

Members on School Boards of Trustees was gauged through identifying, who controlled the decision processes related to the Maori Language Factor Funding. Mechanisms legislated in the new educational reforms which were ostensibly designed to safe-guard Maori interests, for example Equity legislations and Treaty of Waitangi considerations in school charters, are also analysed.

New Zealand's state funded welfare system during the past four years, has been dramatically altered. Government monetary withdrawal is supported in terms that relate to minimal state funding which is further defined by Government as efficient business administration. These major radical changes which have been based on a hack and slash approach in the name of efficiency, have permeated through each and every level of the State Welfare system. Education has not escaped the axe. In an attempt to both minimise monetary inputs and maximise outputs, the creation of new rhetoric espoused that rising unemployment, high inflation rates and a depressed economy could be directly related to the inadequacies of New Zealand's education system (Wilson, 1990). Schools were not effectively educating students for the "available" job spaces in the 'market-place'. The new educational reforms introduced in 1989 sought to eradicate these "problems" by not only restructuring Education Departments, the Education system and the very 'nature' of schools themselves, but by also delegating the 'power' of decision making and 'choice' to parents.

Maori interests throughout the restructuring process of the education system has predictably been marginal. The evidence for this situation is reflected in the final policies implemented, highlighted by critical analysis (Dale 1992, Smith 1988, Penetito 1988, 1989) as well as by current research (Johnston 1991, Wylie 1989). The reason for this situation is twofold. Firstly, the 'democratic' practices of New Zealand's structures in which majority rules, supports a system in which Maori as a minority group have no "real power" to implement their decisions. The relationship between Maori and Pakeha is one of Maori subordination and Pakeha dominance. Maori are "powerless" in terms of the availability of resources and control for validity over their own knowledge and language (Smith, 1988). Historically, education for Maori has been determined by Pakeha resulting in policies specifying particular criteria which Maori needed to meet, in order to "achieve". These criteria have been designed by Pakeha according to their own values and belief systems, culminating in Pakeha interpretations of suitable educational initiatives for Maori. Because these initiatives are based on the criteria of the dominant group, they are unrealistic. The current spate of educational changes are no different in this respect, to previous educational reforms for Maori.

Secondly, because resources and the decision making processes are still controlled and determined by Pakeha, this factor reinforces the subordination of Maori. Any ground gained for Maori interests and aspirations depends purely upon the "goodwill" of Pakeha negotiators. It is clear that the dominant group in New Zealand do not accept the validity of Maori language or knowledge within schooling. This has resulted in what

Graham Smith (1988) refers to as the contestation and control of knowledge validity. Maori attempts to validate their own language and culture in schooling beyond the ideals initiated by policy-makers represented through the conventional 'mainstream' schooling system, consistently results in Maori initiatives being labelled as either apartheid or separatist actions, detrimental to the "well-being" of New Zealand. Synonymous with the negativity of Pakeha to Maori initiatives is the belief of the inferiority of Maori language and culture. Judith Simon (1990) clearly outlines the influences of "racial" and "evolutionary" theories which contributed to the ways in which Pakeha perceived Maori. These perceptions filtered through to education policy and resulted in the fostering of beliefs and ideals about what Maori were capable of achieving and whose culture was most superior.

In the present context, education policy will not change the situation for Maori because the attitudes of the dominant group towards Maori knowledge and language has basically remained unchanged. The suppression and denigration of Maori language and culture has also reinforced the beliefs of the dominant Pakeha group in the supremacy of their own language and culture. For Maori to achieve any measure of educational attainment, education initiatives need to be Maori initiated and controlled.

The Picot Report and Tomorrow's Schools.

The focus for discussion in this paper is the recent educational reform for schools, derived explicitly from the documents Administering for Excellence (1988) and Tomorrow's Schools (1988). For Maori interests and aspirations, the new reforms claimed that within the education system Maori would have

...considerably more scope than they do at present to exercise a fair measure of influence over their children's education (Administering for Excellence, (The Picot Report) 1988:66).

The Picot Report (1988) and Tomorrow's Schools (1988) like all education policies before them, have failed to take account of the wider social, political and economic positions which Maori are located within. These accounts continue to affect the "realities" of Maori people. Also included, are the previously outlined relationship of dominant Pakeha over subordinate Maori (power relations) and the "inferior" position that Maori language and knowledge are seen as occupying. The "position" of Maori in New Zealand society today involves poor housing, poor health, being unemployed, oppressed suppressed and educationally, underachieving. The 'solutions' to the 'problem' of Maori underachievement in the new education reforms however are much more difficult to address. There are no explicit statements which say whether or not Maori underachievement is the issue although in the submissions to the Picot Taskforce, underachievement was clearly the overriding concern of Maori parents. There exist identifiable contradictions between the submissions made by Maori outlined in the Picot Report, and the legislation that was finally implemented in the 1989 Education Act through Tomorrow's Schools (1988).

