasis). It appears that *Te Anga Marautanga* had little if any Māori involvement therefore it cannot give any clear direction for Māori learners or for the national curriculum statements. No specific written material was found in a literature search concerning *Te Anga Marautanga*. However a report to the MOE on curriculum policy and special education support (McMenamin, Millar, Morton, Mutch, Nuttal, & Tyler-Merrick, 2004, p. 33) highlights the absence of a Māori world view despite the NZCF’s claim that the framework “applies to all New Zealand schools, including Kura Kaupapa Māori” (MOE, 1993, p. 3). Houia & Crombie (1993, p. 31) raise a challenge, that if all children have equal rights to education then can this “be done by providing a common curriculum for everyone, or whether, as their needs are thought to be different, different children should be taught according to different curricula”?

The development of Essential Learning areas, or curricula for “... use in classes educated through the medium of Māori language” that parallels and maintains the existing achievement

⁷ The term ‘curriculum framework’ is used here instead of ‘Te Anga marautanga’ to indicate that something with a new shape is envisaged rather than a rewriting of what exists.

objectives⁸ of the preceding English medium curricula are philosophically flawed. A curriculum framework and curricula that have been selected on the basis of a western world-view alone, mirrors the valued knowledge, skills, and experiences that a western society considers important for its young to know is in contradiction to a Māori epistemological views. We need to ask where is the role of mātauranga Māori?

Although several of the marautanga make some reference to Māori beliefs and values, and Māori ways of viewing the world, no consistent Māori world view is evident (Dewes, 1993) in the philosophical statements of each marautanga. This is one of the concerns identified by teachers in Māori units and at Kura Kaupapa Māori schools (MOE, 2003a; MOE, 2003b). Good educational practice must begin with the students' existing frameworks and align to their way of learning (Barton, 1993). For example: cultural values may conflict with inquiry and questioning (McFarlane, 2004; McKinley, McPherson Waiti, & Bell, 1993, p. 239); science is broken into smaller and smaller parts whereas according to Durie (1995, p. 13) "Māori are interested in an integrated approach" and "Māori ... understanding comes much more from understanding the big bit and working out the relationships between the elements, rather than dissecting the elements".

While there may have been attempts to include some aspects of a Māori world in the introduction of the marautanga there is a lack of interconnectedness across the marautanga. For example Tawhaki is referred to in pāngarau, whakapapa and karakia are highlighted in Pūtaiao, while the te reo Māori curriculum makes reference to attitudes and values. There is no common binding, or underpinning cohesiveness.

Te reo Māori as the tuarā is a commonality in the marautanga and can be viewed as the language that carries cultural and philosophical underpinnings. Further common themes evident in each of the marautanga are: mauri, mana, wairua. These common themes can be encapsulated by the following quote,

Ko te reo te waka kawē i te wairua me te whakaaro Māori, e whakatinanatia ai ngā ahuatanga katoa o te ao Māori (Te Tahuu o te Mātauranga, 1996, p. 9).

Further, given that one cannot separate out the language from the culture there would be an expectation that included in the philosophical statements underpinning each of the marautanga there would be clear messages about te reo Māori and its relationship with the curriculum.

⁸ Agreement for Curriculum Development Services for Mathematics in the New Zealand Curriculum: Curriculum Statement in Māori, Contract 383-227 dated 3-12-1992 (see appendix in McMurchy-Pilkington, 2004).

Who are the users?

There are a range of formal learning contexts for Māori in Aotearoa. Approximately 85% of Māori learners are being educated in mainstream schooling contexts, 3% are being educated in Kura Kaupapa Māori, while 12% are located in bilingual units (other than Kura Kaupapa Māori) whereby they are educated in Māori medium for between 31% and 100% of their day (ERO, 2002). The June *Learning Media Newsletter* (Te Pou Taki Kōrero, 2003, p. 4) notes that as at 2002 there were 61 Kura Kaupapa Māori schools, 29 other immersion schools, 75 bilingual schools and 265 schools with immersion classes or bilingual classes. There are clearly a range of stakeholders.

Two stakeholders not clearly evident in curriculum development discourse at this time are the whānau and early childhood groups, particularly Te Kōhanga Reo.⁹ Traditionally, and in contemporary Te Kōhanga Reo contexts Māori tamariki learn alongside their whānau which includes their elders or grandparents. Additionally the National Education Guidelines (MOE, 1999) make reference to the place of the family as the first educators of their children. This stance is also signalled in the NZCF (1993, p. 3) “[c]urriculum developments, particularly at the junior primary level, take account of the national curriculum guidelines for early childhood education in New Zealand”. If the state is committed to an inclusive and a seamless curriculum (O’Neill, 1996), it is important that both the whānau and Māori medium early childhood groups are included in curriculum development. The original marautanga were not developed to be inclusive of early childhood contexts, now is the time to change that.

Should the marautanga try to be all things to all Māori? Early pāngarau curriculum writers debated who their audience was to be for the marautanga. This was not a question that needed to be considered by the English medium curriculum writers as it was assumed that those curricula were for everyone (McKinley & Waiti, 1995).

According to the Māori Project Manager of the first Māori medium marautanga:

... the ministry [helped] by making a decision and saying that the curriculum statement for Māori will be targeted at Kura Kaupapa schools, kura learners, those ones who are actually really teaching and learning te reo Māori. And that is couldn’t be based anything lower than that and everyone who was to use the document needed to either reach that level ... or not use it at all (Māori Project Manager, in McMurchy-Pilkington, 2004, p. 171).

The current curricula do not reflect the range of Māori medium stakeholders. An MOE study (MOE, 2003a) concluded that Māori teachers have a number of frustrations with the Māori medium documents as teachers perceive some of them as direct translations and therefore do

⁹ The Language Nest, Māori medium early Childhood centres.

not reflect Māori philosophies. The teachers indicated a desire for the curriculum documents to be more reflective of Māori pedagogy and tikanga.

Arising from cultural differences between Māori values and non-Māori values, tensions exist within academic (curriculum) and cultural contexts (Goulton, 1998). According to Dewes (1993, p. 31) “Schools with a kaupapa Māori (Māori principle and philosophical) base empower Māori students” whereas schools without this base disable Māori learners and teachers.

2.2 Issues

Should a new central expanded curriculum framework be developed to guide teaching and learning in Māori medium schools? This raises the issue of what should be in a central document and what should be in the individual curriculum statements? Should there actually be a central framework and should there be national curriculum statements for each of the essential learning areas? Where is the role of mātauranga Māori? What is the role of Te Aho Matua? The lack of an inclusive philosophy and central learning processes and competencies in either a curriculum framework or each of the marautanga has left teachers frustrated and confused by the multitude of: philosophical expressions, linguistic terms for the same processes, similar learning and teaching processes dealt with differently in each document, and different structures and components (MOE, 2003a).

2.3 Recommendations

- That an inclusive philosophy that is underpinned by Māori beliefs and values and Māori ways of viewing the world be developed for a new curriculum framework and for each new essential learning area.
- That a more comprehensive, inclusive, holistic, integrative curriculum framework that reflects Māori status as tangata whenua (MOE, 2002) and Māori aspirations be developed as the central core of new Māori national curricula.
- That each revised marautanga be consistent with the philosophy of the new national curriculum framework for Māori.
- That links be made with Te Kōhanga Reo National Trust and other Māori medium Early Childhood organisations to enable inclusive curriculum development.

3 Te Hanganga: Structure

3.1 Structure

This section largely relates to the structure of the Essential Learning areas or each of the curriculum statements. Areas discussed include the achievement objectives, the language and vocabulary (although these areas are covered in more detail in Section 9), separation and partition of knowledge, and the content.

A Māori way of viewing the world that includes both traditional and contemporary perspectives needs to be evident in the structure of each marautanga. The structure should reflect on the relationships and interrelationships of knowledge and understandings in line with our whakapapa, who we are, and how we are related to our ātua, to all things both living and non-living. A curriculum with a western underpinning reflects a 'western' or non-Māori world-view.

Māori teachers especially those from Kura Kaupapa Māori find there are too many achievement objectives, these are too broad, and the language and vocabulary is too difficult and inconsistent (Goulton, 2004; MOE, 2003a). Additionally they allege that the format and structural differences between the curricula are too confusing, driving some teachers to use the English curriculum for clarification (MOE, 2003a).

English medium curricula were based on an assumption that all users, both teachers and students, were first language users rather than second language users as many Māori are. Consequently there is little or no guidance or support for Māori teachers or students of the language demands of individual curriculum areas. This point became evident in the NEMP monitoring processes (Crooks & Flockton, 2000, 2001, 2002; Flockton & Crooks, 1999; Gilmore, Lovett, van Hasselt, 2003) and was highlighted by other writers (May et al., 2004) that second language learners may be at their 'expected' level in their understanding of the marau, but in a lower level in their expression of te reo Māori (p, 28). This aspect needs to have some consideration in the structure.

3.2 Content areas

Māori teachers indicated that they widely used integration of subjects (MOE, 2003a; McMurchy-Pilkington, 2004). While partitioning knowledge into subjects may be an accepted and desirable practice in western-European tradition, it can be an artificial construction for other cultures who view knowledge holistically. Begg (1993) questions whether the separation of subject areas reinforces dominant European views of knowledge. Ohia (1993b) argues against the teaching of marau in isolation from each other. Learning is more likely to be successful if the learner's own

language, culture, and experiences are connected in a meaningful way to the knowledge and skills being taught.

The marautanga content needs to be relevant to learners in Kura Kaupapa Māori and Māori medium contexts. On what basis was the decision made about the content for the current curriculum? Who specifically were the marautanga written for? One of the Māori writers of pāngarau shared her thoughts about this area showing the dilemma for Māori teachers and learners in the 21st century.

We were thinking about children ... coming through Kōhanga reo and they'd explored a lot of those older Māori contexts to the hilt in some way. I guess my own personal kind of thinking at that time, 'What do we want for Māori children? Do we want the world, do we want a broad context? For me I couldn't see how mathematics could be meaningful to them unless we include in things that we are part of. If roller blades were in there, because it might be those kinds of things that they do, especially if they were urban kids. Different from those kids from Whānau-ā-Apanui or Ruatoki, then they might have difference things (Māori Pāngarau Writer, in McMurchy-Pilkington, 2004, p. 171).

Many Māori teachers in a Te Puni Kokiri (2001b) audit expressed a similar desire for more "modern, topical themes, that is, experiences suitable for 'te rangatahi o tēnei ao hurihuri" (MOE, 2001a, p. 19). There is a danger of presenting only traditional aspects of indigenous cultures as diversity within the culture may be overlooked (MOE, 2001a).

There was no flexibility in the curriculum structure as it was predetermined (McKinley, 1995). The translation of achievement objectives for the Māori medium marautanga and the associated importation of a western epistemology has resulted in a dislocation and fragmentation of any aspects of a Māori world that may be in the whenu descriptions (Goulton, 2004). Hauora teachers noted a need for consistency and coherence. They felt that the hauora framework should be revised, particularly the whāinga paetae so that the whenu which were considered to contain Māori knowledge were able to find expression in the marautanga (Goulton, 2004).

3.3 Issues

The curricula may be written in te reo Māori but on what basis was the decision made about the content and structure for the current curricula? Who specifically were the marautanga written for? Teachers find the structure and the language of the curricula too difficult to work with. Additionally the partitioning of knowledge hinders the integration of subjects and the content needs to reflect the contexts of Māori learners. McKinley (1995, p. 81) argues that "the imposing of the curriculum construct of levels and behavioural objectives could be interpreted as controlling Māori through the Māori language".

3.4 Recommendations

- That the structure of each marautanga be reviewed to be inclusive of Māori traditional and contemporary epistemologies and Māori aspirations.
- That there needs to be a content framework that sits beside a linguistic framework for each of the marautanga.
- That consideration be given to examining the role, consistency, clarity, and the number of strands, whaingā paetae, assessment exemplars, and content of each marautanga.
- That each marautanga is supported by relevant resources that may include assessment exemplars, learning experiences, teacher guidance material.

4 Te Ako me Te Whakaako: Pedagogy

4.1 Pedagogy

The literature on Māori pedagogy spans a number of areas from learning in traditional contexts (Hemara, 2000; Pere, 1988), to Kōhanga Reo (Hohepa, McNaughton & Jenkins, 1996; Ka'ai, 1990; Royal Tangaere, 1997), to contemporary Māori medium and bilingual classes (Bishop, 2001; Bishop, Berryman & Richardson, 2001; Martin, McMurchy-Pilkington, Martin, 2004; McMurchy-Pilkington, Tamati, Martin, Martin, & Dale, 2002; Smith, 1997; 2003).

Chapple, Jeffries & Walker (1997) in examining the literature on pedagogy for possible reasons for the gap in Māori educational achievement noted a disappointing lack of literature in the area of pedagogy and Māori. Hemara (2000) found that information on Māori pedagogy is patchy and the written record is limited. This was also apparent in a curriculum stocktake report to the Minister of Education in 2002 that contained only a small paragraph on Māori and several paragraphs on culturally responsive teaching.

Hemara (2000) alleges that

... that way Māori educated themselves and their young appears to be applicable today. Many of the hallmarks of Māori education prove that traditional values and operating standards can be translated into contemporary contexts (p. 81).

Hemara's review also claims, that "Voices are now being heard that refute many 19th and 20th century perceptions and attitudes" (p. 80). However it is unclear whether this reference is to Māori voices refuting claims made by 'others' about Māori learning and teaching, or whether it is non-Māori voices that are refuting claims made by Māori about Māori learning and teaching in the 19th and 20th century.

