Biculturalism in Education: Haere Whakamua, Hoki Whakamuri/Going Forward, Thinking Back

[This article is a reprint and was first published in Volume 12, Issue 2, 2015]

MEGAN LOURIE
School of Education, Auckland University of Technology

ABSTRACT

While references to the Treaty of Waitangi and/or biculturalism are an accepted part of the New Zealand education policy landscape, there is often a lack of consensus around the meaning, and therefore the practice implications, of the term 'biculturalism'. This difficulty can be explained by viewing biculturalism as a discourse that has continued to change since its emergence in the 1980s. In policy texts older understandings of the term are overlaid with more recent understandings and this can contribute to uncertainty about what the term means to teachers in 2016. This is particularly challenging for teachers and school leaders as they attempt to negotiate the requirements of the Practising Teacher Criteria. Therefore, there is a need to continue engaging in discussion about the meaning of biculturalism in education in the present, looking forward, but informed by the past.

INTRODUCTION

References to biculturalism and/or the Treaty of Waitangi have become a familiar and naturalised part of education policy in New Zealand over the past twenty years. For example, the New Zealand Curriculum (Ministry of Education, 2007) "acknowledges the principles of the Treaty of Waitangi and the bicultural foundations of Aotearoa New Zealand" (p. 9), while Section 61.3 of the Education Act 1989 states that school charters need to include: "the aim of developing, for the school, policies and practices that reflect New Zealand's cultural diversity and the unique position of the Māori culture". As any practising teacher is aware, both initial teacher education and subsequent registration and appraisal processes require individuals to provide evidence of the ways they are operationalising biculturalism. This can be challenging for teachers because, despite the familiarity of the term, there is not a consensus about what biculturalism means, especially at the level of individual practice. One of the reasons for this is that it is not always acknowledged that the discourse of biculturalism has undergone significant changes since its emergence in the 1980s. Evidence of earlier understandings can still be found in policy statements, often in tension with more recent understandings, or in fact, significant institutional changes. This article

traces the changes that have occurred in the way biculturalism has been understood in education, and how those changing understandings have been reflected in education policy and practice.

This article draws on the idea first proposed by Mason Durie (1998b) that biculturalism can be regarded as a continuum with a gradation of goals and a number of possible structural arrangements. Augie Fleras and Paul Spoonley (1999) further developed Durie's notion of a continuum to include the policy outcomes associated with different forms of biculturalism. This bicultural continuum can also serve as a timeline of sorts, with each form of biculturalism representing stages in process of ongoing change. It is important to note that as each subsequent form of biculturalism has emerged, it has not replaced its previous form. On the contrary, different forms of biculturalism have overlapped one another and co-existed as time has progressed, although particular forms have tended to dominate at different periods of time. The bicultural continuum represented in Table 1 is proposed as a useful framework for understanding biculturalism as a discourse continually changing as socio-political contexts change.

	Soft	Moderate	Inclusive	Strong	Hard
Goals	celebrating Māoritanga	improving race relations	partnership	separate but equal	tino rangatiratanga: challenging the system
Structures	removal of discriminatory barriers and prejudice	a Māori perspective	active Māori involvement and special treatment	parallel institutions	Māori models of self-determination
Policy outcomes	mainstreaming	taha Māori	responsiveness	devolution	He Putahitanga

Table 1. A bicultural commitment: goals and structures (Fleras & Spoonley, 1999, p. 238)

This article describes the broad contours of changing discourses of biculturalism along this continuum, with a particular focus on how ideas about biculturalism have been represented in education policy and practice. It begins with the establishment of a relationship between Māori and Pākehā through the signing of the Treaty of Waitangi, to the 'soft' genesis of biculturalism and on through to its 'inclusive' and 'strong' forms (Fleras & Spoonley, 1999) before considering its current status. The final section of the paper looks at the current overlay of 'inclusive' and 'strong' forms of biculturalism in education and argues that the tension between these forms of biculturalism contribute to uncertainty about what the term means to teachers in 2016.

THE TREATY OF WAITANGI – A RELATIONSHIP IS ESTABLISHED

The Treaty of Waitangi (1840) was a treaty of cession and protection signed by representatives of the British Crown and chiefs of over 500 iwi (tribes) and hapū (subtribes) (Bromell, 2008). What was to be ceded and what would be afforded protection has been the subject of much debate since the signing, as a result of the confusion caused by having both a Māori and English version of the Treaty, neither of which accurately corresponds with the meaning of the other.

Ranginui Walker (1984) argued that one of New Zealand society's powerful myth-themes is racial harmony, stemming from the belief that Māori and Pākehā had been joined as one by the Treaty as captured in Hobson's often-quoted phrase "he iwi tahi tātou (we are now one people)" (Colenso, 1971, p. 33 parentheses in original)., Accounts of New Zealand history suggest, however, that racial harmony was more mythical than real, as Māori and Pākehā competed for the land and its resources (Walker, 1984). Viewed in this way, an historical account of biculturalism is also an account of changing Māori and Pākehā relationships, born out of competition for social and economic power.