The Picot Taskforce received a number of submissions which outlined a collection of Maori interests and aspirations on educational expectations for Maori children. These expectations encompassed such notions as:

- (1). The education system being seen as a means of revitalising Maori language and culture;
 - (2). The key to addressing Maori achievement at school being the revival of the language and culture;
 - (3). The education system being required to make a commitment to biculturalism and bilingualism;
 - (4). All Maori children being given access to the Maori language;
 - (5). Environments being required to be non-hostile to Maori values and forms;
 - (6). The whanau being given some measure of autonomy and its members access to the classrooms and;
 - (7). More resources being made available to hasten the spread of bilingual education and greater use being made of existing fluent Maori speakers.
- (Administering for Excellence, 1988:65-66).

The response to these submissions by the Taskforce outline important issues which Maori people voiced with relation to Maori interests in education. The submissions highlighted two major "camps" of Maori interests which are mutually contradictory. The first of these interests encompass those whose submissions believed that the present education system was overly Pakeha oriented and thus incapable of accommodating Maori values and forms. Those in this category generally preferred Maori creating their educational institutions (Administering for Excellence, 1988:66). Tomorrow's Schools (1988) provided for this group of interests through the inclusion of an opt-out clause. The problems associated with the opt-out clause are well documented elsewhere (see Sharples, 1989).

The second group identified by the Taskforce were those who were confident that the desired changes could be achieved within a partnership' between the whanau and the institution.

This group supported the present approach of establishing bilingual schools or bilingual units within school...(Administering for Excellence, 1988:66). Tomorrow's Schools (1988) translated these requests into:

- (1). Opportunities will be made available to parents who wish to have their children learn or be educated in the Maori language and;
- (2). The whanau will have access to and participate in education. This will be possible through individuals within the whanau being eligible for election to the Board of Trustees...

(Tomorrow's Schools, 1988:26).

The situation of Maori being absent from policy decision-making has once again resulted in a lack of influence by Maori over the education reforms designed ostensibly for them through Tomorrow's Schools (1988). The combination of "powerlessness" and reinterperatation are further complicated by a redefinition of what those interests actually were because the interest and aspirations of Maori have been redefined to conform with

preconceived notions centring around what became the new education system. Historically, policy (implementations) for Maori have been adjusted by the dominant interest group, to conform to already predetermined structures and frameworks in what Penetito (1989) refers to as

accounting for Maori viewpoints after the main consideration of what needs to be done, eg, now what needs to be done for you (Penetito, 1989:2) Opportunities that exist for Maori interests in Tomorrow's Schools (1988) have also been subjected to Pakeha interpretation as provisions made ignore basic and fundamental concepts embraced in Maori values and views. In particular, collectivism which espouses the philosophies underlying whanau, iwi, and hapu, is reduced to a state of individualism at the policy level, and as individuals on School Boards of Trustees at the community level. The suggestion that whanau can have access to the school through individuals being eligible as members to the local School Board of Trustees, completely reinterprets both the concept of whanau and the submissions made by Maori through the Picot Report.

The notion of individuality reduces Maori collective interests to an aggregation of individual choices. The logic argument on individualism (see Hayek, 1973) not only contradicts collectivity, but cannot account for the notion of culture (Smith, 1990:6). The philosophy which drives the recent spate of educational reforms (commonly referred to as New Rightism) draws upon economic arguments to validate and justify the changes. Culture however, cannot be reduced to an economic base.

It is clear that Maori parents are concerned about the state of Maori educational underachievement. It is not clear however, that the recent educational reforms are addressing this situation. What is apparent is the inclusion of various mechanisms identified as catering to Maori interests and aspirations (Johnston, 1991) but there further exists contradictions with all of these key concepts used to initiate Maori interests in the new educational reforms. In particular the concept of Equity has not been adequately defined by those who initiated its use in the policy documents (Sharp 1990). Is equity addressing social justice, fairness or equality of opportunity? Tomorrow's Schools (1988) makes no commitment to any clarification at all but defines several groups with relation to equity. These groups include women, Maori, Pacific Island, other groups of minority status, working class, disabled students, and rural communities. Sharp (1990) in commenting on the groups which are categorised under equity states that

the Maori might have been forgiven if they had judged that this way of thinking was not entirely suited in approaching their problems. It mixed their demands with other's; it defined groups according to multiple criteria...(Sharp, 1990:226).

Maori are categorised as just another disadvantaged group. Furthermore, there is no recognition that although the groups identified through equity are disadvantaged, the reasons why this is so differs considerably. Yet, all these groups are treated as if they were the same. There is no

recognition that Maori are tangata whenua or that Maori have a different 'agenda' to 'other' groups. David Pearson (1990) outlines that in relation to Maori and 'other' ethnic groups

Maori politics, in all their myriad forms, revolve around the issue of the primordial legitimacy of the aspirations of indigenous peoples to some degree of self-determination, either through reform of the nation state or a more radical redressing of the balance of power (Pearson, 1990:199). Sharp (1990) points out that Maori are in fact not treated as members of an ethnic group in Tomorrow's Schools (1988), but as individuals who just happen to be Maori (Sharp, 1990:226). Ivan Snook (1990) comments that equity

operated against (and perhaps was intended to operate against) Maori aspirations. For its meaning was vague and in so far as it had meaning, was based on the very individualism that Maori claims belie (Snook, 1990:10). Equity actually stresses the needs of individuals who in Maori terms are

...mortal and circumscribed. Maori was immortal and limitless. In the order of things, it was not - it could not be - that the individual preceded the collectivity (Sharp, 1990:217).