According to Hemara (2000) there was a close relationship between the traditional curricula and the spiritual, social, intellectual, and physical wellbeing of the learner and its community. Formal learning usually took place in a *whare Wānanga* but much of the learning was carried out informally in social settings, sometimes in one-to-one situations. This allowed for the development of social interdependency. *Kaumatua* with their vast knowledge, wisdom, and reflection were deemed to be essential in the learning process. Different media, metaphors, allusions, and relationships helped to make the unfamiliar more familiar.

Both Pere and Metge describe learning through observation and participation “I slept, ate, played, worked and learnt alongside four generations...” surrounded by *whānaungatanga* relates Pere, (1988, p. 8). Metge calls this ‘education through exposure’ (1983, in Hemara, 2000, p. 22). Although learning alongside and supported by others it was expected that the learner would “work out what was going on and solve problems that arose” (Hemara, 2000, p. 22). Contemporary educational practice may place children at the centre of the learning, but in a traditional Māori context learners and teachers were located in the same place. Learning processes were reciprocal, in line with the Māori word ‘*ako*’, and all involved learnt something new.

Although preferred Māori pedagogies have been described as group oriented this does not preclude individualised or one to one interactions taking place (Hohepa et al., 1996; Ka’ai, 1990). Two studies carried out in *Kōhanga reo* demonstrated that group activities and group settings were widely favoured but there were many extended dyadic and personalised interactions (Hohepa et al., 1996; Ka’ai, 1990). The discourse in these Māori pedagogical settings differ from the typical discourse patterns that one would expect to see in a western educational context. The concept of *whānau* is embedded in *Te Kōhanga Reo* and *Kura Kaupapa Māori* contexts (Smith, 1997; Tangaere Royal, 1997) as the children learn about *whānau* responsibilities of caring and sharing, and looking after each other. However it is argued that

Simply introducing opportunities to display, for example, cooperative behaviour, in isolation for other Māori pedagogical values, beliefs and practices may not be very effective for Māori children’s learning (Hohepa et al., 1996; p. 39).

A comprehensive study that synthesises research in quality teaching for diverse students in schooling defines diversity as encompassing many characteristics including ethnicity (Alton-Lee, 2003). The study claims that “teaching that is responsive to student diversity can have very positive impacts on low and high achievers at the same time” (p. v). Ten characteristics of quality teaching are identified from the research and the researcher maintains that these interdependent characteristics “are generic in that they reflect principles derived from research across the curriculum” (p. v). Only one of the research-based characteristics includes the term

culture (Number three), “Effective links are created between school and other cultural contexts in which students are socialised, to facilitate learning” (p. vii) but the focus is more on school-home partnerships and student/parent dialogue rather than ethnic diversity. It would appear then that this study has little to offer teachers in Māori medium contexts.

A research project in Māori medium contexts involved 13 teachers who were identified by their peers as engaging in effective teaching and learning strategies for improving the reading and writing of their students (Bishop et al., 2001). These teachers exemplified a list of characteristics that enabled them to create a culturally responsive context for learning. Numerous examples were provided by the Māori medium teachers of personal qualities of effective teachers as identified by Fraser and Spiller (2001 in Bishop et al., 2001). The teachers were found to be compassionate and confidential [sic], act in a fair and just manner, were friendly and firm, had a sense of humour and treated their students with respect. Added to this the student proposed that the teachers exhibited a “large number of effective pedagogical characteristics (p. viii). What is somewhat significant is that amongst the 21 characteristics listed only two mention Māori (ako, whānau) and it could be argued that these two characteristics: “Importance of Ako: to teach, to learn” and “Close links to whānau” are not exclusive to Māori ways of knowing and doing.

The report states

Māori-medium education needs to be developed on its own terms, not on terms determined by the English-medium sector....

Problems that face the Māori-medium sector and examples of effective solutions to these problems need to be identified if there is to be real and consistent progress in Māori-medium education as a whole (Bishop et al., 2001, p. 1).

While we would agree with the claims in the above quote we would argue for a closer re-examination of the suggested characteristics needed for effective teaching in contemporary Māori immersion contexts. Martin, McMurchy-Pilkington, & Martin (2004) contend that effective Māori pedagogy incorporates both pedagogy and tikanga. Tikanga refers to a Māori philosophy of life, and the practices that regulate everyday behaviours and actions, that is, Māori philosophy in practice (Mead, 2003). Martin et al. believe it is tikanga that makes the difference in their teaching, setting their practice apart from their non-Māori colleagues. Therefore pedagogy and tikanga are integral.

Hemara (2000) proposed that traditional Māori curricula had a close relationship to the spiritual, social, physical, and intellectual well being of the individual and the community. We believe this applies also to contemporary curricula for Māori. As noted earlier under *Structure* the current curriculum documents are based on western knowledge frameworks, therefore it follows that tikanga, the spiritual, and often the collectivist social dimension are absent. Dewes (1993)

maintains that pedagogical models in schools of Aotearoa are “totally antithetical to Māori philosophy and practice” (p. 28). She adds that “It is a terrible indictment on Western education systems that social and cultural dimensions are ignored in the pursuit of education excellence” (p, 30).

The marautanga were written to reflect a constructivist pedagogy, but achievement objectives are behaviourist in design. For each marau, constructivist discourse is used whereby the learning experiences and assessment for credentialing or accountability purposes are by and large individualistic. This contrasts with Māori learners who tend to prefer a greater focus on group work or group outcomes (Forbes, 1995; Royal Tangaere, 1997). In teaching Māori learners therefore there is a need to be mindful of the importance of not only self-efficacy but also of collective efficacy (Goulton, 1998). The NEMP group tasks for assessment make effective links to this collective ways of learning and knowing.

ERO (2002) in reviewing Kura Kaupapa schools found that in their opinion 48% of curriculum teaching was satisfactory while 34% had unsatisfactory delivery. Comments like these of their own are hardly helpful when there is no indication of what constitutes ‘satisfactory’ or ‘unsatisfactory’, and on whose terms; or what support can be given to bring about change where it is needed. The report did find that “most kura have a good focus in providing an effective learning environment” and that “Community involvement and support is a strength of many kura (ERO, 2002, p. 7). Maori secondary teachers indicated a need for more professional development on appropriate teaching methodologies (TPK, 2001b). Teachers said that providing examples of programme would be useful (MOE, 2003c).

May, Hill & Takiwai (2004 p. 106-107) state that neither the Māori nor the English medium curriculum statements were seen as adequately supporting the teaching of reading, writing and oral language in Māori medium education. They note in several sections of their report (2004, pp. 2-3; 125-127; 134-135) the need for increased professional development on pedagogy about immersion and second language teaching and learning strategies at both the pre-service and in service level.

4.2 Issues

Can marautanga underpinned by western views of the world reflect effective Māori pedagogical practices? Teachers indicated they need increased professional development on effective pedagogies for Māori learners, including immersion and second language teaching.

4.3 Recommendations

- That a statement on effective pedagogies for Māori learning and teaching contexts be clearly articulated in a new curriculum framework.
- That a new curriculum framework and each marautanga be written in such a way that enables effective Māori pedagogies to be incorporated in the delivery of each marautanga.
- That professional development is made available by Māori for teachers on effective pedagogies for learning and teaching in Māori medium education.
- That ongoing research into effective Māori pedagogies be funded by MOE.

5. Te Hanga i Ngā Marautanga: Curriculum Development Processes

5.1 Curriculum development processes

Critiques have been made of the development process for the various marautanga (McKinley, 1995; McKinley & Waiti, 1995; McMurchy-Pilkington, 2004). What we largely have are curricula written in te reo Māori but not underpinned by Māori world views. A “curriculum written in Māori – or any other language – is not the same as a Māori curriculum, or a curriculum drawn from Māori values” (Durie, 2003, p. 17). McKinley (1995, p. 54) argues “who gets to negotiate and at what level is very important in curriculum development”. Non-negotiable requirements were imposed on the Māori developers with the result that they “could not develop a curriculum from the same starting point” as the English medium developers. Adherence to the structure, inclusive of levels, strands, achievement objectives, and learning outcomes was a requirement imposed on the curriculum developers by the MOE (Barker, 1999; McKinley, 1995; McMurchy-Pilkington, 2004). Thus it could be said that the English medium curricula became the “expert guide for the inexperienced developers” (McKinley & Waiti, 1995, p. 91). This process saw “the control of Māori knowledge moving out of Māori hands and into Pākehā hands” (Smith, 1994, p. 152). Māori input may have been sought by the state during the development process but it could be argued the consultation was “... merely in terms of how Māori people intend to fit into the ‘fait accompli’ ...” (Smith, 1994, p. 150).

Those involved in the development of the curricula stated that there was never enough time to do justice to the curricula development process. This was related to another concern and that was limited resourcing to carry out the task or to do all that the developers felt was necessary to develop an effective curricula for Māori learners (McMurchy-Pilkington, 2004; MOE, 2001c, p. 3). Houia & Crombie (1993) argue there was almost no opportunity to challenge the direction of curriculum development as the speed of change has meant that there was no time for debate. Additionally that the haste with which curriculum development took place in New Zealand/Aotearoa is reminiscent of the speed of similar developments in England and Wales.

There was “no time for genuine debate, genuine consultation or genuine research” (Houia & Crombie, 1993, p. 32).

Developers generally worked in isolation, often away from their language/tikanga roots, and disconnected from each other. This resulted in fragmentation of the language, the discourse, the philosophical, and structural aspects, which are evident across the curricula (McKinley, 1995; McKinley & Waiti, 1995; McMurchy-Pilkington, 2004).

There does not appear to have been provisions for a role for Māori community and parents in the development of the existing curricula. Research by Meaney & Fairhall (2003) demonstrates how one Māori school community developed a mathematics curriculum using a framework designed by one of the researchers. This is an area that needs to be addressed in any future development. Hollings (1995) alleges Māori medium curricula need Māori contribution not just to the process but also to the content and that “requires a lot more Māori research to be going on” (p. 101).

5.2 Issues

Te reo Māori may have been used but Māori knowledge was not necessarily legitimated in the development of ngā marautanga (McKinley, 1995). What is the role of Māori whānau and communities in curriculum development? It is essential that formal and informal processes are developed by MOE whereby dialogue between the various developers is an integral aspect of curricula development to ensure that each team is not “replicating some of the processes, mistakes, and strategies being built up by the other groups” (McMurchy-Pilkington, 2004, p. 237). Any re-development process needs to ensure that we do not repeat “... the level of negotiation in the development process such that it casts doubt on whether this project could be called a curriculum development project at all” (McKinley, 1995, p. 47).

5.3 Recommendations

- That a clear consultative process with key stakeholder groups, in particular Kura Kaupapa Māori, Te Kōhanga Reo National Trust, and iwi educational authorities, be set up and implemented.
- That Māori curriculum teams with the appropriate expertise be involved in all aspects of the development of the new curriculum framework and each of the marautanga for Māori medium contexts.
- That all the curriculum teams for each marautanga meet together to discuss and decide on some common issues like consistency in philosophy, structure, discourse, and vocabulary.

- That research to describe and evaluate curricula development processes for Māori medium be funded by MOE.

6. Te Whakarewatanga o Ngā Marautanga: Implementation and Professional Development

6.1 Implementation

Begg (1993) suggests there are six possible ways that a curriculum development initiative may be implemented by teachers: ownership, adoption, adaption, tokenism, delusion, and indifference. Ownership comes about if teachers are involved in the development process. Although Māori were involved in the Māori medium curriculum development process, the manner and level of their input was defined by the state, that is, by non-Māori (Johnston, 1999; McMurchy-Pilkington, 2004). Adoption is when teachers simply do what is expected of them; adaption happens where teachers use their own ideas and incorporate bits of the curricula into their teaching; tokenism, what many teachers do, is to make one or two changes so they can say they are doing something new; with delusion, teachers think they are carrying out new ideas but in reality they are not; with indifference, teachers continue with the old curricula and ignore the new one. According to interviews with Kura Kaupapa Māori teachers and Māori teachers in units the way in which they implement the curriculum extends across the range of these five (MOE, 2003a). A few teachers admitted they were not in fact using the curricula as these did not meet the needs of their children. Others stated they used both the English and the Māori versions. They reverted to the English version when the vocabulary or ideas were too hard to understand in the Māori medium document.

In the development of the marautanga the extent of the extra demands this would place on Māori teachers was an unforeseen outcome (MOE, 2003b). This has resulted in many Māori teachers developing strategies such as first reading the English medium to guide them. This gap in understanding was also evident in the development of *Te Poutama Tau*¹⁰ where facilitators found that because of the lack of historical development of te reo Māori as a medium of instruction they had to give a lot of time and attention to this aspect in the workshops (MOE, 2003b, p. 16). In an audit concerning Māori language resourcing with Māori language teachers in 40 schools, nearly 90% of teachers said they “made some use of the curriculum statements in Māori” (TPK, 2001, p. 16). However only 50% of the total said they ‘always’ used the Māori medium curricula when planning for teaching, with 39% saying they sometimes did, and 11% saying they seldom or never used the Māori medium curricula.

¹⁰ Māori medium numeracy project

During the development and trialling of *Te Poutama Tau*, feedback from Māori teachers indicated a mismatch for Māori learners in the implementation model of this numeracy project (MOE, 2003b, p. 17). Teachers alleged that the model would not bring about the best results for Māori so the MOE suggested that the facilitators and Māori teachers be more flexible in their approach. This flexibility of process needs to happen more often – listening to the voices of Māori teachers and Māori communities.