Prior to the emergence of bicultural education policy in the 1980s, the state pursued a lengthy agenda of assimilation followed by integration. Broadly speaking, assimilation is the process by which one group takes on the cultural traits of another group. Assimilation was to remain the state policy objective until after World War II when integration became the preferred policy goal. Education was regarded as a primary means of achieving cultural assimilation; consequently English was formally established as the language of instruction in schools, and the curriculum excluded both Māori language and Māori perspectives for many years.

The Hunn Report (Hunn, 1960) rejected the policy of assimilation which had shaped New Zealand's education policy since 1844 and offered an alternative of integration, an equal partnership, which would "combine (not fuse) the Māori and Pākehā elements to form one nation wherein Māori culture remains distinct" (p. 15). James Belich (2001) argued that this new policy was still fundamentally assimilationist, envisaging state leadership rather than Māori leadership., The notion of combining Māori and Pākehā cultural elements within one nation foreshadows, however, the 'soft' form of biculturalism, which was to emerge in the following decades.

FROM 'SOFT' TO 'MODERATE' BICULTURALISM

The goal of 'soft' biculturalism is the celebration of Māoritanga and a more 'moderate' form of biculturalism which has the goal of improving race relations (Fleras & Spoonley, 1999). While the concept of biculturalism was not institutionalised in policy until the 1980s, the term itself emerged at least a decade earlier. Anthropologist Eric Schwimmer is usually credited as the first academic commentator to make use of the term biculturalism in his edited collection, *The Māori People in the Nineteen Sixties*, defining biculturalism as the "conscious confrontation and reconciliation of two conflicting value systems, both of which are accepted as valid" (1968, p. 13). By the mid-1970s, the recognition and inclusion of Māori culture within the national New Zealand culture was gaining traction as a means of improving race relations and ameliorating Māori alienation (Rata, 2005; Sissons, 2000).

In the 1970s the state was under increasing pressure as a result of Māori protest in relation to land grievances (Walker, 1984). It was also under pressure to deal more effectively with ethnic inequality, which, at the time, was reflected in lower school achievement rates and higher arrest, conviction, and imprisonment rates for young Māori. The emergence of urban Māori gangs (Belich, 2001; Sissons, 1993) contributed to a perceived sense of urgency of this

problem. Both academics and those in official circles attributed the problem of underachievement to the social alienation of Māori people due to a loss of their cultural identity. Officially promoting and affirming 'traditional' Māori culture was thought to be a means of eliminating, or at least reducing, ethnic inequalities. The Office of the Race Relations Conciliator was established in 1972 on these grounds, and the Departments of Māori Affairs and Education began to actively pursue cultural promotion activities (Sissons, 1993).

Low rates of examination passes and low school leaving ages among Māori students began to prompt calls for the inclusion of Māori culture and Māori language in school curricula (National Advisory Committee on Māori Education, 1970). Protest pressure from Ngā Tamatoa[1], a number of Māori teachers and a more liberal Minister of Education in the 1972 Labour Government combined to bring about significant changes in education (Walker, 2004). Nga Tamatoa were particularly active organising a petition calling for the inclusion of the Māori language at both primary and secondary level, collecting thousands of signatures. By 1973, all seven Teachers Colleges had established Māori courses and in 1974 a one-year teaching training scheme for native speakers was established in response to the challenge that there were insufficient teachers to introduce the language into schools nationwide.

The first major survey to look at the state of Māori language was initiated in 1973 by the New Zealand Council for Educational Research (NZCER). The findings of this research showed an alarming decline in the number of fluent speakers, and raised serious questions as to whether the Māori language would survive beyond the generation of that time (Benton, 1977, 1979). This heightened awareness and concern appears to have been reflected in increasing numbers of Māori students learning Māori language in secondary schools which increased from 2,249 in 1969 to 6,850 in 1973. At the end of the decade the number was around 15,000 and growth in the enrolments of non-Māori into Māori language courses had also increased (Benton, 1981). Sissons (1993) reported that by 1983 Māori language was taught in 178 secondary schools and about 330 primary schools and was studied by nearly 13,500 secondary and an estimated 30,000 primary students. Marae-based courses for school principals and senior school leaders were established, aiming to increase knowledge of Māori cultural values, language and the special needs of Māori students. There were 31 courses offered between March 1976 and March 1986, sponsored by the Department of Education and catering for 1350 principals and teachers .

The heightened interest and focus on Māori language education was evident in the *Review of the Core Curriculum for Schools* (Department of Education, 1984a). This review was an examination of the structure and balance of the compulsory core curriculum in both primary and secondary education and made a number of significant comments relating to the place of the Māori language within schools. While it did not recommend that Māori language should be part of the compulsory core curriculum, the review made strong suggestions that its development within schools should be fostered as far as possible. The review noted that while there was still no syllabus for te reo Māori (Māori language), both a primary and secondary syllabus were being prepared. *Tihē Mauri Ora* (Ministry of Education, 1990), a Māori language syllabus for primary

---

[1] Ngā Tamatoa (The Warriors) were a Māori protest group active in the 1970s.

schools, was eventually developed, but the only available national syllabus for Māori language in secondary schools during this period continued to be the examination prescriptions for the School Certificate and University Entrance examinations[2].