Tomorrow's Schools (1988) however places importance on individualism and invalidates collectivism.

In general, Tomorrow's Schools (1988) makes three basic assumptions. Firstly that Maori interests through the local School Board of Trustees will be able to compete on the same footing as Pakeha interests. Maori interests have not been able to compete against the interests of the dominant group in the past. Tomorrow's Schools (1988) ignores the fact that Maori have suffered within the state system over the last one hundred and fifty years (Smith, 1988:41). There is also no recognition made that Maori have been disadvantaged in the education system by both central policies AND from interests groups at the periphery of the system such as Pakeha.

The second assumption is that the introduction of 'Maori' language and culture through the Treaty of Waitangi, being set in the non-negotiable section of the Charters, will guarantee that Maori interests will be met. Simon (1986) has pointed out that past initiatives to introduce Maori language and culture into the classrooms ie the Taha Maori programmes, have been subverted through the actions of those involved. Smith (1990) also refers to the general hostile climate which Maori take (concerns) have to be developed within. The examples of two Pakeha communities in Christchurch in which one complained of having 'Taha Maori' rammed down their throats, and the other which complained about Maori 'separatism' and apartheid, adequately exhibits the no win situation which Maori interests are often caught between. (Smith, 1990:6)).

The third assumption that Tomorrow's School (1988) makes is that Maori language and culture is seen as intrinsically valuable to all. Not only does this assumption ignore the power relations that exist between Maori

and Pakeha, but it also ignores the beliefs in the inferiority of Maori language and culture and the belief of Pakeha in the supremacy of their own language and culture.

The Research and Methodology.

Tomorrow's Schools (1988) promoted the view that Maori interests and aspirations would be met in the new education system through membership by Maori as individuals to a School Board of Trustees. The research set out to investigate the degree to which this claim was substantiated. Bearing this in mind, the critique of the new educational reforms for Maori focused on three basic concepts: "Enabling", "Encouraging" and "Empowering". In analysing these three concepts in relation to policy, Roger Dale (1991) states:

...for these strategies and mechanisms [contained within the legislations, regulations etc] to produce outcomes consistent with and faithful to the aims of the policy - effecting the desired change(s) and/or empowering target groups in designated ways, a necessary...condition is that they must contain two key prior elements: -

- they must enable the achievement of policy goals by setting in place (at least the minimum) conditions (e.g. financial, organisational) for this achievement,
- they must encourage the fulfilment of those conditions in ways consistent with the achievement of the policy goals by privileging and installing in practice interpretations of the enabling conditions that are likely to promote such achievement...(Dale, 1991:151).

Theoretically, enabling and encouraging should result in empowerment for Maori. This in turn would lead to: a reduction in Maori underachievement at school (through Maori children identifying with a 'positive' environment); an improvement in the status of Maori within New Zealand society (through more Maori achieving); and the fostering of all round goodwill and partnership.

The evaluation of the claims made by Administering For Excellence (1988) and Tomorrow's Schools (1988) were carried out through interviews with Maori Members on School Boards of Trustees from the Auckland Region. Key areas such as the Treaty of Waitangi in the Charters and the Maori Language Factor Funding were targeted as specific areas for discussion, as it was more than likely that Maori Members would have some form of input and contribution to these two areas.

There are several points that need to be clarified at this point. The research operated under three major constraints: geographical, time and financial. These factors impinged on and set limits to the selection of the sample.

The geographical constraint of using one region (Auckland) posed a problem as the extent to which the research findings would be generally or nationally representative might be questionable. The Auckland area was selected for Boards of Trustees interviews because of its proximity to

myself. A time constraint also meant that only a certain number of participants could be interviewed. The availability of finance placed a further constraint upon what could be achieved. The areas which I could visit to interview key people was controlled by this factor. Lack of finance restricted my movements.

The first part of the research was to select a sample of schools. Through the Ministry of Education in Wellington, the Primary and Secondary School Rolls for Auckland as at 1 July 1990 was obtained. This list showed the numbers of Maori and Pacific Island students in the total school roll. From the 500 schools on the roll, 30 were omitted. These were:

- i). Six Kura Kaupapa Maori schools which were omitted simply because Kura Kaupapa operates on a purely Maori philosophy and ideology, and has different agenda from state controlled schools;
- ii). Four Maori boarding schools which also operated on a different agenda from the mainstream schools (ie, most of the pupils were Maori); and
- iii). Twenty special schools which includes schools for the deaf, the blind and the Intellectually Handicapped.

The number of Maori children in each school (from the total pool of 470 schools), was translated into percentages representing the proportion of Maori students. These percentiles are as follows;

THE PROPORTION OF MAORI CHILDREN ON SCHOOL ROLLS IN THE

AUCKLAND REGION, JULY 1990.