Where teachers were confident in working from the Māori curricula this was more often related to the amount and quality of the professional development they had engaged in. Begg (1993) suggests that the most significant barrier towards the use of new curricula is the lack of ownership. However if the development process is given plenty of time, if consultation occurs at numerous stages throughout the process or local curriculum initiatives are encouraged then ownership may develop. There are clear messages here for national curricula development for Māori.

Implementation of marautanga needs also to include support and guidance for whanau. Māori whānau need to be involved in the implementation of the marautanga. Learning cannot just be confined to school, the home must also be involved in their children's learning. This would parallel developments in the English medium curriculum.

6.2 Professional development

Māori teachers indicated a strong need for continued and sustainable professional development (PD) that reflects Māori philosophies and aspirations, particularly for those who are isolated in mainstream school settings (MOE, 2003a). Some teachers indicated that the PD they had attended either did not provide adequate support (TPK, 2001a) for them to improve the achievement of their students, that it was too theoretical and not classroom based (p. 22), or that it didn't meet their needs (MOE, 2001c). Many stated that they knew more than some of the PD facilitators, and that there is a need for PD for the providers of PD, especially where they are unfamiliar with the Māori medium documents as in some Colleges of Education. There is a need to develop a national, pro-Māori self-sustainable culture of expertise (MOE, 2001c, p. 4).

Over half of the Māori teachers interviewed in one study indicated that they had received the most helpful professional development from advisors in the past (MOE, 2003a p. 22) but many of the teachers indicated that they gained their professional development from colleagues in other schools (MOE, 2003a) or from knowledgeable members of the community (ERO, 2002). Some teachers in Māori units found attending university for such programmes as *Whakapiki i te reo* or *Röpū Reo Rua* were most helpful (MOE, 2001c; 2003a). Others noted that PD was not offered frequently enough to be effective (TPK, 2001).

In another research project (MOE, 2003b) Māori teachers indicated that having a combination of workshops and in-class work was the most helpful PD. They also found having the facilitator modelling was an effective learning context for them. However they identified difficulty in finding relievers for PD release time (see also MOE, 2001c), which may be a reason that many KKM teachers tend to engage in whole school PD rather than individual PD (MOE, 2003a). Teachers suggested that a pool of relievers is set up to release teachers in Māori medium contexts (MOE, 2001c)¹¹. Some just found the PD too far away to even consider attending (TPK, 2001) or that family responsibilities were too onerous to consider committing to (MOE, 2001c, p. 8). A further disincentive to engage in PD was that teachers found taking time away from the classroom meant increased workloads through having to prepare for relievers or catching up on their return (Goulton, 2004).

Three areas identified for PD priority for KKM teachers were greater emphasis on teaching techniques, more focus on level-specific training, and having more courses and material written in Māori and presented by Māori (MOE, 2003a, p, 23).

Learning more about aromatawai (assessment) and how to implement this in their classroom was also identified as important. However language issues need also to be included in professional development as the PD facilitators in *Te Poutama Tau* noted that language issues take up a lot of time in their sessions (MOE, 2003b, p. 36). PD that is offered must take account of the wide varying backgrounds of the teachers (Goulton, 2004). Teachers' voices tend to suggest that there is a need for a "multi-pronged modular [modular?] approach to PD" (MOE, 2001c, p. 4).

Many teachers suggested that PD should coincide with the release of new resources (TPK, 2001). This would contribute to effective use of the resources they said, rather than have them lying on the shelf unused because no one really understood their purpose.

In their review of bilingual/immersion education May et al. (2004) alleged that professional development for teachers in such contexts were seriously inadequate, particularly at the pre-service level. They strongly advocated for professional development in theories of bilingual/immersion education at pre-service and in-service levels to be significantly extended and resourced nationally. An annual hui for the learning and teaching of te reo Māori would be useful with no agendas other than te reo Māori (MOE, 2001c, p.5).

¹¹ The difficulty of finding relievers has also been identified as a problem for teachers gaining places in Whakapiki courses.

6.3 Issues

How to ensure teachers and whānau make more effective use of ngā marautanga? Teachers admitted that they implement the marautanga in a variety of ways, a few did not use them at all, others used both the English and Māori versions. Would ensuring all teachers had ongoing professional development by Māori, that reflected Māori philosophies and aspirations, relevant to ngā marautanga, and useful for classroom contexts result in increased achievement for Māori learners? Teachers have indicated they want PD in a variety of areas including assessment and on the use of new resources as these are released. Additionally PD needs to be supported with a pool of suitable relievers. Professional development on theories and research of bilingualism/immersion and first and second language acquisition is also seen to be imperative.

6.4 Recommendations

- That Professional Development by Māori for teachers of Māori medium contexts form an integral aspect of any revised marautanga.
- That professional development for teachers of Māori medium contexts reflect Māori aspirations in education and include a variety of models.
- That a range of professional development opportunities be provided for Māori language proficiency development.
- That professional development in theories and research of bilingualism/immersion and first and second language acquisition at pre-service and in- service levels for teachers of Māori medium contexts be significantly extended and resourced nationally.
- That ongoing research to develop wider understanding of the theories and research underpinning bilingualism/ immersion education be resourced as a matter of urgency (May et al, 2004).
- That whānau involvement in the implementation of the marautanga be encouraged and resourced.

7 Te Aromatawai: Assessment

7.1 Assessment

In 1998 the government adopted the Māori Language Education Plan (MLEP) with five key elements that aimed to increase learning of te reo Māori and to improve the delivery of Māori language learning. The third element concerns “developing assessment tools to determine if language education and education outcomes are being achieved” (TPK. 2001. p. 11). However the audit on Māori language resourcing was strangely silent on this area.

Hollings, Jeffries & McArdell (1992) reported to MOE over ten years ago that most teachers in Kura Kaupapa Māori are not satisfied with the way they are assessing Māori language. In the curriculum areas other than te reo Māori teachers were using translations or interpretations of English based materials. Several of the recommendations in the report included an urgent need for further professional development in all areas of Māori language assessment and for professional development for teachers in Māori medium settings. It is pleasing to note the work that has been done by Rau (1998) on assessments for early literacy, the exemplar development, and the work of Te Taura Whiri on Māori language assessment. However this work needs to be ongoing and extended to all the curriculum areas.

In a report of the Education and Science Committee on the Inquiry into the teaching of reading in New Zealand (House of Representatives, 2001, p. 39) it noted “ERO reports that while assessment tools are being developed they are currently inadequate and many teachers do not know how to use what is available”. The recommendation under assessment reads as follows:

That there be urgent development of more assessment tools – diagnostic and benchmark – for use in Māori-medium schools. The development of further diagnostic tools must be clearly linked to teaching programmes; legitimated by Māori cultural processes; and accompanied by appropriate teacher development support (House of Representatives, 2001, p. 39).

ERO (2002) claimed that 56% of Kura Kaupapa Māori schools lacked effective means to assess their programmes and the needs of Māori children attending their schools. This resulted in Kura Kaupapa Māori (KKM) being unable to demonstrate the effectiveness of their teaching to outside agencies. Assessment was considered to be one of the greatest weaknesses in KKM. In their summary of key programme factors May et al. (2004, p. 133) maintain that teachers in bilingual/immersions settings need “access to appropriate language assessment resources, and consistent and regular training and support in them”. So despite reports, recommendations and goals relevant assessment tools and processes for Māori medium contexts still appear to be an area of concern.

NEMP (Crooks & Flockton, 2000, 2001, 2002; Flockton & Crooks, 1999; Gilmore, Lovett, van Hasselt, 2003), AsTTie (MOE, 2004) and the Exemplars (MOE, n.d., www.tki.org.nz) are three

developments that have involved writing or gathering assessment tasks in the medium of te reo Māori with input from Māori teachers. Many of the assessments are translations and some are written by practising Māori teachers. Some caution against using translated materials (MOE, 2001a) and NEMP's work has contributed to the ongoing debate in this area. These are important developments that need ongoing reflection, resourcing and teacher PD. The challenge "is to develop appropriate tasks using both authentic Māori text and cultural practices" that reflect the experiences of Māori learners (EARU, 2001).

The NEMP reports (Crooks & Flockton, 2000, 2001, 2002; Flockton & Crooks, 1999; Gilmore, Lovett, van Hasselt, 2003) suggest that there are areas in the achievement of learners Kura Kaupapa Māori and Māori immersion education contexts where they are achieving the same as or are exceeding learners in English medium contexts. However these reports show there are some areas where Māori learners are not achieving as well as their peers (see also MOE, 2003b). While there are some mitigating factors for Māori medium contexts, in particular linguistic issues, ongoing research should be funded in this area. What does not help is to read conflicting reports in the media about the same set of results. For example one Christchurch newspaper article headlined *Care urged on Māori tests* (Scanlon, 2001) begins with "Students in Māori language are performing slightly worse than Māori students in mainstream schools". Whereas another article appearing on the same day in Wellington with the headline *Māori immersion pupils 'keeping up'* begins "Students taught in Māori are keeping up with their peers in other schools, a national survey has found " (Dominion, 2001).

NEMP (Crooks & Flockton, 2000, 2001, 2002; Flockton & Crooks, 1999; Gilmore, Lovett, van Hasselt, 2003) goes through a fairly rigorous process in ensuring that the tasks administered to national samples of Māori learners in total immersion settings are suitable and have validity, reliability, and consistency across non-Māori peers. Nonetheless they are mindful of the possible disadvantages to Māori learners and they suggest caution in any conclusions drawn about the comparative merits of Māori immersion and English language education from the national results. They note that translated tasks may be equivalent in terms of the subject level but not at the level of the student's te reo Māori (Gilmore, Lovett, van Hasselt, 2003, p. 28). There is an attempt to involve Māori immersion teachers in the writing of assessment tasks as there are concerns that some of the translated tasks may not be in line with Māori ways of thinking.

Some Māori medium teachers expressed that "millions are spent on assessment" although there is still a great dearth of resources to support marautanga like te reo Māori and second language learning (MOE, 2001c). Teachers indicated issues around the impact of assessment and expressed concerns that it appears that "we're valuing what we measure, not measuring what we value" (MOE, 2001c. p, 6).

7.2 Issues

Assessment is considered to be one of the areas that is proving a challenge to KKM schools (ERO, 2002; Crooks & Flockton, 2000, 2001, 2002; Flockton & Crooks, 1999; Gilmore, Lovett, van Hasselt, 2003). NEMP and other MOE initiatives are engaged in developing, monitoring, or providing assessment resources. How can more teachers in Māori medium contexts be assisted in developing or using effective assessment tools for their learners? Two issues arising around assessment include the nature and impact of translated tasks, and a need for teacher professional development in the areas of assessment.

7.3 Recommendations

- That professional development in effective classroom assessment using appropriate Māori medium assessment tools and strategies are seen as imperative for teachers of Māori medium contexts.
- That MOE continue to fund and research assessment initiatives that relate to the curricula and are relevant for Māori immersion contexts.
- That NEMP continue to work with Māori medium teachers and Māori communities to resolve some of the identified issues concerning the assessment of Māori learners in te reo Māori.

8 Ngā Rauemi: Resources

8.1 Resources

The development of Māori medium education “within a context of language decline has resulted in a demand for resources (both human and material) that has been difficult to satisfy” (MOE, 2003, p. 11). In an audit by TPK (2001a) 75% of the Māori teachers involved stated that there were not enough learning and teaching materials in the medium of Māori to support their needs. This is despite the production of more Māori language resources for use by teachers and students being one of the goals of a Māori Language Education Plan. These resources which are to be “graded according to the language proficiency of students, are essential to ensure that interest is maintained in learning and using the language and that a quality Māori language education is provided” (TPK, 1999, p. 14).

Looking back over the previous 10 years as Māori educators we could say that there are a growing number of human and material resources to support the teaching of the marautanga in te reo Māori. However there is still a “limited availability of suitable resources” for teaching and learning programmes in te reo Māori compared to those in mainstream schools (MOE, 2003a,

p. 6). In some areas there are significant gaps (ERO, 2002) or they are non-existent or downright 'scarce' (Te Pou Taki Kōrero, 2003, Crooks & Flockton, , 2001, p.6). Shortage of appropriate and readily accessible resources in some areas, particularly pāngarau (MOE, 2003b), resulted in teachers relying on non-Māori resources such as textbooks and photocopied worksheets (MOE, 2003a, p. 6). Many teachers have made their own iwi based resources, and teachers often share their own home made resources with other schools or teachers (TPK, 2001a).

Māori medium resources will never keep pace with English medium resources. English medium resources have been both centrally and privately published for many years. Additionally the MOE and schools have had access to thousands of English medium resources from overseas markets. It has only been in the last ten years that there has been any substantial activity by the MOE in this area. As Henare Everitt (previously a manager for Learning Media Māori) was heard to once remark, that if all the MOE resourcing budget for two years was put exclusively into Māori medium resources, this would make a tremendous impact for Māori medium education and possibly no noticeable difference to English medium teaching and learning resources which have been built up over many years. Some teachers believe that "The resource pool is being dipped into by too many small separate initiatives that are not linked (MOE, 2001c, p. 5).

Currently resources are a combination of translated and original or adapted materials. For some resources, the fact they are translations may not be problematic. However as NEMP (Crooks & Flockton, 2000, 2001, 2002; Flockton & Crooks, 1999) cautions us that while translations may have been done "with considerable care by a team of [seven] experienced people, some of the resulting translations used vocabulary or language structures that would not have been easy for all immersion students to understand" (2001, p. 6).