The curriculum initiative 'Taha Māori' dominated official discussions about Māori education by the mid-1980s (Sissons, 1993). The intention of the initiative was to include *taha Māori* (a Māori dimension) in all aspects of school life, from curriculum to values to organisation. It was thought that Taha Māori offered Māori students previously lacking cultural recognition, thereby potentially contributing to an improvement in their educational achievement. In addition, Taha Māori was seen as a means by which racial harmony could be ensured:

> For the Māori youngster, the incorporation of taha Māori is an important avenue in the development of self-worth and identity, and the degree of success that it likely to follow...For the non-Māori New Zealander, taha Māori gives the child a share in something that is uniquely New Zealand and facilitates cross-cultural understanding. (Department of Education, 1984b, p. 5)

Taha Māori appears to have gained very little traction in schools, however, and eventually disappeared entirely. Little is known about how well-supported it was by Pākehā, and it was critiqued by some Māori as a token attempt to appease Māori desires to include Māori content in the curriculum (Smith, 1990; Tocker, 2015).

In summary, understandings of biculturalism in the 1970s and until the mid-1980s stemmed from ideals of political justice and social inclusion: the focus was on recognising and including Māori culture within the national New Zealand culture. The intentions of early biculturalists to "bring Māori in from the margins of society" (Rata, 2005, p. 267) fitted with democratic ideals. The establishment of the Waitangi Tribunal in 1975 had affirmed the place of the Treaty of Waitangi in New Zealand society, and the widespread perception that emerged during the 1970s and early 1980s was that the Treaty was, first and foremost, an agreement made with Māori at the founding of the nation that should be honoured in the name of fairness. It can be argued, then, "that biculturalism gained traction and coherence, primarily through a discourse of *equality* rather than as a recognition of cultural claims within democracy per se" (Barclay, 2005, p. 120, emphasis in original). The social alienation of Māori people was understood as being due to a loss of their cultural identity and the solution was seen as greater visibility and inclusion of Māori culture and perspectives in mainstream society.

In education the period of 'soft' to 'moderate' biculturalism was characterised by increased discussion about the inclusion of a Māori perspective in the curriculum. There was much greater awareness of the declining health of the Māori language and the potential benefits for learners of the greater inclusion of Māori language and culture in schools. This shift in attitudes was reflected in

---

[2] This was not an issue specific to te reo Māori. National syllabi did not exist for any secondary school subjects until the 1990s, subsequent to the publication of the 1993 Curriculum Framework (Ministry of Education, 1993).

the increased numbers of schools offering Māori language as a subject, and in the number of students participating in Māori language learning. A syllabus for primary schools was developed, however up until the mid-1980s there were few changes at the policy level despite changing attitudes towards Māori language and culture.

'INCLUSIVE' BICULTURALISM

The late 1980s and 1990s are characterised by the appearance of what Fleras and Spoonley (1999) refer to as 'inclusive' and 'strong' forms of biculturalism, as well as its continued existence in 'moderate' forms. It was during this period that biculturalism became firmly embedded in New Zealand institutions as policy (Rata, 2004). This section will focus on the development of the 'inclusive' form of biculturalism during this period, in particular the increasing influence of the Waitangi Tribunal in establishing and legitimating the idea of 'partnership'[3]. The emergence of 'strong' biculturalism which occurred during a similar period of time will be discussed in the following section.

By the mid-1980s, it was becoming clear to state officials and Māori leaders that the systemisation of Māori tradition for Māori self-esteem and social integration had failed to significantly reduce socio-economic inequalities between Māori and Pākehā, and this coincided with increasingly demanding calls for greater Māori political and economic autonomy (Sissons, 1993). Notions of partnership and active Māori involvement, which characterise 'inclusive' biculturalism, began to emerge in discourse. Māori academic Ranginui Walker had already begun to advocate for a power-sharing model of partnership, stating that

> ...biculturalism means more than Pākehās learning a few phrases of Māori language and how to behave on the marae. It means they will have to share what they have monopolised for so long, power, privilege and occupational security. (1986, p. 5)

The increasing influence of the Waitangi Tribunal

The Waitangi Tribunal became a significant force behind the development of biculturalism after the 1985 Treaty of Waitangi Amendment Act was passed giving the Tribunal powers to hear Māori claims retrospective to 1840 (Bromell, 2008; Levine, 2005; Rata, 2004). The Tribunal is a permanent commission of inquiry charged with making recommendations about claims brought by Māori relating to actions or omissions of the Crown, which breach the promises made in the Treaty of Waitangi. This means, in effect, the Waitangi Tribunal has