Category	Number of Schools	Percentage
i). No Maori Students	19	4.0%
ii). Less than 1%	6	1.3%
iii). 1% to 9.9%	174	37.0%
iv). 10% to 19.9%	117	24.9%
v). 20% to 29.9%	78	16.6%
vi). 30% to 39.9%	33	7.0%
vii). 40% to 49.9%	28	6.0%
viii). 50% +	15	3.2%
TOTALS	470	100%

A comparison was made between the school rolls in the Auckland area and Maori Members on the School Trustees Association Register. Of particular note was that some schools in the 40%+ brackets had up to, and in some cases more than, three Maori Members on the School Boards of Trustees, and some schools in the 0-19.9% bracket which had one and in some cases no Maori Members. It must be acknowledged that the register from which the name of Maori Members on School Boards of Trustees were obtained was a voluntary register of the School Trustees Association and may not reflect the 'true' proportion of Maori Members on School Boards of Trustees. The register contains only those Maori who identify themselves as being Maori, and not necessarily all of them. There is also no indication as to whether

or not Maori are there as individuals, or as representatives of the community. The sample selection therefore is not typical or representative of Maori Members on Boards of Trustees.

On the basis of the two sets of data, the 20% to 29.9% bracket was selected as the sample group. This was done on the following grounds. Firstly, the 20% to 29% percentile appeared critical. Above the 30% bracket, the number of schools was reducing and below the 20% bracket, the number of Maori Members was reducing. The 20% to 29.9% bracket contained a balance of both schools and Maori Members. Secondly, there was a reasonable number of schools (78) within the 20% to 29.9% bracket. Thirdly there were also a reasonable number of Maori Members on the Boards of Trustees (32) and finally, the intention was to interview twenty to twenty-four participants and it was feasible that the 20% to 29% bracket would produce this number. The selection of this percentile category was not random. This was because it was assumed that the proportion of Maori Members on the Boards of Trustees both above and below the selected category of 20% to 29.9%, would reflect the proportion of Maori children in those schools. Above 30%, the Maori Members might be expected to have a 'voice', and below 20%, it might be expected that they would have less of a voice. Therefore, the 20% to 29.9% was a critical group to test the effectiveness of legislation, particularly since the proportion of Maori children on the school roles were well above the national average and numbers of pupils. Where there were more Maori children (30%+), the likelihood of having more than one to two Maori members was increased and conversely where there were fewer Maori children (0% to 19.9%), there was also a likelihood of having no Maori Members.

Of the 78 schools which came into the 20% to 29.9% bracket, 32 Maori Members in 23 schools were identified. The school types were;

- i). Contributing schools (13)
- ii). Primary schools (8)
- iii). an Intermediate school (1)
- iv). Secondary schools (10)

Of the 32 schools selected, 3 were omitted due to insuperable difficulties of access. Letters were therefore sent to 29 Maori Members on School Boards of Trustees, inviting them to participate in this study. 19 Members accepted an invitation to partake in the research resulting in 16 being interviewed ().

The questions for the interviews were grouped into four areas. The first group focused on the participant's age, educational experience and career, to provide a general overview of his/her background.

The second group of questions focused on the Boards of Trustees itself and looked at why members decided to stand and their perceptions of the effectiveness of their contributions.

The third area targeted the Maori Language Factor Funding. Because the

Maori Language Factor Funding had been made available specifically for the development of Maori Language programmes, it was more than likely that Maori Members would be to have some degree involved in the initiation and implementation of the Language Programmes.

The fourth area was related to the Treaty of Waitangi. The importance of the Treaty was that it guaranteed the claims that were made in the The Picot Report (1988). This guarantee was implemented through the non-discretionary section of the charter. The purpose of this area of questions was to perceive how far the Treaty was guiding policy implementation for the Maori Members. The Minister of Education, Dr the Honourable Lockwood Smith had announced that the Treaty would be made optional in the charters (Herald, 22/11/90). The responses of Maori Members to this statement was investigated, taking account of the fact that the Treaty of Waitangi had been incorporated into the charters as the basis of guarantees that Maori needs, interests and aspirations would be catered for in the new educational reforms.

The interviews with Maori Members were carried out over a period of five weeks and were conducted predominantly in public places. All the interviews (which averaged around one hour's duration) were taped (with permission) and later transcribed in full.

Findings.

A. Experiences.

The youngest members from the Bords of Trustees sample group were 32 years of age with the oldest being 58. The children of the younger members attended the Primary/Contributing schools with the older members having children in the Secondary schools. Only one member did not have children at the school where they were a Board of Trustee Member. (This member was co-opted ()). Most members had left school around the 5th and 6th forms with four members having advanced to tertiary level. Not all of those who left in the fifth form had School Certificate. Two members had left as soon as they turned fifteen. Seventy five percent of the members interviewed were involved with community work which was voluntary and un-paid. All of these members were on more then two committees (one being on eight). Five members had careers in community work as well. Out of the sixteen members interviewed, one classified himself as unemployed through redundancy, two members identified themselves as mothers, one member did not say and the other twelve were involved in areas that ranged from being teachers through to managers.