A group of Māori educators has been instrumental in compiling a comprehensive resource document "Māori in the New Zealand Curriculum," currently still in draft form (Gardiner & Parata, 2004. p. 29). This resource is to be used as a basis for programme planning to assist in the learning of Māori for students in NZ mainstream schools. Similar documents need to appear for Māori medium contexts. Kura Kaupapa Māori teachers have made requests for more support documents to help the understanding of the marau, and they wanted to have a support document where the whenu is broken down with further activities (MOE, 2003a).

Ohia (in Gilmore, Lovett, van Hasselt, 2003, p. 29) cautions us about the results from some of the NEMP monitoring because of the problematic nature of translations and the possible mismatch between a learner's understanding of the spoken and written word. Sometimes in the

translation the mathematics concept is changed so there is a great need to ensure those involved are both experienced mathematics teachers and speakers of Māori with native like fluency (Trinick, 1999). There is a difficulty in working with resource materials printed in English as Māori teachers are concerned about translation problems that lead to lack of correctness and conciseness in te reo Māori and lack of clarity in the subject area (MOE, 2003b).

We are left with the message that there needs to be more than translated materials as “curriculum priorities are different for Māori immersion education than for general education, patterns of achievement can be expected to differ accordingly” (Crooks & Flockton, 2001, p. 6). Further there needs to be language checks to ensure some consistency across iwi dialects, registers, varieties, and colloquialisms (McCaffery, McMurchy-Pilkington, & Dale, 1998). Supplementary resources like videos are also necessary to support the readers, other printed material (MOE, 2001c) and radio and television (EARU, 2003). Additionally there needs to be resources for students to focus on the essential skills (MOE, 2001c, p. 5).

One pressing issue is that in some instances there appears to be a disconnection between the resource development and teachers familiarity with the resources (MOE, 2001, 2003a; TPK, 2001a). This highlights a further tension and that is the need for professional development not only for pedagogy, curriculum, and assessment, but also in the effective use of resources (EARU, 2003; MOE, 2003a; MOE, 2003b).

An area of concern was that most of the Kura Kaupapa Māori teachers interviewed in an MOE study (MOE, 2003a) indicated they had not seen or used the resources provided by the MOE publications to support their mathematics teaching (p. 20). The publication they were most familiar with however was *Whakamahi i te Pāngarau* document although only 5 out of the 15 who replied had seen it and only 3 had actually used it. It would follow then that PD needs to go hand in hand with resource development.

While the quantity and quality of Māori medium resources produced have improved considerably over the last decade “there was a mismatch between what was produced and what classroom teachers wanted” (TPK, 2001, p. 7). In line with this finding TPK noted that MOE had set a goal to work more closely with Māori language teachers on the development of learning resources. Many teachers suggested that the MOE should have follow up surveys after resources have been distributed to determine what is useful and what is not (TPK, 2001), although this is somewhat problematic if teachers do not actually get to see or learn about the resources (MOE, 2003a).

Māori Teachers indicated they wanted resources on contemporary topical themes for their learners' lifestyles along with grading and cataloguing of the resources so that teachers could make more effective use of them (TPK, 2001a). Resources ought to take into account dialectical differences.

Teachers indicated there needed to be a clear distinction between resources made for teachers and those developed for their pupils. It may also be worth considering developing a third category of resources that involve the whānau (Goulton, 2004).

Many Māori teachers who are second language learners expressed a need for more curriculum support material in English (TPK, 2001a, p. 22). This creates a tension with those who want more resources in te reo Māori (MOE, 2003a). Nonetheless PD on how to use the Māori medium material would likely both support the reo development of the second language learners and demonstrate the effective use of the material.

8.2 Issues

Although the number of resources has increased there is still a great need for ongoing resource production both in te reo Māori (MOE, 2001a) and also to support second language teachers and learners. Concerns about using translated resources are ongoing and cognisance should be taken of some of the issues being raised in this area by NEMP and Māori teachers. How can we get Teachers to be involved in decisions about resource development to ensure they get resources that meet their learners' needs? It is important that professional development goes hand in hand with resource development so teachers understand how to use the resources in ways that effect learning. Resources being developed should have language checks.

8.3 Recommendation

- That resource development to support the Māori medium curricula continue as a matter of priority.
- That resource development recognise and support the difficulties and tensions of working in Māori medium contexts, and with second language teachers and learners.
- That professional development go hand in hand with resource development to enable Māori medium teachers to gain maximum benefit from the resources.
- That long term planning for resource development be formulated in consultation with Māori medium teachers so as to ensure their needs and the needs of their learners are reflected in the resources.
- That MOE make more use of internet and electronic sources for more effective use of resources.

9. Ngā Take Reo: Linguistic Issues

9.1 *Linguistic Issues*

He taonga tō reo ('Your Language is a Treasure').

Language revitalisation will only succeed when planning and initiatives reflect the will of the people" (TPK, 2003a, p. 1, 2).

Since the colonisation period of the 1800s te reo Māori has lacked historical development as a medium of instruction in formal education contexts. Therefore there were no established patterns of discourse in most of the essential learning areas as "the language had not been allowed to develop and grow naturally over previous generations" (MOE, 2003b, p. 12). New demands are being placed on te reo Māori to meet the advances in technology and academic contexts (Barton, Fairhall & Trinick, 1998). Additionally on entering formal schooling Māori learners can be located on a much wider language continuum than their English speaking peers (Bishop et al., 2002; Flockton & Crooks, 1999). These factors have contributed to issues that need addressing in order to teach the Māori medium curricula effectively.

After many years of Māori resistance to colonising practices Māori/English bilingual primary schools and Māori immersion schools began in the early to mid 1980s. Out of these schools rose the development of an explicit mathematics vocabulary (Barton & Fairhall, 1995; Barton, Fairhall, Trinick, 1998), along with vocabulary to support the other curriculum areas. While Māori language development was the focus for many Māori whānau, they came to the realisation that "there is a need to combine the revitalisation of the Māori language with attempts to improve their education achievement rates" (Ohia, 1993b, p. 108). Māori parents who send their children to be educated in te reo Māori are no longer satisfied with merely achieving Māori language fluency, what they expect from education are the "best possible outcomes" and "zero tolerance of educational failure" (Durie, 2001, p. 6).

The state has indicated its support for the promotion of te reo Māori in a range of policy statements and support documents (see for example TPK 1999a, b, 2003a, b; TPK & TTWTRM, 2003) and regularly collects statistics to monitor development (TPK, 2002a;) and reports to the community (ERO, 1995; 2002; TPK, 1999b; 2001c, 2002a, b;). It is important to note that in the context of schools and the curriculum there are two aspects of language: language that helps teachers teach, and language that helps learners learn (MOE, 2001c, p. 2). There are concerns about teachers' level of reo competency and to "address this will require more than advisers". One could say that those who cannot understand the curriculum documents fully should not teach te reo Māori but then who will given that many Māori teachers are second language learners themselves (MOE, 2003c, p. 2)? The answer lies in giving a priority focus to teachers' reo development, helping teachers "pick this language up so as to

ultimately help their students' language improve rather than just minimise technical language" (Ibid).

The introduction of many new words involved a struggle (MOE, 2001c, p. 2), leaving many teachers unfamiliar with the document, and a need for much greater professional development integral to the development process. The quality of te reo Māori used by teachers and learnt by children has been the subject of at least five major pieces of research. (Dale, McCaffery, McMurchy-Pilkington, 1998; ERO, 2000, 2002; Hollings, Jeffries & McArdell, 1992; Karetu, 1996; Rau, 2003).

Rau (2003) examined the literacy skills of Māori students in years one to three. She notes that one of the most significant factors in raising student literacy is the high number of linguistically challenging documents in Māori medium education and the demands these make on teachers who are themselves mostly second language learners. She argues therefore that Māori medium teachers need significantly greater language and literacy professional development.

The ERO (2000) report maintains that the curriculum document themselves inadequately support the teaching of literacy and oral language in Māori medium settings. Only 12 out of 52 Kura Kaupapa Māori reviewed were considered to have demonstrated good quality language programmes. They found that at only 23 out of the 52 kura the methods used were likely to lead to competency in te reo Māori.

From the assessment findings from 47 Māori medium programmes Hollings et al. (1992) conclude there was a lack of appropriate assessment procedures and tools for te reo Māori development. Two main variables that impacted on this situation were the lack of high quality resources and teachers who are second language learners rather than fluent speakers of te reo Māori.

In noting that the initial period of language revitalisation has been successful Karetu (1996) and Dale, McCaffery, McMurchy-Pilkington (1998) call for a greater emphasis on issues of quality of te reo Māori. The writers present a case that the current language being used by kaiako and tamariki is significantly different from the reo used by previous generations of native speakers. There are many concerning features and language items that have come into current usage by many speakers. More worrying appears to be the lack of teacher strategies to address these issues and to improve the quality of te reo Māori spoken by kaiako and learnt by students.

Research in pāngarau suggests that trying to learn western mathematics in a second language can cause difficulties as the logic of a language can change the way that students learn

mathematics, and the structure of the language can interfere with the mathematics concept (Barton, 1993; Trinick, 1999). On the other hand as mathematics teaching is “heavily laden with passives” and second language learners of Māori tend to favour the active voice unlike native speakers of the language, then mathematics teaching can be a positive support in the revitalisation of te reo Māori (Fairhall, 1993, p. 121). Vocabulary and grammatical structures must be chosen carefully and there needs to be an awareness that direct translation can cause difficulties due to idiomatic language (Fairhall, 1993; Trinick, 1999). This view is reinforced by the work being carried out by NEMP in its national monitoring of Māori year 4 and year 8 learners (Crooks & Flockton, 2000, 2001, 2002; Flockton & Crooks, 1999; Gilmore, Lovett, van Hasselt, 2003). In order to make curriculum more relevant to Māori students, it is not enough to merely change English words to Māori words and leave the knowledge or process content unchanged (Clark, 1999; Trinick, 1999).

After more than four years of engaging in national monitoring of samples of year four and year eight Māori learners in total immersion settings NEMP has articulated some cautions in interpreting assessment results (Crooks & Flockton, 2000, 2001, 2002; Flockton & Crooks, 1999; Gilmore, Lovett, van Hasselt, 2003, p. 28, p. 29). While many Māori may seem to be fluent speakers, there is often a wide gap between conversational language and an ability to engage with academic language or concepts in te reo Māori, or between engagement orally and in writing, or between the subject level and the linguistic level (MOE, 2001c, p. 3). There is also a tension between using the standardised vocabulary of the curriculum and local dialects used by schools. If the language of the terms are not standardised at least for teachers then problems arise as Māori learners meet more sophisticated levels of the same topic areas at higher levels of the curriculum, or if they change schools (MOE, 2003b).

The conclusion from all the formal and anecdotal information to date is that issues with the quality of te reo Māori needs to be urgently addressed.

This situation requires that any future Māori medium curriculum development gives far more language guidance to teachers and learners than would be the case with curriculum for languages that are far less endangered. We note that the MOE has introduced generic *Whakapiki i Te Reo* courses for teacher Māori language development, and in 2003 established other Whakapiki courses for specific curriculum areas like pāngarau and hangarau. Teachers on these courses report enormous benefits in both their personal and pedagogical reo confidence and abilities (MOE, 2003a. see also footnote¹²).

¹² Personal communication from a meeting with course participants in September 2004.

Te Taura Whiri i Te Reo Māori was set up under the Māori Language Act 1987. Its main purpose was to initiate, support and develop policy to promote, revitalise, and maintain te reo Māori as a living language. With the development of the Māori medium curricula between 1993 and 2000 Māori language development proceeded at a phenomenal pace to keep up with the demand of the technical language required to engage in the discourse of each of the marau (Harlow, 1993). There has been a proliferation of vocabulary and discourses for teachers (Rau, 2003 in May et al., 2004) who are second language learners, and they have had difficulty internalising these (MOE, 2003b, p. 12). In forming a set of guidelines to assist in the development of new vocabulary Te Taura Whiri has engaged Māori speakers in the debate about 'loans' from other languages, in particular English. Language purists would purge all transliterations and language borrowings. In fact it could be said that this is likely to be the view of any marginalised minority group that is facing language and cultural extinction. On the other hand some iwi and hapū have already incorporated large numbers of local transliterated words into their daily conversation.¹³ The question could be asked why not borrow words? Why do Māori have to have Māori translations for senior chemistry or mathematics? Harlow (1993) gives strong reasons why this is a situation that many Māori could not live with.

To preserve the language as a living means of communication entails preserving it in opposition to and distinct from English. If, in order to fit Māori for the modern world, we borrow from English, this looks like a sort of admission of defeat, an admission in fact Māori is not capable of handling new areas and topics with its own resources (p. 129).

Parallels for issues relating to the language demands of the curriculum should then be drawn from settings where minority languages are under revival and maintenance. It cannot be assumed that teachers have access to the language they need in order to foster quality learning in curriculum areas (MOE, 2003b). Nor can it be assumed that students have the language necessary to handle the demand being made by the curriculum. NEMP (EARU, 2002) urges that a key component for success "is the development of rich language environments which encourage the growth of students' vocabulary, sentence structure, thinking skills and clarity of explanations" (p.4).

As Māori teachers and learners are largely second language learners of te reo we therefore must repackage te reo Māori in the marautanga so it is far more user friendly and accessible and supports teachers in their Māori language development (Goulton, 2004; TPK, 2001b). Many teachers found the language difficult (Goulton, 2004; MOE, 2003a). What tends to happen is that when communicating many teachers tend to think in English and translate their teaching concepts using English language forms (McMurchy-Pilkington & Trinick, 2002). This 'borrowing of linguistic structures' (MOE, 2003b, p. 37) can either lead to student confusion and

¹³ It is not suggested that this is a one way process. In fact many Māori words have become part of many New Zealanders' every day conversation e.g. whānau, kia ora, hui, koha.

misunderstanding of the language structure, or interfere with their understanding of the content, or both (Trinick, 1999).

