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Introduction

Since the beginning of European settlement in the 19th Century, the teaching of English had been considered a task of major importance in New Zealand schools (Kandori, 2001; May, 2004a). Te reo Maori (the Maori language) was considered the key obstacle for the academic progress of indigenous Maori students and was regularly banned from being spoken in schools (Benton, 1981; May, 2004a). However, in the 1980s the Treaty of Waitangi, New Zealand’s foundational document between the British Crown and Maori, was reconsidered in relation to the legal rights of Maori. As a result, the Maori language started to be recognized as a “taonga” (treasured possession of Maori) and “therefore, had a guaranteed right to be protected under the terms of the Treaty” (May, 2004a p.24). Since then, Maori education (Ii, 2001; May, 2004a).

Documents prepared by the New Zealand government (Department of Education, 1984a; Department of Education, 1984b) presented the idea that biculturalism between Maori and Pakeha (New Zealand Europeans) could become a stepping stone to the achievement of multiculturalism (Irwin, 1989; May, 2002a; May, 2004b). However, as mentioned above, this idea appeared to cause tension between the concepts of biculturalism and multiculturalism because, for the Maori, the only other ethnic group represented as signatories in the Treaty of Waitangi were Pakeha of European culture. Thus the idea of multiculturalism could deny the separate and prestigious status of Maori by respecting the rights of other minority ethnic groups, and Pakeha was trying to abolish the climate of biculturalism by introducing the policy of multiculturalism (Irwin, 1989; May, 2002a; May, 2004b).

On the other hand, New Zealand started to implement its multicultural policy in 1986 when it abolished existing restrictions on migrant nationalities. Since then, the ethnicity of New Zealand society has become more diverse, with in particular, the fast growth of the Asian population (from 2.9% to 8.8%) and the relative decrease of the European population (from 82.5% to 64.8%) (Statistics New Zealand, 2006).

Several Japanese scholars have reported on the development of Maori education (Ii, 2001; Kandori, 2001; Sugihara & Oyabu, 2005; Sugihara, 2007). However, it is hard to find research work conducted by Japanese researchers on such education in relation to the tension between
biculturalism and multiculturalism in New Zealand although this issue has become one of the most controversial issues in New Zealand since the 1980s (Irwin, 1989; Benton, 1988; May, 2002a; May, 2004b; May, 2005). This paper on Maori education, biculturalism and multiculturalism in New Zealand will help to address this shortage. Therefore, this paper will outline how Maori education in New Zealand has been developed and will also discuss the context of Maori education in relation to the tension between biculturalism and multiculturalism. This paper will also make clear how scepticism towards multiculturalism has been created in the climate of tension between biculturalism and multiculturalism.

1. Development of Maori Education in New Zealand

In this section, at first I will briefly outline the historical changes of the situation surrounding Maori and Maori language. Next this paper will clarify how Maori education has been developed in New Zealand since the 1980s. It will also present critical views on the development of the Maori education in relation to biculturalism and bilingualism in New Zealand.

1.1 A historical view of Maori language and colonialism in New Zealand

As stated earlier, since the early European settlement period te reo Maori (Maori language) had been considered the key obstacle in the academic progress of Maori students (Benton, 1981; May, 2004a) although the Treaty of Waitangi tried to “establish the rights and responsibilities of both parties as a mutual framework by which colonization could proceed”(May, 2004a p.22). In addition, historically Maori had not much influence on New Zealand educational policy decision making, and New Zealand schooling appeared to play the role of assimilating Maori into the British moral and cultural system (May, 2004a). In the process of Maori assimilation, New Zealand European settlers were not only to reject and replace Maori language and knowledge structures within their education, but were also deny Maori access to European knowledge and learning (May, 2004a).

Prior to the arrival of European settlers, Maori had been utilizing their unique and sophisticated educational system founded upon an extensive network of oral tradition (May, 2004a; Smith, 1989). Therefore, Maori tried to establish a combination made up of their own educational knowledge based on the oral tradition, and that of the European settlers’ knowledge. As a result, early Pakeha mission schools were well attended by Maori. The mission schools taught in Maori initially after the Bible was translated into Maori, and then, taught in English. Consequently literacy in both English and Maori grew rapidly among the Maori people (Jones et. al. 1990; May, 2004a).

However, in the 1840’s some fundamental changes took place. The 1844 Native Trust Ordinance and the 1847 Education Ordinance Act reinforced the assimilation of Maori into English Colonial culture. But the key aims of New Zealand schooling in the 19th century regarding the Maori people were that they retain their laboring status and be discouraged from entering the commercial and
professional positions in urban areas (May, 2004a). By the beginning of the 20th Century Maori language had been banned from the New Zealand schools and “the prohibition was often enforced by corporal punishment, which was to continue until the 1950s” (May, 2004a p.26).