As a group, Maori Members were generally not well informed about particular areas (including finance and the Maori Language Factor Funding) and tended to acknowledge the guidance' and `expertise' of their Pakeha counterparts. Maori 'expertise' resulted in Maori Members being predominantly located on community oriented sub-committees. Apart from one member being Chairperson of his Board and another being Deputy-Chairperson, not one of the Board

members indicated that they held positions of authority. Even though one Member was a Budget Officer, this member was not on the finance sub-committee. The conclusion drawn from this is that Maori Members were located in positions on their Boards that offered no direct decision making into the running of the school. This conclusion is further supported by the experiences of Members with regard to the Maori Language Factor Funding.

B. School Boards of Trustees

50% of those members interviewed were co-opted on to the Boards. Approaches for them to join were made predominantly by the principals of the schools involved. In this group, two were asked to replace members who had resigned. Of the co-opted members, five were asked to join the Board as a parent representative with the other three members being approached as Maori representatives. All but two of this group came to be regarded as the Maori representative. Seven accepted co-option because they saw a need for Maori representation. The eight remaining members in the sample group stood for and were elected to the local School Board of Trustees. Of this group, four represented their own interests as parents and four represented Maori community groups. The latter four members had been approached by the local community to stand. In this group of eight all but one came to be recognised both at the board and community level as the 'Maori representative'. This was regardless of whether they wanted to or not. Reasons for standing varied. One member stood to offset what she identified as a 'setup' by the principal to load the Board with 'his' men and four members stood 'for our people'. One stood purely because her child was in the school. The last two identified problems with Maori youth as motivating them to stand.

From the sample group of 16, all but three of the Maori Members came to be 'the representative' of the 'Maori community'. Several members took their position as the 'Maori representative' seriously enough to warrant setting up whanau groups which met regularly to advise the Maori member on the wishes of Maori parents.

Fifteen of the Maori Members noted that there was some difficulty in getting the Maori parents to participate in the decision-making for the school. Lack of Maori parental participation prior to the Boards of Trustees had also been noted. The majority of Maori women Board of Trustee members spent a great deal of time contacting the Maori community, by phoning parents or 'door-knocking' to meet and obtain the opinions of the Maori parents in the community.

C. Maori Language Factor.

The Maori Language Factor Funding (\$8.5million) is a part of the \$21 million which was set aside for equity funding. Funding which had initially been used for Maori language programmes (such as Taha Maori) in the old Educational administration, was destined to become 'lost' under the new administration. The result was the establishment of a Maori Language Factor

Funding.

The initial difficulty with the Maori Language Factor Funding was to initiate some method which would see an even distribution 'across the board'. This would mean a formula which did not rely on those administering the fund 'to be judgemental in delivery on application from schools to the centre' (Ministry Official No 1. 1991). This meant that those involved in administering the fund would not be influenced by what they perceived as being suitable ways of spending this funding. As a result, the Maori Language Factor Formula was developed to be allocated as a per Maori pupil rate. Delivery to schools is based on the number of self identified Maori students on school rolls.

In the initial stages and from the official count (of previous school rolls), the amount targeted to each pupil was \$75. When the actual roll numbers came in (1990), this amount dropped to \$70.33 simply because of the fixed amount that had been set aside for Maori Language Factor Funding of \$8.5 million, and because of an increase of 'Maori students' by some 10-11,000. This was further adjusted in July, 1990 (the start of the Government's financial year), by a 'inflation factor' raising the amount to \$71.33.

Towards the end of 1990, the Minister of Education, the Honourable Lockwood Smith, approved another change to the funding formula which, again, affected the per pupil rate. It had become apparent through various Maori personnel that the funding was being used 'for all manner of other purposes that were totally unrelated to what the funding had been intended for' (Ministry Official No 1. 1991). As a result, 10% of the \$8.5 million (\$850,000) was held back from the 1991 funding pool, and put into a contestable fund called Kaiarahi Reo (). This brought the Maori Language Factor Funding down to \$59.58 per child for 1991. There are moves however to have more of this funding allocated to other sources. The decisions for spending the Maori Language Factor Funding are left entirely up to the discretion of the School Board of Trustees. This decision also includes which children the funding is to be allocated to.

The assumption through Tomorrow's Schools (1988) is, that the 'promotion' of Maori language and culture will contribute to an atmosphere which Maori children will be able to identify with, feel comfortable within and therefore result in Maori achievement. As outlined by Bullivant (1981:236) the rhetoric of multiculturalism embraces the notion:

- (a) ...by learning about his (sic) cultural and ethnic 'roots' an ethnic child will improve his educational achievement;
- (b) the closely related claim that learning about his (sic) culture, its traditions and so on will improve equality of opportunity;
- (c) that learning about other cultures will reduce children's (and adult) prejudice and discrimination towards those from different cultural and ethnic backgrounds. (Bullivant, 1981:236).