Murphy & Hollings (1993) express a concern “that the lack of sophistication of the children’s language may not enable them to pursue intellectually demanding tasks that will enable them to develop the higher metacognitive levels of thinking essential for success in an academic world” (p.13). As it has been alleged that “[I]n some cases language proficiency was identified as an impediment to student achievement” (MOE, 2003b, p. 8; Flockton & Crooks, 1999) then it is imperative that both teachers and Māori learners’ language development needs are supported. A second review of *Te Poutama Tau* suggests that learners “with lower language proficiency tended to make less progress than those who were more proficient (MOE, 2004a, p. 7).

Some Māori educationalists suggest a need to resurrect terms that had fallen out of use (McMurphy-Pilkington, 2004). This may or may not reduce the mismatch some young Māori learners find when trying to talk to their kaumatua using the academic or more technical language of the classroom.

9.2 Dialects and Standardisation

Many Māori teachers have stated that they prefer to use ‘local’ vocabulary or expressions in preference to standardised terms because they allege that the standardised terms are not well understood (MOE, 2003b).

Tensions exist between transliterations and iwi dialects. Should we keep transliterations or do they arise from colonialist hegemonic contexts? Are they a normal part of contact between peoples (Harlow, 1993)?

May et al (2004) suggest that while mainstream schooling contexts have expanded Māori medium programmes

there is a high likelihood that many of these programmes are not teaching *sufficiently* through te reo Māori as the target language. ... The degree to which te reo Māori is a significant *instructional* language in many of these contexts remains open to serious question, certainly those with lower levels of immersion. This is of particular concern, given that instructional content in the target language [Māori] is central to additive bilingualism and the cognitive and educational advantages of bilingualism.

Good models of the language are essential... (original emphasis, p. 122).

Curriculum statements and many resources are pitched at fluent speakers (TPK, 2001), which does not reflect classroom reality. Many Māori teachers and students are second language learners and need resources designed with this purpose in mind. Consideration should be given to the use and influence of Māori television and radio. Learners’ te reo Māori can be

reinforced or changed through listening to or watching the media. There should be research to track Māori language changes through the impact of Māori medium media in the home and also the influence of iwi initiatives on te reo Māori. There may be lessons to be learned for the classroom context.

There are a range of initiatives taking place through MOE projects, Te Tauri Whiri, Te Puni Kokiri, and other government sponsored and iwi projects. There is a great need for co-ordination of these initiatives.

9.3 Issues

As te reo Māori has not been allowed to develop over time new demands are now being placed on the language. The number of speakers of te reo Māori has increased but there are often wide gaps between those who use conversational language and those who can engage in academic language. There are also tensions between the use of standardised vocabulary and local dialects. Should we keep transliterations or do they arise from colonialist hegemonic contexts? While teaching the curricula in te reo Māori can assist Māori language revitalisation, there are also tensions like the structure or logic of the language interfering with the concept being taught/learned. Teachers have had difficulty internalising some of the vocabulary because of the pace and proliferation of the developments. What can be done to support the language development of teachers in Māori medium contexts?

9.4 Recommendations

- That consideration is given to incorporating linguistic support and more 'user-friendly' language in each marautanga.
- That ongoing professional development in the discourse of the language of each marautanga be provided for teachers in Māori medium contexts.
- That more research is carried out to see how language is changing as a result of Māori medium teaching and learning (Trinick, 1999).
- That each curriculum area identifies appropriate and relevant aheinga reo, vocabulary, structures, and language features in order to achieve the goal of effective learning and teaching in Māori medium contexts.
- That a linguistic audit be carried out to review the Māori language of each marautanga with the aim of ensuring consistency across the documents.
- That in line with the recommendations arising out of *Te Poutama Tau* evaluation that: diagrams be used to support the use of Māori language in the marautanga; that stories in the *Purapura* be written to incorporate some of the specialised Māori language from the marau (eg pāngarau and Pūtaiao); that a language strand be added to all the marau (MOE, 2003b).

- That such programmes as *Whakapiki i Te Reo Māori* be expanded to all curriculum areas and be made available to teachers in Māori immersion contexts.
- That there be greater co-ordination of the Māori language initiatives and developments across various government agencies and iwi groups.

10. Te Wāhi ki Te Reo Pākeha: Place of English

One of the earliest published discussions of the place of English in Māori medium education occurs in the work of McCaffery, McMurchy-Pilkington, Dale, (1998). These researchers raise issues related to the growing interest in moving from just language survival and maintenance to addressing Māori academic achievement. They conclude that it will be necessary to address the teaching of English literacy if Māori academic achievement is to become an issue addressed by Māori medium education.

A significant recent research study by Berryman & Glynn (2003; Glynn & Berryman, 2002) also addresses this issue at a local level. They responded to requests from a Kura Kaupapa school community in the Bay of Plenty to assist them to develop an appropriate transition programme for their students moving from year eight to an English medium secondary school. The findings of the research project demonstrate that students were able to develop skills in English reading and writing without any detrimental impact on their ability in te reo Māori. “This whānau were able to respond very positively to their own questions about how to provide an English transition programme to improve their children’s academic opportunities in a bilingual secondary school system” (p. 28).

It is worth noting one of the recommendations in a report of the Education and Science Committee on the Inquiry into the teaching of reading in New Zealand (House of Representatives, 2001, p. 39), “That the Ministry of Education focus some research resources on the investigation of transition issues between Māori- and English-medium instruction and use the findings to develop guidelines to assist parental and school decision making”. It is unclear whether in fact this recommendation was accepted and resourced.

The recent review of Bilingual/Immersion education: Indicators of good practice (May, Hill, Tiakiwai, 2004, p. 3) contains a recommendation about the need to teach academic English language proficiency specifically at some point in Māori-medium programmes, irrespective of the level of immersion. In reviewing the international research on the balance between languages and bilingual immersion education May et al. (2004) concluded that there needs to be an instruction programme that directly addresses academic literacy skills within academic programme though the timing and approach for this should managed by kura/schools as they

best see fit. “The teaching of academic literacy in both L1 and L2 is pivotal to the success or otherwise of bilingual/immersion programmes” (p. 125), as is a minimum of five to six years teaching in Māori as the target language. A related recommendation notes that teaching in a bilingual/immersion programme requires specialist training in bilingual/immersion theory, research, pedagogy, and second language acquisition.

10.2 Issues

Māori medium teachers and Māori language teachers are concerned with Māori language survival and maintenance. It is also necessary to address the question: when to teach academic English proficiency in their school/class?

10.3 Recommendations

- That the place of English in Māori medium education curriculum contexts be investigated and discussed amongst Māori immersion teachers and communities.
- That specialist professional development be given in bilingual/immersion theory, research, pedagogy, and first and second language acquisition for teachers in bilingual/immersion programmes.

11. Etahi Whakautu ki Ngā Pātai Rangahau: Answering the Research Questions

11.1 Answering the Research Questions

Returning to the questions and sub-questions of this literature review:

What does the literature tell us about what we have learned 10 years on from the national Māori marautanga development?

Sub-questions

- What are some of the unique features of the Māori marautanga?
- What are some of the issues emerging from teachers in Māori immersions regarding the implementation of marautanga Māori in what way do the current marautanga drive the pedagogy of Māori immersion teachers?
- What are some of the issues from working in Māori immersion contexts?
- Are the issues likely to be the same for all immersion schools/units?
- What might the Marautanga o Aotearoa need to address in order to meet the needs of teachers and learners in Māori immersion?
- Does the marautanga meet the aims and aspirations of Kura Kaupapa Māori?

- What does the literature tell us about the achievement of learners in kura kaupapa Māori and Māori immersion education contexts?
- Do the whāinga paetae need to be more specific to guide teachers or should they be broader to allow for school based whānau/hapū/iwi input?

a) *What are some of the unique features of the Māori marautanga?*

The uniqueness of *Te Anga Marautanga* and the marautanga in comparison to the English medium curricula is that they are written in Māori using a sophisticated language register that goes beyond a conversational level of te reo Māori. There has been an attempt at including Māori values and philosophies. This is evident in the use of Whakatauaāki, karakia, Māori contexts, and Māori learning exemplars. However the fact remains that the basis of the framework and the curricula are primarily based on western values and world views (see *section one, two, five* of this report). The marautanga are written in te reo Māori but they have little in the way of Māori traditional and contemporary epistemology, Māori ways of knowing the world.

b) *What are some of the issues emerging from teachers in Māori immersion regarding the implementation of marautanga Māori? In what way do the current marautanga drive the pedagogy of Māori immersion teachers?*

Some of the implementation issues have been outlined in *section six*. In effect teachers need to be involved and have PD to enable them to implement the marautanga effectively. Teachers need ownership and commitment to the marautanga, they should be involved in the development processes, not just in a tokenistic way. It will take time for consultation, teacher education, and upskilling. Neither *Te Anga Marautanga* nor the seven marautanga are underpinned by Māori epistemologies. Teachers in Kura Kaupapa have concerns that Te Aho Matua was not considered when the marautanga were developed.

Further, facilitators of PD associated with curricula implementation need to be confident, competent, and Māori. While the current marautanga drives the pedagogy of some Māori immersion teachers, for others they do not use the marautanga. It appears this is because the documents do not meet the needs of Māori learners, nor are the philosophical statements inclusive of preferred Māori pedagogies (see *section four*). What is not evident is whether in fact this is related also to teacher understanding and confidence with the marautanga.

c) What are some of the issues from working in Māori immersion contexts?

Some of the issues that have been strongly identified as placing constraints on working in Māori immersion contexts were covered in *sections two* (philosophy), *three* (structure), *five* (curriculum development processes), *six* (implementation and PD), *eight* (resources), *nine* (linguistic issues), and *ten* (the place of English). The issues here are comprehensive and need to be addressed in both the short and long term if the intention is that the marautanga form the bases of teachers' practices in Māori immersion contexts. Other issues identified include the capacity and available number of Māori speaking teachers and their understanding of the marautanga, the resources; and the number and range of MOE documents and policies distributed without adequate PD in the last ten years.

d) Are the issues likely to be the same for all immersion schools/units?

Some of the research reports and evaluations show that there are common issues and concerns but there are also some differences between teacher concerns in Kura Kaupapa Māori schools and bilingual units (see for example ERO, 2002; MOE, 2003a). For this reason it is imperative that a range of interest groups including Te Rūnanga Nui o Te Kura Kaupapa Māori, teachers in Bilingual units, and kura-a-iwi are involved in ongoing consultation about the future of the curriculum framework and the marautanga.

e) What might the Marautanga o Aotearoa need to address in order to meet the needs of teachers and learners in Māori immersion?

The needs of teachers and learners in Māori immersion are wide and varying, and in some instances need urgent attention. Additionally it is imperative that the role, place, and involvement of the whanau in their children's education is given consideration. Most of the recommendations from this report are designed to address these needs. Especially those of professional development, Māori language development, relevant resources, the rewriting of the framework and the marautanga in a more user friendly style that reflects Māori epistemologies. However this report is largely based on what the literature is saying. More gathering of teachers' and Māori stakeholders' voices are needed during the development process. Further there needs to be more listening and two way dialogic encounter. Māori communities are becoming a little tired of consultation without action.

f) Does the marautanga meet the aims and aspirations of Kura Kaupapa Māori?

Interviews with teachers in Kura Kaupapa Māori (MOE, 2003a) show that the marautanga partly meet their needs but there are significant gaps. In particular the marautanga do not reflect Māori epistemologies and Te Aho Matua. There is limited literature on this aspect and as noted above, Kura Kaupapa Māori communities need to be engaged in the dialogue.

g) What does the literature tell us about the achievement of learners in Kura Kaupapa Māori and Māori immersion education contexts?

Both ERO (2002) and the NEMP reports (Crooks & Flockton, 2000, 2001, 2002; Flockton & Crooks, 1999; Gilmore, Lovett, van Hasselt, 2003) suggest that there are areas in the achievement of learners Kura Kaupapa Māori and Māori immersion education contexts where they are achieving the same as or are exceeding learners in English medium contexts. However these reports show there are some areas where Māori learners are not achieving as well as their peers (see also MOE, 2003b). There are some mitigating factors for Māori medium contexts, which include a shortage of competent Māori speaking teachers, resources (*section eight*), a greater need for PD with the marautanga (*section six*), as well as linguistic issues (*section nine*) and minimal effective assessment tools in te reo Māori (*section seven*). Although Māori medium is still new having had only about 20 years to develop they “should have had research and evaluation projects in them for every aspect of teaching and learning, including conceptual learning, language development, and assessment” (MOE, 2002, p. 44). We would support this view and urge that ongoing research should be funded in this area.

h) Do the whaingā paetae need to be more specific to guide teachers or should they be broader to allow for school based whānau/hapū/iwi input?

Section three summarises some of the concerns of teachers about the structure of the marautanga, including comments about the whaingā paetae. Further, a number of Māori teachers and communities have indicated they would like to have their iwi knowledge and dialects reflected in the marautanga. This suggests that the whaingā paetae need to be broader and flexible such that there is room for inclusiveness. However the marautanga will need supporting documents that make more explicit the underpinning content and processes.