---

[3] Elizabeth Rata (2008) also uses the term inclusive biculturalism but views the concept of partnership very differently. Whereas Fleras and Spoonley (1999) propose that partnership is a goal of inclusive biculturalism, Rata sees partnership as belonging to what she terms 'exclusive biculturalism'. This form of biculturalism is characterised by the political recognition of two distinctive and separate ethnic groups, Māori and Pākehā. Rata argues the exclusive biculturalism project has been driven by tino rangatiratanga politics. Therefore, her term 'exclusive biculturalism' loosely corresponds with Fleras and Spoonley's 'strong' and 'hard' forms of biculturalism.

exclusive authority to determine the meaning and effect of the Treaty as it is embodied in the English and Māori texts (Bromell, 2008; Rata, 2004). The 1985 Treaty of Waitangi Amendment Act, as well as enabling retrospective Treaty claims, also established tribes, not pan-Māori, as the legal claimants for historical reparations. This significantly changed the discourse of biculturalism as 'Māori' became used increasingly to mean tribal Māori, and the idea of social justice came to refer to tribal recognition, rather than inclusion of Māori culture into broader New Zealand society (Rata, 2011). It is this change which marks the move from 'soft' to 'moderate' forms of biculturalism to 'inclusive' and 'strong' forms of biculturalism.

The Waitangi Tribunal has been pivotal in establishing, then naturalising, first the concept of treaty partnership, and, later, Treaty principles (Rata, 2004). The principle of partnership was first explicitly identified in the Tribunal's 1985 Manukau Report (Waitangi Tribunal, 2012). By 1987 the Court of Appeal could say that the Treaty of Waitangi had established a relationship "akin to a partnership" (Te Puni Kōkiri, 2001, p. 77). Section 9 of the State-owned Enterprises Act 1986 states that "[n]othing in this Act shall permit the Crown to act in a manner that is inconsistent with the principles of the Treaty of Waitangi". This section of the legislation was included as a response to concerns about the possible infringement of rights guaranteed to Māori by the Treaty of Waitangi if Crown assets were transferred to private enterprise (Rata, 2004). This was the first reference in legislation or policy to the principles of the Treaty. By May 2001 there were over thirty pieces of legislation referring to the Treaty of Waitangi or its principles (Te Puni Kōkiri, 2001).

While the government professed a commitment to partnership with Māori during the 1990s, this commitment tended to focus on institutional accommodation, usually by incorporating a Māori dimension into state practices and national symbols (Durie, 1995). Māori names were adopted for government departments, Māori language and protocol became increasingly visible on ceremonial occasions, and official reports were printed in both Māori and English (Poata-Smith, 1996; Spoonley, 1993). However, biculturalism also began to extend to collaborations by Māori and the Crown to draft legislation protective of Māori interests (Durie, 1998a).

'MODERATE' BICULTURALISM IN EDUCATION

Mainstream education policy lagged behind broader public policy developments in relation to the changing form of biculturalism described in the previous section. While significant developments in education were occurring initially outside the state education system, change within mainstream education was slower. 'Inclusive' biculturalism, with its emphasis on partnership, did not appear in education policy statements until the 2000s. Prior to this, educational changes gave greater substance to 'moderate' biculturalism, that is, there was greater attention paid to the inclusion of Māori culture and Māori perspectives in mainstream school settings.

The strengthening of a 'moderate' form of biculturalism in the late 1980s and 1990s appears to have been, in part, the result of the influence of the Māori language revival movement. This is evident in the influential report *Administering for Excellence* (Taskforce to Review Education Administration,

1988) which signals recognition of the importance of Māori language in education as a means of improving Māori educational achievement:

> It is clear from the submissions made to us that the Māori people attach high priority to the revitalisation of the language and culture and that they are looking to the education system to assist them in the task. It is also clear that the revival of the Māori language and culture is not seen as an end in itself, but as the key of lifting the educational performance of Māori children. (Taskforce to Review Education Administration, 1988, p. 65)

The influence of the Māori language revival movement led to the development and eventual state funding of kura kaupapa Māori[4] (Tocker, 2015). There was also an increase in the number of students learning Māori in the late 1990s and early 2000s in the mainstream. Between 1989 and 2009, the number of students learning Māori in mainstream secondary schools rose 40.4 percent, and the number of schools offering the subject increased by around two thirds (Waitangi Tribunal, 2011, p. 399).

The 1993 Curriculum Framework (Ministry of Education, 1993) established for the first time in New Zealand a clear set of national guidelines within which teachers could develop programmes for their students. It is also the first acknowledgement of biculturalism in education policy that relates to the national education system and not specifically to Māori language revitalisation initiatives. The framework contains a number of principles which 'give direction to the curriculum in New Zealand schools' (p. 6), and states 'the New Zealand Curriculum recognises the significance of the Treaty of Waitangi. The school curriculum will recognise and value the unique position of Māori in New Zealand society' (p.7). This statement exemplifies 'moderate' biculturalism with its focus on recognition and the inclusion of Māori perspectives.