The Research of Nathan Glazer et al (1977:18-21 as cited in Bullivant,

1981:237), points out that there is

little hard research evidence to support the causal relationship between the improvement of an ethnic child's identity, knowledge of his (sic) cultural background and heritage and an increase in life chances (Bullivant, 1981:237).

Judith Simon's (1990) extensive fieldwork has shown that Taha Maori programmes can have positive effects on the self-esteem of Maori children within the schooling setting but the wider reality is that these children still have to contend with a dominant culture, power deficiency and discrimination outside the school, for which they are not equipped (Simon, 1990:417).

Programmes Implemented.

There was a variety of ways in which the Maori Language Factor Funding money was allocated and predominantly, it was the principal who decided how the money was going to be spent. Programmes which developed out of the Maori Language Factor Funding included;

- i). Bi-lingual units (from half an hour to two hours per week);
 - ii). One Bi-lingual unit which were nearly completely totally immersed in Maori language;
 - iii). A whanau programme;
 - iv). Resources (books, tapes, computers etc) and ;
 - v). Costumes for the 'concert party' and marae trips.
- Some schools had no programmes at all but were in the process of developing their resources. Most boards made some type of effort to consult the community with regards to the spending of this money.

Seven members interviewed referred to their programmes as either Bi-lingual or Basic. These types of programmes entailed 1/2 an hour a week to 2 hours per week and involved those children whose parents agreed to let them participate. Of the seven Maori Members, six experienced problems. These were firstly, that the Principal of the school involved was not altogether supportive of a Maori Language Programme being implemented; secondly, that the Boards of Trustees were also not supportive of a Maori Language programme; thirdly, that some teachers did not support the inclusion of Maori language in their everyday teaching; and fourthly, that the result of this lack of support reflected in the commitment of the school to language programmes of 1/2 to 2 hours per week. One member commented on the unavailability of a certified teacher as the reason for their programme being Basic.

Because Maori Language Funding cannot be spent on teacher salaries, schools were more prepared to take on the services of a kai-awhina/kaiako who were given a 'koha' for their services.

The Maori member whose experiences were different was a co-opted member who

noticed that money had been put aside for 'Maori work'. This member arranged a meeting with the Principal to ascertain what the funding was going to be spent on. From this meeting began the development of a Maori Language programme which had the support of both the Principal and a teacher who agreed to take the classes. Consultation with parents was also forthcoming. Although the time allotment for this bi-lingual programme is starting out at two hours per week, the intention of those involved in the programme, is to have it as an integrated part of the curriculum. This is intended for 1992.

Nine members interviewed spoke of 'cultural group' activities. In some cases the Maori Language Factor Funding was being used to outfit the concert party for costumes, or as koha (donation) for tutors who were involved with the 'cultural groups'. These nine members included those from the bi-lingual language programmes and one other member whose school had no language programme at all. The Maori Language Factor Funding was also spent to transport children to various destinations as either part of the 'cultural groups' activities, or as part of Maori cultural activities in general. The latter included marae trips.

All 16 members spoke of resources, either buying books, video tapes, cassettes or Maori dictionaries for their libraries. In two instances, these resources were available to the Maori language children only, and this was seen as a positive situation for these children. The other 14 schools used their resources for all the children in the school.

One member spoke of the principal spending the Maori Language Factor Funding on books which were unsuitable for the primary school children, and geared more for secondary school use. The major concern for this member was that she had already spent considerable time seeking out resources for the school, only to be refused by the Principal who did not want to spend the Maori Language Factor Funding on anything that had been suggested.

One member spoke of the operation of a whanau programme. This programme is unique in that its formation, implementation, and direction was completely Maori initiated. The second feature that contributed to its uniqueness, was that this programme was the only one which had the total support of the Principal and no interference from other interests.

The programme implemented was based on a whanau support system and involved various Maori children within the third and fourth forms (Children who would have been streamed into different classes were altogether in this one class). The whanau support programme revolved around two factors. The criterion for being involved in the programme was that firstly, the students must sit School Certificate Maori and secondly, that Maori values and 'being Maori' was part of the normal everyday function of the class. This involved students helping each other with schoolwork, sharing 'knowledge', caring for the wellbeing of fellow students and peer-teaching. Maori values which are being practised revolve around the concept of sharing knowledge and the idea of 'whanau responsibility'. This involves

collective support for each member in that whanau group. There is a total commitment to the whanau programme from the parents, the children involved, the Maori studies department, the principal and the Board of Trustees. The whanau programme is well supported with fluent Maori language speakers who are both certified Maori Language teachers and, who were present in the school prior to the initiation of this programme. Most notably the major considerations which resulted in the total support of this programme was that from conception to implementation, the programme was Maori initiated and controlled.

There is one example of a programme categorised as Total Immersion. The Maori Member who spoke of this programme referred to it as a 'bi-lingual' programme on the grounds that there would be some objection if it was known as a total immersion course. This programme was initiated for the school by the Boards of Trustees, because the school attracted a large number of children from Kohanga Reo. It was because of the Kohanga new entrants that the Total Immersion programme was set up. The programme is well supported by the Boards of Trustees and the principal of the school. This language programme is further supported by a fluent Maori speaker who is also a certified teacher.