12. Whakawhāititanga: Concluding Summary

12.1 Concluding Summary

Politically there has been a significant change in MOE with regards to Māori medium curriculum development. The policymaking and the practice have shifted. We as Māori are ‘allowed’ to have more freedom in our development, for example the final two curriculum documents were not required to be exact translations (Nga Toi and Hauora). In 2002 according to McMurchy-Pilkington & Trinick (2002) attitudes within MOE had not shifted a great deal. From recent discussions with the MOE however it appears there has been a significant shift in attitude since 2002. This is essential for the development of an effective, inclusive, quality curricula for Māori medium contexts. We would expect this phase will continue throughout the entire process of marautanga development and implementation.

There has been nothing in the current reforms to protect traditional Māori intellectual property (White, 1995, p. 29). This raises a big issue in regards to the place of authentic traditional knowledge in a national curriculum document. In writing curriculum documents for Māori questions can be raised about the intellectual property and ownership of the knowledge. Questions to ask would centre around public or private domains. Can Māori knowledge located in a curriculum be bought and sold as a commodity? Who has rights to Māori traditional and iwi/hapū knowledge? Is knowledge all public or does some belong to the private domain of hapū or iwi?

Traditionally in Māori society the 'right to know' was related to whanau membership rather than everyone being entitled to know. A further dilemma ensues from this and that is if Māori traditional knowledge is not taught in schools today where else would it be taught within a context of extensive urbanisation of Māori whānau (McMurphy-Pilkington & Trinick, 2002, p. 6)?

May et al (2004, p. 130) maintain that further development of Māori medium education should concentrate on quality or depth rather than coverage or width. Although policy making for Māori has had the appearance of shifting from Māori friendly to Māori centred in the past decade (Johnston, 1999, p. 80; McMurphy-Pilkington, 2004), Māori views and aspirations are still being "made to conform to an already defined structure and framework", which "in effect neutralises Māori involvement, participation and interests" (Johnston, 1999, p. 84). As Māori we were involved in the development of a mathematics curriculum for Māori but it was not on our terms (McMurphy-Pilkington, 2004). The same can be said about the other six marautanga.

12.2 Issues

How can Māori participate more effectively in policy making so that the outcomes better represent Māori goals and aspirations?

12.3 Recommendations

That the recommendations in this report be implemented, and resourced by the Ministry of Education.

13. Etahi Atu Pātai: Further Questions

There are further questions that arise out of this study, that are neither evident in the literature nor the teachers' voices. These include the following:

- What is the rationale and purpose of a curriculum framework and marautanga?
- What should the principles of such a framework and marautanga be?
- Who should a national marautanga be for?
- Should there be a separate marautanga for Kura Kaupapa Māori (with Te Aho Matua), for Māori medium schools, and for various iwi groups, or should there be a marautanga that has provision for specific needs of Māori stakeholders' groups?
- What is the place of hanaunga Māori and what is appropriate for Māori medium curricula?
- What characteristics of marautanga are most effective for Māori learners?
- How will the range of teachers' te reo Māori proficiency and content knowledge be addressed?
- How will the range of students' te reo Māori be addressed?
- How can effective links be made from the marautanga to Te Kōhanga Reo, and the Māori medium early childhood sector?
- How can the marautanga support the efforts of hanau in the education of their children and how can the hanau support the marautanga?
- How can more effective links be made between the marautanga and other Māori language revitalisation initiatives and strategies?

Concluding words for this report are those of Durie (1995, p. 13):

However, no matter how good it is, if Māori development doesn't have a Māori soul and it can't hear a Māori heartbeat it won't amount to very much; it might as well be a Māori programme delivered by Pākehā.

14. He Whakaräpopototanga o Ngä Take me Ngä Tütöhutanga: Summary of Issues & Recommendations

1. Te Anga Marautanga: Curriculum Framework

Issues

Mäori were not involved with the development of Te Anga Marautanga, therefore it does not reflect Mäori traditional and contemporary epistemologies. Mäori were involved in the development of the marautanga, the seven essential learning areas, but as these were largely parallel documents to the English medium curricula these too did not reflect Mäori traditional and contemporary epistemologies. Should there be a separate curriculum framework for Kura Kaupapa Mäori, for Mäori medium contexts and for local iwi? What is the place of Te Aho Matua? What should go in a curriculum framework?

Recommendations

- 1.1 That a new curriculum framework be written to inform the development of the essential learning areas and that it consist of statements about beliefs and values, key skills or competencies, Mäori language development across curriculum, mätauranga Mäori, tikanga underpinning pedagogy, language acquisition.
- 1.2 That key stakeholder groups with expertise and an interest in Mäori medium education, in te reo Mäori, curriculum writing, assessment, pedagogy, and Mäori mätauranga be established to develop an appropriate new curriculum framework.
- 1.3. That discussions be held with Te Rünanga Nui o Ngä Kura Kaupapa Mäori concerning a new curriculum framework that best suits the needs of Kura Kaupapa Mäori.

2. Te Tähu: Philosophy

Issues

Should a new central expanded curriculum framework be developed to guide teaching and learning in Mäori medium schools? This raises the issue of what should be in a central document and what should be in the individual curriculum statements? Should there actually be a central framework and should there be national curriculum statements for each of the essential learning areas? Where is the role of mätauranga Mäori? What is the role of Te Aho Matua? The lack of an inclusive philosophy and central learning processes and competencies in either a curriculum framework or each of the marautanga has left teachers frustrated and confused by the multitude of: philosophical expressions, linguistic terms for the same processes, similar learning and teaching processes dealt with differently in each document, and different structures and components (MOE, 2003a).

Recommendations

- 2.1 That an inclusive philosophy that is underpinned by Māori beliefs and values and Māori ways of viewing the world be developed for a new curriculum framework and for each new essential learning area.
- 2.2 That a more comprehensive, inclusive, holistic, integrative curriculum framework that reflects Māori status as tangata whenua (MOE, 2002) and Māori aspirations be developed as the central core of new Māori national curricula.
- 2.3 That each revised marautanga be consistent with the philosophy of the new national curriculum framework for Māori.
- 2.4 That links be made with Te Kōhanga Reo National Trust and other Māori medium Early Childhood organisations to enable inclusive curriculum development.

3. Te Hanganga: Structure

Issues

The curricula may be written in te reo Māori but on what basis was the decision made about the content and structure for the current curricula? Who specifically were the marautanga written for? Teachers find the structure and the language of the curricula too difficult to work with. Additionally the partitioning of knowledge hinders the integration of subjects and the content needs to reflect the contexts of Māori learners. McKinley (1995, p. 81) argues that “the imposing of the curriculum construct of levels and behavioural objectives could be interpreted as controlling Māori through the Māori language”.

Recommendations

- 3.1 That the structure of each marautanga be reviewed to be inclusive of Māori traditional and contemporary epistemologies and Māori aspirations.
- 3.2 That there needs to be a content framework that sits beside a linguistic framework for each of the marautanga.
- 3.3 That consideration be given to examining the role, consistency, clarity, and the number of strands, whāinga paetae, assessment exemplars, and content of each marautanga.
- 3.4 That each marautanga be supported by relevant resources that may include assessment exemplars, learning experiences, teacher guidance material.

4. Te Ako me te Whakaako: Pedagogy

Issues

Can marautanga underpinned by western views of the world reflect effective Māori pedagogical practices? Teachers need increased professional development on effective pedagogies for Māori learners, including immersion and second language teaching.

Recommendations

- 4.1 That a statement on effective pedagogies for Māori learning and teaching contexts be clearly articulated in a new curriculum framework.
- 4.2 That a new curriculum framework and each marautanga be written in such a way that enables effective Māori pedagogies to be incorporated in the delivery of each marautanga.
- 4.4 That professional development is made available by Māori for teachers on effective pedagogies for learning and teaching in Māori medium education.
- 4.5 That ongoing research into effective Māori pedagogies be funded by MOE.

5. Te Hanga i Ngā Marautanga: Curriculum Development Process

Issues

Te reo Māori may have been used but Māori knowledge was not necessarily legitimated in the development of ngā marautanga (McKinley, 1995). What is the role of Māori whānau and communities in curriculum development? It is essential that formal and informal processes are developed by MOE whereby dialogue between the various developers is an integral aspect of curricula development to ensure that each team is not “replicating some of the processes, mistakes, and strategies being built up by the other groups” (McMurchy-Pilkington, 2004, p. 237). Any re-development process needs to ensure that we do not repeat “... the level of negotiation in the development process such that it casts doubt on whether this project could be called a curriculum development project at all” (McKinley, 1995, p. 47).

Recommendations

- 5.1 That a clear consultative process with key stakeholder groups, in particular Kura Kaupapa Māori, Te Kōhanga Reo National Trust, and iwi educational authorities, be set up and implemented.
- 5.2 That Māori curriculum teams with the appropriate expertise be involved in all aspects of the development of the new curriculum framework and each of the marautanga for Māori medium contexts.

- 5.3. That all the curriculum teams for each marautanga meet together to discuss and decide on some common issues like consistency in philosophy, structure, discourse, and vocabulary.
- 5.4 That research to describe and evaluate curricula development processes for Māori medium be funded by MOE.

6. Te Whakarewatanga o Ngā Marautanga: Implementation and Professional Development

Issues

How to ensure teachers make more effective use of ngā marautanga? Teachers admitted that they implement the marautanga in a variety of ways, a few did not use them at all, others used both the English and Māori versions. Would ensuring all teachers had ongoing professional development by Māori, that reflected Māori philosophies and aspirations, relevant to ngā marautanga, and useful for classroom contexts result in increased achievement for Māori learners? Teachers have indicated they want PD in a variety of areas including assessment and on the use of new resources as these are released. Additionally PD needs to be supported with a pool of suitable relievers. Professional development on theories and research of bilingualism/immersion and first and second language acquisition is also seen to be imperative.

Recommendations

- 6.1 That Professional Development by Māori for teachers of Māori medium contexts form an integral aspect of any revised marautanga.
- 6.2 That professional development for teachers of Māori medium contexts reflect Māori aspirations in education and include a variety of models.
- 6.3 That a range of professional development opportunities be provided for Māori language proficiency development.
- 6.4 That professional development in theories and research of bilingualism/immersion and first and second language acquisition at pre-service and in- service levels for teachers of Māori medium contexts be significantly extended and resourced nationally.
- 6.5 That ongoing research to develop wider understanding of the theories and research underpinning bilingualism/ immersion education be resourced as a matter of urgency (May et al, 2004).
- 6.6 That whānau involvement in the implementation of the marautanga be encouraged and resourced.

7. Te Aromatawai: Assessment

Issues

Assessment is considered to be one of the areas that is proving a challenge to KKM schools (ERO, 2002; Crooks & Flockton, 2000, 2001, 2002; Flockton & Crooks, 1999; Gilmore, Lovett, van Hasselt, 2003). NEMP and other MOE initiatives are engaged in developing, monitoring, or providing assessment resources. How can more teachers in Māori medium contexts be assisted in developing or using effective assessment tools for their learners? Two issues arising around assessment include the nature and impact of translated tasks, and a need for teacher professional development in the areas of assessment.

Recommendations

- 7.1 That professional development in effective classroom assessment using appropriate Māori medium assessment tools and strategies are seen as imperative for teachers of Māori medium contexts.
- 7.2 That MOE continue to fund and research assessment initiatives that relate to the curricula and are relevant for Māori immersion contexts.
- 7.3 That NEMP continue to work with Māori medium teachers and Māori communities to resolve some of the identified issues concerning the assessment of Māori learners in te reo Māori.

8. Ngā Rauemi: Resources

Issues

Although the number of resources has increased there is still a great need for ongoing resource production both in te reo Māori (MOE, 2001a) and also to support second language teachers and learners. Concerns about using translated resources are ongoing and cognisance should be taken of some of the issues being raised in this area by NEMP and Māori teachers. How can we get Teachers to be involved in decisions about resource development to ensure they get resources that meet their learners' needs? It is important that professional development goes hand in hand with resource development so teachers understand how to use the resources in ways that effect learning. Resources being developed should have language checks.

Recommendations

- 8.1 That resource development to support the Māori medium curricula continue as a matter of priority.
- 8.2 That resource development recognise and support the difficulties and tensions of working in Māori medium contexts, and with second language teachers and learners.

- 8.3 That professional development go hand in hand with resource development to enable Māori medium teachers to gain maximum benefit from the resources.
- 8.4 That long term planning for resource development be formulated in consultation with Māori medium teachers so as to ensure their needs and the needs of their learners are reflected in the resources.
- 8.5 That MOE make more use of internet and electronic sources for the more effective use of resources.

9. Ngā Take Reo: Linguistic Issues

Issues

As te reo Māori has not been allowed to develop over time new demands are now being placed on the language. The number of speakers of te reo Māori has increased but there are often wide gaps between those who use conversational language and those who can engage in academic language. There are also tensions between the use of standardised vocabulary and local dialects. Should we keep transliterations or do they arise from colonialist hegemonic contexts? Should we keep transliterations or do they arise from colonialist hegemonic contexts? While teaching the curricula in te reo Māori can assist Māori language revitalisation, there are also tensions like the structure or logic of the language interfering with the concept being taught/learned. Teachers have had difficulty internalising some of the vocabulary because of the pace and proliferation of the developments. What can be done to support the language development of teachers in Māori medium contexts?