'INCLUSIVE' BICULTURALISM IN EDUCATION

'Inclusive' biculturalism, with its focus on partnership, became more apparent in education policy during the 2000s. *The National Education Guidelines* legislate the direction New Zealand schools must take in the planning and provision of education. These Guidelines have four main components which include the *National Administration Guidelines (NAGs),* and the *New Zealand Curriculum.* NAG 1(e) sets out the requirement for schools to consult with Māori communities, based on a notion of partnership. Schools, therefore, must "in consultation with the school's Māori community[5], develop and make known to the school's community policies, plans and targets for improving the achievement of Māori

---

[4] Māori medium schools which adhere to a separate education philosophy known as *Te Aho Matua.*

[5] The notion of a 'school's Māori community' is highly problematic. It implies that there is cohesive and homogeneous community of Māori people living within a school zone which is often not the case, especially in large urban cities. Even if schools want to consult with Māori, they must face the complex issue of how the interests of diverse Māori groups or communities, who may come from different iwi, or hapū, might be represented in a consultation process.

students" (Ministry of Education, 2015a). *The New Zealand Curriculum* (Ministry of Education, 2007) "acknowledges the principles of the Treaty of Waitangi and the bicultural foundations of Aotearoa New Zealand" (p. 9), and articulates a strong statement of support for the idea of partnership: "[o]ur vision is for young people….[w]ho will work to create an Aotearoa New Zealand in which Māori and Pākehā recognise each other as full Treaty partners" (p. 8).

The shift from 'moderate' to 'inclusive' biculturalism is clearly illustrated if definitions of biculturalism written by two commentators during different time periods are compared. In 1989 Richard Mulgan described biculturalism as "the public recognition of the importance of two cultures, Māori and Pākehā, as central to the life of Aotearoa-New Zealand" (p. 28). Two decades later David Bromell (2008) observed that "quite apart from any political consensus on the matter" biculturalism is commonly expounded in New Zealand as a "power-sharing partnership between Māori and the Crown, based on the Treaty of Waitangi" (p41).

In education a similar process occurred, in that the initial emphasis appeared to be on greater inclusion and recognition of Māori practices and the Māori language. This is characteristic of 'moderate' biculturalism. The emergence of biculturalism in its 'inclusive' form, characterised by references to partnership, did not happen until the 2000s in mainstream state education and it continues to be the dominant form of biculturalism expressed in education policy in 2015.

'STRONG' BICULTURALISM

The development of 'inclusive' biculturalism was paralleled by the emergence of 'strong' biculturalism during a similar period of time in the late 1980s. The corporatisation of iwi (tribes) was a key component in the emergence of 'strong' biculturalism which is characterised by devolution and notions of separate but equal power sharing and/or institutions. Andrew Sharp (1997) distinguishes the shift from 'inclusive' to 'strong' biculturalism as the shift from 'bicultural reformism' which is an adaptation of "[P]ākehā institutions to meet Māori requirements" to "bicultural distributivism" meaning the development of "different and specifically Māori institutions to share the authority defined by the Treaty" (p. 230). In education, the development of the parallel and independent education system kura kaupapa Māori, was an example of the materialisation of a 'strong' form of biculturalism. In time kura kaupapa Māori became part of the state-funded education system.

In 1988 the Government abolished the Department of Māori Affairs and established the much smaller Ministry of Māori Affairs, and the Iwi Transition Agency. The Iwi Transition Agency was charged with facilitating the establishment of Iwi Authorities which are legally constituted corporate identities, able to contract themselves with government departments for development projects, job training and social welfare delivery. This process was known as devolution. Two years later in 1990, the Runanga Iwi Act (RIA) was passed, which enabled iwi to acquire the legal mandate to deliver government-funded social, economic and culture programmes for their people, provided they met prerequisites relating to their constitution and operational systems. They were to be business entities and were required to adopt a corporate model of management (Hill, 2009). One effect of this was to establish a political

relationship between the corporate tribe and the government, as part of the consolidation of a system for the transfer of economic resources from public to tribal ownership, and for the devolution of state services into tribal control (Rata, 2011).

'STRONG' BICULTURALISM AND KURA KAUPAPA MĀORI

The campaign by a widespread Māori movement for a separate education system (kura kaupapa Māori) was initially driven by concern about the survival of the Māori language and employed the discourse of 'inclusive' biculturalism., Once established, however, the project was regarded as a means of maintaining and strengthening a separate Māori identity and institutional structure, which is characteristic of 'strong' biculturalism as defined by Fleras and Spoonley (1999). At this point, it is important to acknowledge that kura kaupapa Māori distanced themselves from biculturalism soon after their establishment. Kura kaupapa Māori now employ the discourse of indigeneity or tino rangatiratanga, which is underpinned by the principle of self-determination, or relative autonomy (see for example, Graham Smith, 2000). While Fleras and Spoonley (1999) place self-determination and tino rangatiratanga on the 'hard' end of the bicultural continuum, this article acknowledges the view that biculturalism is regarded by some as separate to, and incompatible with, the discourse of indigeneity (see for example, O'Sullivan, 2007). Consequently this section of the article is limited to the initial establishment of kura kaupapa Māori only, in order to show the brief intersection of biculturalism and the kura kaupapa Māori movement.