Two Members spoke of their schools having classes in Maori language. These were part of the schools curriculum and involved one secondary and one contributing school. For the secondary school, Maori Language was available as a School Certificate option, and was in place prior to Maori Language Factor Funding. The Maori Language Factor funding was used to boost resources for those students involved in these classes.

For the contributing school, these classes are available three times a week to the children, with the teachers at the school also having lessons. This member said that the support of the teachers and the principal has been invaluable. Being part of the curriculum meant that the language classes were treated as a normal everyday occurrence and did not attract any negativism.

Three members interviewed had no programme running in their school (two of these members belonged to the same school). All three spoke of some type of resistance to a Maori language programme. One member spoke of the teaching staff as being partially to blame for the absence of a Maori Language programme. The other Maori Member from the same school suggested that the principal's tactlessness had cost him the support of the Maori community to provide a tutor for their intended programme. The principal had attempted firstly to find a tutor outside of the area, and then approached the local Kohanga Reo for a tutor when he was unable to find one. When the teacher at the Kohanga Reo agreed to teach, she was not given any guidelines or hours in which language could be taught in the school. Subsequently, problems developed with the tutor waiting for some 'direction' and the principal not complying. The language programme fell through and at the time of this interview, the Principal had made no moves to rectify the situation (although he had been asked to do so by the Maori Members of the school

Boards of Trustees).

The last member from this group of three had decided not to develop a Maori Language programme simply because the people who were already involved at the school with the 'culture group', were over-committed. There are also no Maori teachers at this school (although the percentage of Maori pupils at the school is 22.5%) and generally no support for Maori input or language. This member stated that the principal was a racist, and the school monocultural.

The Last two members had no idea as to what the Maori Language Factor funding was spent on. One of these did not know of the existence of this funding until interviewed (This member was co-opted).

D. The Treaty of Waitangi.

Only two members had heard about the intended moves to make the Treaty of Waitangi being made optional in the charters. One member and their board had discussed the 'optional clause', and in the second case, parents had been consulted.

Of the fourteen members who were unaware that such a move had been proposed, several voiced their concerns that if this was the case, they were in opposition to the Treaty being ousted from the charters.

Other members noted that there had been some resistance from Board members (non-Maori) about the Treaty of Waitangi being present in the charters. This had led to considerable debate and disagreements.

CONCLUSSIONS.

In general, several points were highlighted from the interviews.

At the school level Principal support was imperative for the initiation and success of any type of programme. In all cases, the degree to which parental input counted, or the degree to which the Boards of trustees were challenged by either the Maori member or the Maori community depended upon the commitment of the principal to Maori take.

Teacher support was also an important factor. Some teachers resisted against having a Maori Language programme introduced at their schools and further refused to have any part in it. By contrast there were teachers who actively supported the programme and contributed to them. The latter types of programmes were being developed further.

Who 'taught' the programmes also influenced what type of programme was implemented. Not having adequate certified teachers was used on many occasions as a reason for not having more hours committed to the Maori language programmes.

At the Board level Maori Members on the Boards of Trustees did not necessarily have any control over or input into the spending of Maori Language Factor Funding. The degree to which this occurred varied and contributed a significant factor towards the types of programmes implemented. Where Maori 'control' was minimal or non-existent, so were the programmes. Where Maori were more 'in control' of the Maori Language Factor Funding, the implemented programmes reflected a greater commitment to Te Reo Maori.

Knowledge of the limitations and extent to which Maori Language Factor Funding could be applied varied considerably. Maori Members were not altogether as a group well informed about this funding. The absence of Ministerial guidelines led to the control over this funding being contested. The degree to which Maori members controlled this funding was reflected in the types of 'language' programmes that were implemented. Generally however, it was the principal who controlled the Maori Language Factor Funding.

At the community level and because of the Maori Language Factor Funding, several whanau groups had been set up by the Maori Members. These whanau groups operated as Maori parent consultancy groups to the Board of Trustees and the Schools. The degree to which this consultation existed however, varied. It was not always evident that parents were consulted in the processes relating to community participation. It was readily apparent however, that Maori parents avoided the schools and this was one of the major concerns voiced by the Maori Members on the Boards of Trustees.

Programmes that were controlled by either the Boards of Trustees or the principals did not necessarily reflect the wishes of the Maori parents. Some programmes were 'watered down' versions with other programmes contradicting what Maori parents had asked for.

One of the problems associated with the development of Maori Language programmes, was the inaccessibility of Maori Language teachers. This was often used as a reason to crush any initiatives by Maori Members to implement a Maori Language programme. There does exist however, a shortage of certified Maori language teachers and this will continue to create problems unless the demand is met. It is recognised however that for the Maori language programmes the expertise of fluent Maori speakers (non-certificated) can be used in the new educational reforms. The problem associated with this is that schools are able to use the Maori Language Factor Funding for Koha to volunteers, but not to pay for a certificated teacher. There is no financial support for Maori Language Teachers through Maori Language Factor Funding and resistance to hiring a Maori Language teacher (through other channels) is clearly related to the lack of money which is available for Teaching resources in general. The indication was that schools were not prepared to use other funding to hire a Maori Language teacher. What is also prevalent in the findings is that non-certificated teachers are seen as aides, assistants in the Maori Language programmes but not controllers of the programmes.