Recommendations

- 9.1 That consideration is given to incorporating linguistic support and more 'user-friendly' language in each marautanga.
- 9.2 That ongoing professional development in the discourse of the language of each marautanga be provided for teachers in Māori medium contexts.
- 9.3 That more research needs to be carried out to see how language is changing as a result of Māori medium teaching and learning (Trinick, 1999).
- 9.4 That each curriculum area identifies appropriate and relevant aheinga reo, vocabulary, structures, and language features in order to achieve the goal of effective learning and teaching in Māori medium contexts.
- 9.5 That a linguistic audit be carried out to review the Māori language of each marautanga with the aim of ensuring consistency across the documents.
- 9.6 That in line with the recommendations arising out of *Te Poutama Tau* evaluation that: diagrams be used to support the use of Māori language in the marautanga; that stories in the *Purapura* be written to incorporate some of the specialised Māori language from

the marau (eg pāngarau and Pūtaiao); that a language strand be added to all the marau (MOE, 2003).

- 9.7. That such programmes as *Whakapiki i te reo* Māori be expanded to all curriculum areas and be made available to teachers in Māori immersion contexts.
- 9.8 That there be greater co-ordination of the Māori language initiatives and developments across various government agencies and iwi groups.

10. Te Wāhi ki Te Reo Pākeha: Place of English

Issues

Māori medium teachers and Māori language teachers are concerned with Māori language survival and maintenance. It is also necessary to address the question: when to teach academic English proficiency in their school/class?

Recommendations

- 10.1 That the place of English in Māori medium education curriculum contexts be investigated and discussed amongst Māori immersion teachers and communities.
- 10.2 That specialist professional development be given in bilingual/immersion theory, research, pedagogy, and first and second language acquisition for teachers in bilingual/immersion programmes.

11. Whakawhāititanga: Concluding Summary

Issues

How can Māori participate more effectively in policy making so that the outcomes better represent Māori goals and aspirations?

Recommendations

- 11.1 That the recommendations in this report be implemented, and resourced by the Ministry of Education.

References

- Alton-Lee, A. (2003). Quality teaching for diverse students in schooling: Best evidence synthesis. Wellington, NZ.: Ministry of Education, June.
- Aspin, C. (1994). *A study of mathematics achievement in a kura kaupapa Māori*. Unpublished MA Thesis, Victoria University, Wellington.
- AsTTle (2004). Wellington, NZ.: Learning Media, Ministry of Education. In www.asttle.org.nz
- Barton, B. (1993). Ethnomathematics and its place in the classroom. *SAMEpapers*, 46-68.
- Barton, B., & Fairhall, U. (1995). Is mathematics a Trojan horse? Mathematics in Māori education. In B. Barton & U. Fairhall (Eds.), *Mathematics in Māori education* (pp. 1-12). A collection of papers for the History and Pedagogy of Mathematics Conference, Cairns, Australia: Mathematics Education Unit, The University of Auckland, NZ.
- Barton, B., Fairhall, U., & Trinick, T. (1995). Whakatupu reo tatai: History of the development of Maori mathematics vocabulary. In *SAMEpapers*, pp. 144-160.
- Barton, B., Fairhall, U., & Trinick, T. (1998). Tikanga reo tatai: Issues in the development of a Māori mathematics register. *For the Learning of Mathematics*, 18(1), 3-9.
- Begg, A. (1993). Matematika Pasefika. *SAMEpapers*, pp. 69-83.
- Begg, A. (1995). The mathematics curriculum: A comparative study. *SAMEpapers*, pp. 161-185.
- Berryman, M. & Glynn, T. (2002) NZARE
- Berryman, M. & Glynn, T. (2003) *Transition from Māori to English: A community approach*. Wellington, NZ: New Zealand Council for Educational Research.
- Bishop, R. (2001). Changing power relations in Education: Kaupapa Maori messages for mainstream institutions. In C. McGee & D. Fraser (Eds.), *The professional practice of teaching* (2nd ed., pp. 201-219). Palmerston North, NZ: Dunmore Press.
- Bishop, R., Berryman, M., & Richardson, C. (2001). *Te toi huarewa: Effective teaching and learning strategies, and effective teaching materials for improving the reading and writing in te reo Māori of students aged five to nine in Māori medium education*. Final Report to the Ministry of Education. Wellington, NZ.: Research Division, MOE.
- Boston, J. (1995). Inherently governmental functions and the limits to contracting out. In J. Boston (Ed.), *The state under contract* (pp. 78-111). Wellington, NZ: Bridget Williams Books Ltd.
- Brewerton, M. (2004). *Reframing the essential skills: Implications of the DeSeCo Project*. Annex C. Presentation to The New Zealand Curriculum Project Reference Group, 31 March, 2004. MoE: Wellington.
- Chamberlain, M. (2004). New Zealand curriculum Te anga marautanga o Aotearoa project: Ahakoa he iti, he pounamu – Focusing on that matters. *NZ Principal*, June, 4-5.
- Chapple, S., Jeffries, R., & Walker, R. (1997). *Māori participation and performance in education: A literature review and research programme*. Wellington, NZ. New Zealand Institute of Economic research.
- Clark, M. (1999). *Māori and Pacific Islands student performance in mathematics*. Paper presented at the Research Seminar on Mathematics Education (Year 0-6 students), 12 June, Wellington, NZ..
- Crooks, T. & Flockton, L. (2001). *Assessment results for Māori students 2000 Music. Aspects of technology, reading and speaking*. Dunedin: Educational Assessment Research Unit, University of Otago, NZ.
- Crooks, T. & Flockton, L. (2002). *Assessment results for Māori students 2001 Information skills, social studies, mathematics*. Dunedin: Educational Assessment Research Unit, University of Otago, NZ.
- Crooks, T. & Flockton, L. (2003). *Assessment results for Māori students 2002 Writing. Listening & viewing. Health & Physical education*. Dunedin: Educational Assessment Research Unit, University of Otago, NZ.
- Dale, H., McCaffery, J., & McMurchy-Pilkington, C. (1997). *Wetewete i te Reo: Immersion Plus One*. Paper presented at the NZARE Conference, Auckland, NZ.
- Dewes, C. (1993). Mathematics education for Maori. In Te Puni Kokiri (Ed.), *Pāngarau Maori mathematics and education* (pp. 28-37). Wellington, NZ: Te Puni Kokiri.
- Dominion Newspaper* (2001). Māori immersion pupils 'keeping up'. January 17, p. 9.

- Durie, A. (2003). Curriculum framing. *SET 2*, p. 11.
- Durie, M. (1995). Māori, science and development. *Proceedings of the Inaugural NAMMSAT Conference*, p. 12-14. The National Association of Māori Mathematicians, Scientists and Technologists. Wellington: Te Puni Kokiri.
- Durie, M. (1998). *Te mana, te kawanatanga: The politics of Māori self-determination*. Auckland, NZ.: Oxford University Press.
- Durie, M. (2001). *A framework for considering Māori educational advancement*. Opening address for Hui Taumata Mātauranga Conference, 24 February, Turangai/Taupo.
- Durie, M. (2003). Ngā kāhui pou: *Launching Māori futures*. Wellington, NZ.: Huia Publishers.
- Educational Assessment Research Unit. (2000). *Forum Comment: Achievement of Māori Students 1999 Science – Art - Graphs, Tables and Maps*. Dunedin: Educational Assessment Research Unit University of Otago.
- Educational Assessment Research Unit University of Otago. (2001). *Forum Comment: Achievement of Māori Students 2000 Music - Aspects of Technology - Reading & Speaking*. Dunedin: Educational Assessment Research Unit University of Otago.
- Educational Assessment Research Unit. (2002). *Report Overview: Achievement of Māori Students 2001 Pūkenga Mōhiohio - Tikanga-ā-lwi – Pāngarau Information Skills – Social Studies – Mathematics*. Dunedin: Educational Assessment Research Unit University of Otago.
- Educational Assessment Research Unit. (2003). *He whakaputanga whakaaro: Te ekenga paetae a te ākonga Māori 2002 Te tuhituhi – te whakarongo me te matakitaki – te hauora me te mātauranga korikori*. Dunedin: Educational Assessment Research Unit University of Otago.
- Education Review Office. (2000). *Literacy education in Kura Kaupapa Māori*. Wellington, NZ.: Education Review Office.
- Education Review Office (2002). *The performance of Kura Kaupapa Māori. June*. Wellington, NZ.: Education Review Office.
- Fairhall, U. (1993). Mathematics as a vehicle for the acquisition of Maori. *SAMEpapers*, 116-123.
- Flockton, L. & Crooks, T. (2000). *Assessment Results for Māori students 1999 Science, Art, Graphs, Tables, and Maps*. Dunedin: Educational Assessment Research Unit, University of Otago.
- Forbes, S. (1995). Is mathematics fair assessment? p. 84-85. *Proceedings of the Inaugural NAMMSAT Conference*, p. 12-14. The National Association of Māori Mathematicians, Scientists and Technologists. Wellington: Te Puni Kokiri.
- Gardner & Parata, (2004) *Māori in the New Zealand curriculum*. Draft report.
- Gilmore, A., Lovett, S., & Van Hasselt, C. (2003). *National Education Monitoring Project: Probe Study Findings 2003*. Dunedin: Educational Assessment Research Unit, University of Otago, NZ.
- Glynn, T. & Berryman, M. (2002). *Culturally appropriate strategies for home and school collaboration: A community elder's role in improving reading and writing for Māori students*. Paper presented to the NZARE Conference.
- Goulton, F. (1998) *He Huarahi Ako: Pathways to Learning*. Te Oru Rangahau Māori Research & Development Conference, 7-9 July, Massey University, Palmerston North, pp. 112-118.
- Goulton, F. (2004). *He whatu korowai*. Draft report detailing the draft hauora consultation programme and findings for Cathie Bull: Horowai Associates. August.
- Harlow, R. (1993). A science and mathematics terminology for Māori. *SAMEpapers*, 124-137.
- Hemara, W. (2000). *Māori pedagogies: A view from the literature*. Wellington, NZ: New Zealand Council for Educational Research.
- Hohepa, M., McNaughton, S., & Jenkins, K. (1996). Maori pedagogies and the roles of the individual. *New Zealand Journal of Educational Studies*, 31(1), 29-40.
- Hollings, M. (1995). Changing expectations. p. 97-100. *Proceedings of the Inaugural NAMMSAT Conference*, p. 97-100. The National Association of Māori Mathematicians, Scientists and Technologists. Wellington: Te Puni Kokiri.
- Hollings, M., Jeffries, R. & McArdell, P. (1992). *Assessment in Kura Kaupapa Māori and Māori language immersion Programmes*. A Report to the Ministry of Education, July.

- Houia, W. & Crombie, W. (1993). The New Zealand National Curriculum: English, Māori and community languages. In *Working Papers in Language Education, No 1*, pp. 31-42. Waikato, NZ.: The University of Waikato Language Institute.
- Jacques, K. (1991). *Community contexts of bilingual education: A study of six South Island primary School Programmes*. Unpublished PhD Thesis, University of Canterbury, Christchurch.
- Jesson, J. (2001). Transforming New Zealand education. In V. Carpenter, H. Dixon, E. Rata & C. Rawlinson (Eds.), *Theory in Practice for Educators* (pp. 89-108). Palmerston North, NZ: Dunmore Press.
- Johnston, P. (1999). 'In through the out door': Policy developments and processes for Māori. *New Zealand Journal of Educational Studies*, 34(1), 77-85.
- Joseph, D. (2003). Å tātou kōrero: Te whakamahere i ngā momo kōrero Māori. *He Pukenga Kōrero*, 7, 2, pp. 35-54.
- Ka'ai, T. (1990). *Te hiringa taketake: Mai te Kōhanga reo ki te kura*. Unpublished MA Thesis, University of Auckland, Auckland, NZ.
- Ka'ai, T. (1995). *Te tātari i te kaupapa*. Unpublished PhD Thesis, University of Waikato, Hamilton.
- Kāretu, T. (1996). "When push comes to shove". Paper presented to the Fifth National Conference on Community Language and English for Speakers of Other Languages. Hamilton, NZ.: Language Institute, University of Waikato.
- Kāretu, T. (1998). He hē anō te hē. *He Muka Putanga* 11 (3), Takurua.
- Keegan, P. (2004) *The Māori vocabulary knowledge of year 6 students in Māori-medium education*. Unpublished PhD Thesis, Victoria University, Wellington.
- Learning Media. (2003). *Education Now A newsletter from Learning Media*, 2. June. Wellington: Learning Media.
- Lee, G., & Hill, D. (1996). Curriculum reform in New Zealand: Outlining the new or restating the familiar? *DELTA*, 48 (1), 19-32.
- MacFarlane, A. H. (2004). *Kia hiwa ra! Listen to culture*. Wellington, NZ.: NZCER.
- Marsh, C. J., & Willis, G. (1999). *Curriculum: Alternative approaches, ongoing Issues* (2nd. ed.). New Jersey: Merrill.
- Martin, McMurchy-Pilkington, Martin (2004) *Te Rito: Centering Maori pedagogy in teacher education*. Presentation to TEFANZ Conference, Auckland College of Education, July.
- May, S., Hill, R., & Tiakiwai, S. (2004). *Bilingual/Immersion education: Indicators of good practice. Final Report to the Ministry of Education*. Wellington, NZ: Ministry of Education.
- McCaffery, J., McMurchy-Pilkington, C., & Dale, H. (1998, 25-28 September). *Teaching and learning issues in Māori Medium Education: Immersion plus one*. Paper presented at the Community Languages and ESOL Conference, Palmerston North, NZ.
- McCulloch, G. (1992). *The school curriculum in New Zealand*. Palmerston North, NZ: The Dunmore Press.
- McKinley, E. (1995). *A power/knowledge nexus: Writing a science curriculum in Māori*. Unpublished MA Thesis, University of Waikato, Hamilton, NZ.
- McKinley, E. A. (2003). *Brown bodies, white coats: Postcolonialism, Māori women and science*. Unpublished PhD, University of Waikato, Hamilton, NZ.
- McKinley, E., McPherson Waiti, P., & Bell, B. (1993). Language, culture and science education. *SAMEpapers*, 232-262.
- McKinley, E., & Waiti, P. (1995). Te tauāki marautanga pūtaiao: He tauira - The writing of a national science curriculum in Māori. *SAMEpapers*, 75-94.
- McMenamin, T., Millar, R., Morton, M., Mutch, C., Nuttal, J., & Tyler-Merrick, G. (2004). *Final Report to the MOE on curriculum policy and Special Education support*. School of Professional Development, Christchurch College of Education. 25 March.
- McMurchy-Pilkington, C. (2001). Maori education: Rejection, resistance, renaissance. In V. Carpenter, H. Dixon, E. Rata. & C. Rawlinson. (Eds.), *Theory in Practice for Educators* (pp. 161-188). Palmerston North, NZ: Dunmore Press.
- McMurchy-Pilkington, C. (2004). *Pāngarau Māori medium mathematics curriculum: Empowerment or new hegemonic accord?* Unpublished EdD, University of Auckland, Auckland, NZ.