In 1986, a successful claim was made to the Waitangi Tribunal which established the Māori language as a taonga (a valued possession), and as such, guaranteed protection by the Treaty of Waitangi. This 'guarantee' was interpreted as the requirement to act:

> ...the word (guarantee) means more than merely leaving the Māori people unhindered in their enjoyment of their language and culture. It requires active steps to be taken to ensure that the Māori people have and retain the full exclusive and undisturbed possession of their language and culture. (Waitangi Tribunal, 1986, p. 20)

The following year, in 1987, Māori was made an official language of New Zealand, and the combined effect of these two acts firmly entrenched the place of Māori language in all education sectors. In the late 1980s the development of kura kaupapa Māori as an extension of kohanga reo (Māori language early childhood centres) for school age children was actively supported by Pākehā with a commitment to 'moderate' or 'inclusive' biculturalism. The campaign for legislation that would enable these schools to be given state funding was based upon the understanding that kura kaupapa Māori would produce "bilingual and bicultural citizens" (Nepe, Rata, Smith, & Smith, 1989, p. 40).

In 1989, in response to confusion about what the term 'treaty principles' meant, the government defined five principles. Principle 2 was the principle of self-management which stated that iwi have a right to organise themselves as iwi and to control their own assets and resources under the law. It was this principle that justified the lobby for state funding for Kura Kaupapa Māori. The lobby was

successful and as a result of the 1989 Education Act, kura kaupapa Māori became part of the state-funded education system.

The establishment of kura kaupapa Māori suggests that a form of *'strong'* biculturalism did materialise briefly in New Zealand education before being replaced by the ideology of indigeneity., For the most part, however, *'inclusive'* biculturalism, which attempts to materialise partnership practices between the state and iwi groups, dominates the present policy landscape. For example, *Ka Hikitia – Accelerating Success 2013-2017* (Ministry of Education, 2013) is a strategic document with the goal of guiding and measuring quality education provision for Māori students. The document emphasises collaboration and "the value of working closely with iwi and Māori organisations" (p.14) in order to improve the performance of the education system. The 'inclusive' or 'partnership' language of biculturalism is salient in this document: "Ensuring Māori students enjoy and achieve education success as Māori is a joint responsibility of the Crown (represented by the Ministry of Education and other education sector agencies/departments) and iwi, hapū and whānau" (2013, p.14).

POLICY AND PRACTICE

'Moderate', 'inclusive' and 'strong' forms of biculturalism (Fleras & Spoonley, 1999) appear in education policy and auditing documents in 2016., it is not, however, always clear to which form of biculturalism the term is referring when used, and this can result in confusion among teachers and school leaders who are attempting to operationalise biculturalism. The Practising Teacher Criteria are a good example of this, especially when considering the practices of individual teachers.

The recently renamed Practising Teacher Criteria were developed in 2011[6] (Education Council of Aotearoa New Zealand, 2015) and include criteria based on an 'inclusive' form of biculturalism. Criterion 3 requires teachers to "demonstrate commitment to bicultural partnership in Aotearoa New Zealand" (2015). The single indicator for providing evidence this criterion is being met is that a teacher can "demonstrate respect for the heritages, languages and cultures of both partners to the Treaty of Waitangi". While there are many ways a teacher might demonstrate respect for heritages, languages and cultures, this indicator is much more suggestive of a 'moderate' form of biculturalism with its focus on recognition and inclusion, than it is of partnership, especially if partnership is considered to be underpinned by notions of power-sharing.

Criterion 10 requires teachers to demonstrate that they "work effectively within the bicultural context of Aotearoa New Zealand" (2015). There are two key indicators for this criteria: that teachers "practise and develop the relevant use of te reo Māori me ngā tikanga-a-iwi in context" and that they "specifically and effectively address the educational aspirations of ākonga Māori, displaying high expectations for their learning" (2015). It is difficult to identify which form of biculturalism underpins the thinking behind these key indicators. What is meant by "working effectively with the bicultural context of Aotearoa New Zealand"? Does this refer to a 'moderate' form of biculturalism? If so, the use of some Māori

---

[6] Up until 2015, the Practising Teacher Criteria were termed the Registered Teacher Criteria.

language in all classrooms would be appropriate because the goal of 'moderate' biculturalism is recognition and inclusion. But how do these indicators reflect the goal of partnership, if biculturalism is understood as 'inclusive' (Fleras & Spoonley, 1999) and based on a partnership relationship?

As discussed earlier in this article, kura kaupapa Māori now operate within a discourse of indigeneity, which is quite different to biculturalism. Indigeneity principles do, however, very loosely align with Fleras and Spoonley's (1999) descriptors for aspects of 'strong' and 'hard' biculturalism. Moreover, it is likely that many non-Māori people working in schools interpret the existence of kura kaupapa Māori as a materialisation of bicultural principles, not indigeneity principles, as biculturalism is the dominant policy discourse. In this respect, a 'strong' form of biculturalism also exists in the public imaginary in the form of parallel, separate schools guided by a separate curriculum, *Te Marautanga o Aotearoa* (Ministry of Education, 2008). This means that many teachers have knowledge or experiences of the different forms of biculturalism that are in existence, either in policy discourses, or in practice, without necessarily understanding that there are significant differences between those forms.