The experiences of the Maori Members on the School Board of Trustees differed considerably from each other however, the difficulties of being the only Maori member on the School Board of Trustees has certainly been highlighted in several instances through the the research. The degree to which a single member or indeed two Maori members on a Board were able to effectively initiate the interests of the Maori community was limited. Of particular concern was the alienation and outright hostility that some Maori members had to contend with on their School Boards of Trustees.

The conclusions to be drawn from the research is that the policy directives have enabled Maori participation in the new education system. Maori have not however, been given a fair hearing. Policy makers have reinterpreted what Maori asked for (ie. to improve Maori educational achievement) into what they see as being appropriate educational initiatives (biculturalism and token gestures of bilingualism).

Encouragement for Maori interests and aspirations is based entirely upon the goodwill of the Principal and the Board of Trustees. Without the support of this group, Maori remain marginalised and powerless. Maori therefore, have not been empowered. The claims made by the Picot Report (1988) that Maori parents would have a 'fair measure of influence over their children's education' are not supported by the findings from the research.

The most notable feature to surface in the research was that Maori members cannot in any way be classified as a homogenous group. Views, perceptions and ideas are shaped by varying factors which relate to life experiences and also influence what Maori Members see as being appropriate education for Maori children. This raises considerable concerns as Maori are always seen as being a homogenous group when it is quite clear that this is not the case. Despite this which the research recognises and substantiates, there are experiences in common - indeed that members of such a heterogeneous group have so much in common is itself a very significant finding.

FOOTNOTES

REFERENCES

- BULLIVANT, B. (1981) *The Pluralist Dilemma in Education: Six Case Studies*. England: George Allen & Unwin (Publishers) Ltd
- CODD, J. & GORDON, L. (1990) *School Charters: The Contractualist State and Education Policy*. Paper presented at NZARE special seminar on educational policy analysis, Massey University, 6-8 July
- DALE, R. (1989) *The State and Education Policy* Philadelphia: Open University Press

- DALE, R. (1991) Strategy and Mechanisms in the Implementation of Education Policy: Enabling, Encouraging, Effective or Empowering? Unpublished Draft, Department of Education University of Auckland
- DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION (1988) Administering for Excellence: Report of the Taskforce to Review Education Administration. Wellington
- DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION (1988) Tomorrow's Schools: The Reform of Education Administration in New Zealand. Wellington
- GLAZER, N. & D. MOYNIHAN, (1970) Beyond the Melting Point: The Negroes, Puerto Ricans, Jews, Italians, and Irish of New York. Cambridge Mass: MIT Press
- HAYEK, F. (1973) Law, Legislation and Liberty Volume 1: Rules and Order London:Routledge and Kegan Paul
- HAYEK, F. (1976) Law, Legislation and Liberty Volume 2: The Mirage of Social Justice London: Routledge and Keegan Paul
- JOHNSTON, P. (1991) "A Fair Measure Of Influence"?: Maori Members on School Boards of Trustees Unpublished Thesis, Education Department, Auckland University.
- KAWHARU, H. (1989) (ed) Waitangi: Maori and Pakeha Perspectives of the Treaty of Waitangi. Auckland: Oxford University Press.
- NEW ZEALAND HERALD 22/11/90
- PEARSON, D. (1990) A Dream Deferred: The Origins Of Ethnic Conflict in New Zealand Wellington: Allen & Unwin Port Nicholson Press
- PENETITO, W. (1984) `Taha Maori and the core curriculum', DELTA 34, July Pgs 34-43.
- PENETITO, W. (1988) Maori Education for a Just Society Royal Commission on Social Policy Wellington: Government Printer Pgs 88-114
- PENETITO, W. (1989) The Treaty Charters and Educational Change Prepared for Inspectors and Education Officers, Department of Education
- ROYAL COMMISSION ON SOCIAL POLICY, (1987) The Treaty of Waitangi and Social Policy, Discussion Booklet No.1, Wellington: Royal Commission on Social Policy.
- ROYAL COMMISSION ON SOCIAL POLICY, (1988) The April Report, Volumes I, II, III(1), III(2), IV Wellington: Royal Commission on Social Policy.
- SHARP, A. (1990) Justice and the Maori: Maori Claims in New Zealand Political Argument in the 1980s. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- SHARPLES, P. (1989) Kura Kaupapa Maori: Recommendations for Policy Proposals for the Establishment of Kura Kaupapa Maori. Access Vol 8/1 Pgs 28-43.
- SIMON, J. (1990) The Place of Schooling in Maori Pakeha Relations. PHD Thesis in Anthropology, University of Auckland.
- SMITH, G. (1986) `Taha Maori: A Pakeha Privilege', DELTA, 37 Pgs 10-23.
- SMITH, G. (1988) Pikau: A Burden for One's Back, Access 7, Pgs 34-44.