- McMurchy-Pilkington, C., Tamati, T., Martin, R., Martin, N., & Dale, H. (2002). *Whakapakari i Te Reo Maori*. Paper presented at the NZARE Conference Massey University, Palmerston North, 5 December.
- McMurchy-Pilkington, C., & Trinick, T. (2002). Horse power or empowerment? Mathematics curriculum for Māori – Trojan horse revisited. In B. Barton, K. C. Irwin, M. Pfannkuch & M. O. J. Thomas (Eds.), *Mathematics Education in the South Pacific. 25th Annual Conference of the Mathematics Education Research Group of Australia, Vol 2* (pp. 465-472). Auckland, NZ: MERGA.
- Mead, H. M. (2003). *Tikanga Māori: Living by Māori values*. Wellington, NZ.: Huia Publishers.
- Mead, H. M. & Grove, N. (2001). *Ngā pēpeha o ngā tipuna*. Wellington, NZ.: Victoria University Press.
- Mead, L. T. T. R. (1996). *Nga aho o te kakahu mātauranga: The multiple layers of struggle by Māori in education*. Unpublished PhD, University of Auckland, Auckland, NZ.
- Meaney, T. & Fairhall, U. (2003). Tensions and possibilities: Indigenous parents doing mathematics education curriculum development. . In L. Bragg, C. Campbell, G. Herbert, & J. Mousley (Eds.), *Mathematics education research: Innovation, networking, opportunity. Proceedings of the 26th Annual Conference of the Mathematics Education Research Group of Australasia, Geelong*, pp. 507-514. Sydney: MERGA.
- Ministry of Education. (1990). *Tihē Mauri Ora Māori language Junior classes to Form 2 Syllabus for schools*. Wellington, NZ: Learning Media.
- Ministry of Education. (1991). *The national curriculum of New Zealand: A discussion document*. Wellington, NZ: Learning Media.
- Ministry of Education. (1993). *The New Zealand curriculum framework*. Wellington, NZ.: Learning Media.
- Ministry of Education. (1999). *The national education guidelines*. Wellington, NZ: Ministry of Education.
- Ministry of Education. (2001a). Māori education: Some suggestions from the research literature – A discussion paper. *The Research Bulletin*, p. 1-32. Wellington, NZ.: Ministry of Education.
- Ministry of Education. (2001b). *Mathematics in the NZ Curriculum Pāngarau I roto I te Marautanga o Aotearoa. Curriculum stocktake discussion day. 31st May, Wellington.*
www.tki.org.nz/r/nzcurriculum/postings/maths1_e.php
- Ministry of Education. (2001c). *Curriculum stocktake – Discussion day notes: Te reo Māori I roto I te marautanga o Aotearoa. 17th, 18th September, Brentwood, Wellington.*
www.tki.org.nz/r/nzcurriculum/postings/discussion_e.php
- Ministry of Education. (2002). *Curriculum stocktake Report to Minister of Education, September 2002*. Retrieved 30 May, 2004
http://www.minedu.govt.nz/index.cfm?layout=document&documentid+5610&data=|#P1030_201142
- Ministry of Education. (2003a). Teachers' experiences in curriculum implementation: general curriculum, mathematics and technology. Retrieved September 9, 2004, from
<http://www.minedu.govt.nz/index.cfm?layout=document&document=7491&data=1>
- Ministry of Education. (2003b). *Exploring issues in mathematics education: An evaluation of Te Poutama Tau 2002*. Wellington, NZ.: Ministry of Education.
- Ministry of Education. (2003c). *The effects of curricula and assessment on pedagogical approaches and on educational outcomes*. Retrieved 1 June, 2004
http://www.minedu.govt.nz/index.cfm?layout=document&documentid=5610&data=|#P1030_201142
- Ministry of Education (2004a). *Exploring issues on mathematics education: An evaluation of Te Poutama Tau 2003*. Wellington, NZ. Ministry of Education.
- Ministry of Education (2004b). Annex A, B, D. Unnamed presentations to The New Zealand Curriculum Project Reference Group, 31 March, 2004. MoE: Wellington.
- Ministry of Education (n. d.) Exemplars from www.tki.org.nz/exemplars
- Murphy, H., & Hollings, M. (1993). Speaking Maori : a study of children's language. *Many voices*, 4, 11-14.
- Nepe, T. M. (1991). *Te toi huarewa tipuna*. Unpublished MA Thesis, University of Auckland, Auckland, NZ.

- New Zealand House of Representatives (2001). *Report of the Education and Science Committee on the Inquiry into the teaching of reading in New Zealand*. Wellington, NZ.: New Zealand House of Representatives.
- Ohia, M. (1993a). *Bilingualism and bilingual education*. Unpublished MEd Admin Thesis, Massey University, Palmerston North.
- Ohia, M. (1993b). Adapting mathematics to meet Māori needs and aspirations: An attempt to shift paradigms. *SAMEpapers*, 104-115.
- Olssen, M., & Morris Matthews, K. (1997). Introduction. In M. Olssen & K. M. Matthews (Eds.), *Education policy in New Zealand: the 1990s and beyond* (pp. 7-46). Palmerston North, NZ: Dunmore Press.
- O'Neill, A. (1996). Curriculum development in Aotearoa New Zealand: An editorial introduction. *DELTA*, 48(1), 3-10.
- O'Neill, A.-M. (1997). Curriculum reform: Devolution issues in Aotearoa New Zealand. An editorial introduction. *DELTA*, 48 (No 2), 127-140.
- Pere, R. R. (1988). Te wheke: Whaia te maramatanga me te aroha. In S. Middleton (Ed.), *Women and Education in Aotearoa* (Vol. 1, pp. 6-19). Sydney, Australia: Allen & Unwin.
- Rata, E. (1991). *Maori survival and structural separateness*. Unpublished MEd Thesis, University of Auckland, Auckland, NZ.
- Rau, C. (Compiler) (1998). He mätai äta titiro ki te tütukitanga mätätupu pänui, tuhi. Ngäruawahia, NZ.: Kia Ata Mai Educational Trust.
- Rau, C. (2003). *A snapshot of the literacy achievement of year 2 students in 80-100% Māori immersion programmes in 1995 and 2002-2003 and the impact of teacher professional development*. Wellington, NZ.: Ministry of Education.
- Royal Tangaere, P. (1997). Te Köhanga Reo: More than a language nest. In *Early Childhood Folio 3*. Wellington, NZ: New Zealand Council for educational Research.
- Scanlon, S. (2001). Care urged on Māori tests. *The Press, Christchurch*, January 17, p. 11.
- Smith, G., Hingangaroa. (1994). Maori culture for sale. *Polemic*, 4(3), 149-153.
- Smith, G. H. (1997). *The development of Kaupapa Maori: Theory and praxis*. Unpublished PhD, University of Auckland, Auckland, NZ.
- Smith, G. H. (2003). Kaupapa Maori Theory: Theorizing indigenous transformation of education & schooling. Paper presented at the NZARE/AARE Joint Conference, Hyatt Hotel, Auckland NZ, December.
- Te Pou Taki Kōrero (2003). *Education Now: A newsletter from Learning Media, Issue 2, June*. Wellington, NZ.: Te Pou Taki Kōrero.
- Te Puni Kokiri (1999). *Te tūāoma: The Māori language: The steps that have been taken*. Wellington, NZ.: Te Puni Kokiri.
- Te Puni Kokiri (2001a). ????. Wellington: Te Puni Kokiri. P 19 (see p.17 mine)
- Te Puni Kokiri (2001b). *Māori Students Learning Te Reo in Mainstream Secondary Schools*. Wellington, NZ.: Te Puni Kokiri.
- Te Puni Korkiri. (2001c). *Provisional Results of the 2001 Survey of the Health of the Māori Language*. Wellington: Te Puni Korkiri.
- Te Puni Kokiri. (2002a). *Survey of Attitudes, Values and Beliefs about the Māori Language*. Wellington: Te Puni Kokiri.
- Te Puni Kokiri. (2002b). *The Health of the Māori Language in 2001*. Wellington: Te Puni Kokiri.
- Te Puni Kokiri. (2002c). *Survey of the Health of the Māori Language in 2001 (PART 1)*. Wellington: Te Puni Kokiri.
- Te Puni Kokiri. (2003a). *He reo e kōrerotia ana – He reo ka ora - A shared vision for the future of te reo Māori*. Wellington, NZ.: Te Puni Kokiri.
- Te Puni Kokiri. (2003b) “*Kei Te Ako Tonu Au*”: *Strategies for Second Language Learners of Te Reo Māori*. Wellington: Te Puni Kokiri.
- Te Puni Kokiri, & Te Taura Whiri i te Reo Māori. (2003a). *He Reo e Kōrerotia ana, he reo ka ora/ A Spoken language is a Living Language: Te Rautaki Reo Māori The Māori Language Strategy*. Wellington: Te Puni Kokiri, & Te Taura Whiri I te Reo Māori.
- Te Tahuhu o te Mātauranga. (1996). *Te reo Maori i roto i te Marautanga o Aotearoa*. Te Whanganui a Tara: Te Pou Taki Korero.
- Te Tāhuhu O Te Mātauranga. (1999). *Exploring Issues in Mathematics Education*. Wellington: Te Tāhuhu O Te Mātauranga..

- Timutimu, N. A. (1995). *Kei ngaro tö tatou reo rangatira: Middle generation Mäori language crisis*. Unpublished MA Thesis, University of Auckland, Auckland, NZ.
- Trinick, T. (1999). *Te reo tatai. The relationships between Mäori culture and Mäori mathematical language*. Unpublished MA Thesis, University of Auckland, Auckland, NZ.
- University of Auckland. (1995). *Proceedings of the Inaugural NAMMSAT Conference: The National Association of Mäori Mathematicians, Scientists and Technologists*. Wellington: Te Puni Kokiri.
- White, T. (1995). Can traditional Mäori knowledge be protected and commercialised? p. 27-21. *Proceedings of the Inaugural NAMMSAT Conference: The National Association of Mäori Mathematicians, Scientists and Technologists*. Wellington: Te Puni Kokiri.

Papakupu: Glossary

(Some definitions of the words used in this report)

Aotearoa	'Land of the Long White Cloud', New Zealand
Ahua	Appearance, demeanor
Ako	Teach, learn
Aromatawai	Assessment
Atua	God, spiritual being
English medium	Being taught through the medium of the English language
Hangarau	Technology
Hāngi	Earth oven for cooking food in
Hapū	Sub tribe
Hauora	Health, well-being
Hui	Meeting, gathering
Iwi	Tribe, people from a tribe
Kaiako	Teacher
Karakia	Prayer, ritual ceremony
Kaumātua	Māori elder
Kura	School
Kura-ā-iwi	Tribal school
Kura Kaupapa Māori	Māori medium schools that subscribe to the philosophy of Te Aho Matua
Mana	Status, power, prestige
Māori	Indigenous people of New Zealand
Māori medium	being taught through the medium of the English language
Marau	subjects
Marautanga	Curriculum
Mātauranga	Knowledge
Mauri	Life force
Mokopuna	Grandchild
Ngā toi	The arts
Pākeha	Non-Māori, usually of European descent
Pāngarau	Mathematics
Poutama	A 'step' pattern in Māori art forms
Pūtaiao	Science
Reo	Language, voice
Rūnanga	Council, parent body
Tamariki	Children

Tangata whenua	People of the land, original inhabitants
Tapu	Sacred, sacrosanct, sacred restriction, natural law
Tautoko	Support
Te Aho Matua	Philosophy of Kura Kaupapa Māori
Te Anga Marautanga	The curriculum framework
Te ao Māori	Māori world
Te Kōhanga Reo	Māori language preschools, 'language nest'
Te reo Māori	Māori language
Te Poutama Tau	Māori medium Numeracy Project
Te Taura Whiri	The Māori Language Commission
Tikanga	Customs, practices, regulation
Tikanga ā Iwi	Social studies; customs, practices of people
Tino rangatiratanga	Self-determination, autonomy
Tuarā	Back, backbone
Wairua	Spirit, spirituality
Wānanga	Learning, seminar, series of discussions
Whāinga paetae	Achievement objective
Whakataukī	Proverb, tribal saying
Whakawhānaungatanga	Forming or renewing relationships, familiness
Whānau	Family
Whakapapa	Family tree, genealogy, relating one to another
Whare Wānanga	House of learning
Whenu	Strand