CONCLUSION

The intention of this article has been to describe the changing discourse of biculturalism since its emergence in the 1980s with a particular focus on how these changes have been reflected in education policy. Policy making is a messy process, characterised by contestation and compromise (Ball, 1990), and this can result in contradictions and tensions within policy ensembles. Biculturalism is underpinned by complex and changing ideas, so it is unsurprising that contradictions appear in policy texts. The bicultural continuum developed by Fleras and Spoonley (1999) is a useful tool with which to help identify a number of discursive threads that are present in current education policy. At face value the notion of a continuum may suggest that bicultural discourse has developed in a straightforward linear fashion but this is not the case. Over time, different forms of biculturalism have emerged, overlapping and co-existing with one another, and this has contributed to the emergence of contradictions within policy texts. It is therefore, unsurprising that teachers can feel frustrated by the requirement to show evidence of their bicultural commitment as part of policy auditing systems, when they are confused about what the term means or what it might look like in practice. The lack of clarity in policy documents and the resulting confusion points to the need for continuing engagement in discussion about the meaning of biculturalism in education in the present, looking forward, but informed by the past.

REFERENCES

Ball, S. J. (1990). *Politics and policy making in education*. London, England: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Barclay, K. (2005). Rethinking inclusion and biculturalism: Towards a more relational practice of democratic justice. In J. Liu, T. McCreanor, T. McIntosh, & T. Teaiwa (Eds.), *New Zealand identities: Departures and destinations* (pp. 118-139). Wellington, New Zealand: Victoria University Press.

Belich, J. (2001). *Paradise reforged: A history of the New Zealanders from the 1880s to the year 2000* Auckland, New Zealand: Penguin.

Benton, R. A. (1977). *Survey of language use in Māori households*. Wellington, New Zealand: New Zealand Council for Educational Research.

Benton, R. A. (1979). *Who speaks Māori in New Zealand?* Wellington, New Zealand: New Zealand Council for Educational Research.

Benton, R. A. (1981). *The flight of the amokura: Oceanic languages and formal education in the South Pacific*. Wellington, New Zealand: New Zealand Council for Educational Research.

Bromell, D. (2008). *Ethnicity, identity and public policy: Critical perspectives on multiculturalism* Wellington, New Zealand: Institute of Policy Studies, Victoria University of Wellington.

Colenso, W. (1971). *The signing of the Treaty of Waitangi*. Christchurch, New Zealand: Capper Press.

Department of Education. (1984a). *A review of the core curriculum for schools*. Wellington, New Zealand: Department of Education.

Department of Education. (1984b). *Taha Māori in schools: Suggestions for getting started*. Wellington, New Zealand: Department of Education.

Durie, M. (1995). Beyond 1852: Māori, the state and a New Zealand consitution. *Sites, 30*(Autumn), 31-47.

Durie, M. (1998a). *Te mana, te kawanatanga: The politics of self-determination*. Auckland, New Zealand: Oxford University Press.

Durie, M. (1998b). *Whaiora: Māori health development*. (2nd ed.). Auckland, New Zealand: Oxford University Press.

Education Act No 80 (1989). Retrieved from http://www.legislation.govt.nz/act/public/1989/0080/latest/DLM175959.html

Education Council of Aotearoa New Zealand. (2015). *Practising Teacher Criteria*. Retrieved from http://www.educationcouncil.org.nz/content/registered-teacher-criteria

Fleras, A., & Spoonley, P. (1999). *Recalling Aotearoa: Indigenous politics and ethnic relations in New Zealand*. Auckland, New Zealand: Oxford University Press.

Hill, R. (2009). *Māori and the state: Crown-Māori relations in New Zealand/Aotearoa, 1950-2000*. Wellington, New Zealand: Victoria University Press.

Hunn, J. K. (1960). *Report on Department of Māori affairs*. Wellington, New Zealand: Government Printer.

Levine, H. (2005). Moving beyond cultural essentialism. In J. Liu, T. McCreanor, T. McIntosh, & T. Teaiwa (Eds.), *New Zealand identities: Departures and destinations* (pp. 104-117). Wellington, New Zealand: Victoria University Press.

Ministry of Education. (1990). *Tihē mauri ora!: Māori language: Junior classes to form 2: Syllabus for schools*. Wellington, New Zealand: Learning Media.

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

Ministry of Education. (2007). *The New Zealand curriculum*. Wellington, New Zealand: Ministry of Education.

Ministry of Education. (2008). *Te Marautanga o Aotearoa*. Wellington, New Zealand: Te Pou Taki Kōrero Whāiti.

Ministry of Education. (2013). *Ka hikitia accelerating success 2013-2017*. Retrieved from http://www.minedu.govt.nz/theministry/policyandstrategy/kahikitia.aspx

Ministry of Education. (2015). *The National Administration Guidelines (NAGs)*. Retrieved from http://www.education.govt.nz/ministry-of-education/legislation/nags/

Mulgan, R. G. (1989). *Māori, Pākehā and democracy*. Auckland, New Zealand: Oxford University Press.

National Advisory Committee on Māori Education. (1970). *Māori education: Report of the National Advisory Committee on Māori education*. Wellington, New Zealand: Department of Education.

Nepe, T., Rata, E., Smith, G. H., & Smith, L. T. (1989). 'Proposals for the establishment of kura kaupapa Māori', a report by Te Komiti o Nga Kura Kaupapa Māori o Tamaki Makaurau. *Access: Critical Perspectives on Cultural and Policy Studies in Education, 8*(1), 25-43.

O'Sullivan, D. (2007). *Beyond biculturalism: The politics of an indigenous minority*. Wellington, New Zealand: Huia.

Poata-Smith, E. (1996). He pokeke uenuku i tu ai: The evolution of contemporary Māori protest. In P. Spoonley, D. G. Pearson, & C. Macpherson (Eds.), *Nga patai : racism and ethnic relations in Aotearoa/New Zealand* (pp. 97-116). Palmerston North, New Zealand: Dunmore Press.

Rata, E. (2004). 'Marching through the institutions': The neotribal elite and the Treaty of Waitangi. *Sites, 1*(2), 57-83.

Rata, E. (2005). Rethinking biculturalism. *Anthropological Theory, 5*(3), 267-284. doi:10.1177/1463499605055960

Rata, E. (2008). Educating for citizenship in a bicultural society. In S. Brown, J. O'Neill, & A. St George (Eds.), *Facing the big questions in teaching: Purpose, power and learning* (pp. 51-61). Melbourne, Australia: Cengage.

Rata, E. (2011). Encircling the commons: Neotribal capitalism in New Zealand since 2000. *Anthropological Theory, 11*(3), 327-353. doi:10.1177/1463499611416724

Schwimmer, E. (1968). The aspirations of the contemporary Māori. In E. Schwimmer (Ed.), *The Māori people in the nineteen-sixties* (pp. 9-64). Auckland, New Zealand: Blackwood & Janet Paul.

Sharp, A. (1997). *Justice and the Māori: The philosophy and practice of Māori claims in New Zealand since the 1970s*. Auckland, New Zealand: Oxford University Press.

Sissons, J. (1993). The systemisation of tradition: Māori culture as a strategic resource. *Oceania, 64*(2), 97-116.

Sissons, J. (2000). The post-assimilationist thought of Sir Apirana Ngata: Towards a genealogy of New Zealand biculturalism. *New Zealand Journal of History, 34*(1), 47-59.

Smith, G. H. (1990). Taha Māori: Pākehā capture. In R. Codd, R. Harker, & R. Nash (Eds.), *Political issues in New Zealand education* (pp. 183-197). Palmerston North: Dunmore Press.

Smith, G.H. (2000). Māori education: Revolution and transformative action. *Canadian Journal of Native Education, 24*(1), 57-72.

Spoonley, P. (1993). *Racism and ethnicity in New Zealand*. Auckland, New Zealand: Open University Press.

Taskforce to Review Education Administration. (1988). *Administering for excellence: Effective administration in education: Report of the taskforce to review education administration*. Wellington, New Zealand: The Taskforce.

Te Puni Kōkiri. (2001). *He tirohanga o kawa ki te Tiriti o Waitangi*. Wellington, New Zealand: Te Puni Kokiri.

Tocker, K. (2015). The origins of kura kaupapa Māori. *New Zealand Journal of Educational Studies,, 50*(1), 23-38.

Waitangi Tribunal. (1986). *Report of the Waitangi Tribunal on the te reo Māori claim (Wai 11)*. Retrieved from www.waitangi-tribunal.govt.nz

Waitangi Tribunal. (2011). *Ko Aotearoa tēnei: A report into claims concerning New Zealand law and policy affecting Māori culture and identity* Retrieved from www.waitangitribunal.govt.nz/reports/downloadpdf.asp?ReportID={BF 981901-5B55-441C-A93E-8E84B67B76E9}

Waitangi Tribunal. (2012). *Report of the Waitangi Tribunal on the Manukau claim (Wai 8)*. Retrieved from http://www.waitangi-tribunal.govt.nz/scripts/reports/reports/8/7FFC574E-B152-435D-8FD8-5EAFE075D839.pdf

Walker, R. (1984). The genesis of Māori activism. *The Journal of the Polynesian Society, 93*(3), 267-282.

Walker, R. (1986). *The meaning of biculturalism*. Auckland, New Zealand: R. J. Walker.

Walker, R. (2004). *Ka whawhai tonu matou: Struggle without end* (revised ed.). Auckland, New Zealand: Penguin

ABOUT THE AUTHOR

MEGAN LOURIE
School of Education
Auckland University of Technology

Megan is a lecturer in the School of Education at Auckland University of Technology. She has a background in secondary school teaching where she worked in a number of different roles including Head of Department (Māori) and Head of Languages. Her research is informed by policy sociology approaches, and her areas of interest include bicultural education policy, and issues relating to Māori language and Māori language learning in mainstream school settings.