The above unequal and oppressive situation towards Maori culture and language under the effect of colonialism in New Zealand remained up until the 1970s (May, 2004a; Pearson, 2000; Ii, 2001). The situation created concern for the possibility of the Maori language dying as a spoken language. A tendency towards the abandonment of Maori language had been found even during the 1930s (Benton, 1981). May (2004a) also reports that “In 1930, for example, a survey of children attending Native schools estimated that 96.6% spoke only Maori at home. By 1960, only 26% spoke Maori…”(p.27). In a climate, of such rapid reduction in the number of Maori who were able to speak the language, its certain death was predicted (Benton, 1979; Benton, 1983). This development of the possible loss of the Maori language was only halted by the establishment of bilingual schools teaching in both Maori and English language in the late 1970s (May, 2004a). (3)

1.2 The development of Maori education since the 1980s
1.2.1 Te Kohanga Reo

As mentioned earlier, in the 1980s the long ignored Treaty of Waitangi became the subject of public focus in relation to the legal rights of Maori, and Maori language started to be recognized as a “taonga” (treasured possession), as the protection of the language was guaranteed by the Treaty (May, 2004a; May, 2005).

Under this new political and social climate the first Te Kohanga Reo (Maori-medium pre-school) was established to revive Maori language and culture in 1982 (May, 2004a; Ii, 2001). Although the survival of Maori language appeared to be very difficult in the initial stages of the school programme, the programme has been very successful (Jones et. al. 1990; May, 2004a). According to Ii (2001), Jones et. al. (1990) and May (2004a), the significant increase of the number of Te Kohanga Reo can be seen since its establishment. In 1982 there were only 50 Te Kohanga Reo in New Zealand, but they increased to 520 in 1988 (Jones et. al. 1990), increasing to 767 in 1997 (Ii, 2001). As a result of the establishment of Te Kohanga Reo, the rapid growth of Maori children’s participation rate in early childhood education can be seen (May, 2004a). In 1982 only less than 30% of Maori children aged 2 to 4 years old attended pre-school education, but the rate had increased to 53% in 1991 (May, 2004a).

Te Kohanga Reo movement was operationalized by whanau (extended family members). The schools have been run by fluent Maori-speaking staff members who are parents, grandparents and caregivers. Nationally, Te Kohanga Reo National Trust has been supporting the whanau (Ii, 2001; Jones et. al., 1990). Therefore, Maori parents have been able to control their children’s education significantly and this school system can give educational autonomy to Maori parents within the philosophy of Te Kohanga Reo (May, 2004a). The key points of the philosophy of the school
The Kohanga Reo Movement was also independent financially up until 1990 when the national government started to support this school system and assisted in the development of a nationally recognized syllabus (May, 2004a).

Because the remarkable achievement of Te Kohanga Reo also strongly influenced the development of Maori education in other educational areas, specifically the primary level Kura Kaupapa Maori(5), the Te Kohanga Reo Movement can be considered the major turning point in the development of Maori Education and the Maori people's perceptions of their language (Jones et. al., 1990; May, 2004a).

On the other hand, the success of Te Kohanga Reo has created serious difficulties for state primary schools which were not prepared for the new challenges from the children graduating from Te Kohanga Reo. Having no coordinated support system, some schools tried to meet the needs of the children through bilingual classes, others through the use of volunteers from the local communities (Jones et al., 1990). The state schools have been incapable of providing for the needs of graduates from Te Kohanga Reo (hereafter, Kohanga Reo). This situation has caused growing frustration among Maori parents who want to maintain their children’s Maori language ability and culture (Jones et. al., 1990).

Recently there have been some significant changes within this school system. According to the education Act of 1989, the Ministry of Education is supposed to control all aspects of Maori medium education previously administered by the Department of Maori Affairs. It envisaged that Kohanga Reo should become fully administrated by iwi(6) authorities within five years. But a change in the New Zealand Government and the abolition of the Runanga Iwi Act 1990 in 1991 ended such plans (Waitangi Tribunal, 2010), "the new administration preferring language and education to be implemented through mainstream departments rather than any devolution through iwi." (Waitangi Tribunal, 2010 p.12). Under the Ministry of Education’s regime, the number of children who have been studying at Kohanga Reo continued to rise significantly, peaking with 14,514 students at 809 Kohanga Reo services in 1993 (up from 8,724 children at 470 services in 1989). By 2009, this had declined to 9,288 children who were attending 464 Kohanga Reo. The proportion of Māori children in early childhood education attending Kohanga Reo was just under
half in 1993 and stands at just under a quarter in 2010 (Waitangi Tribunal, 2010). Therefore in recent years, the number of children at Kohanga Reo has relatively decreased overall.

1.2.2 Kura Kaupapa Maori (Maori-medium primary school)

Kura Kaupapa Maori was established on the success of Te Kohanga Reo. The first Kura Kaupapa Maori (Maori-medium primary school) was opened privately in 1985. Its foundation philosophy and principles were those of Kohanga Reo (Jones et. al., 1990). After 5 years of political advocacy by Maori people, Kura Kaupapa Maori gained approval for state funding under the Education Amendment Act(7) (8) in 1990 (May, 2004a).

The success of this type of school has largely come from following the principles of Kohanga Reo (Jones et. al. 1990; May, 2004a). As in those, Maori Kura Kaupapa Maori have kept the teaching and learning of the curriculum through total Maori language immersion. Therefore, Kura Kaupapa Maori can provide for the needs of graduates from Kohanga Reo, and can satisfy the needs of Maori parents who have been frustrated by the incapability of the state primary schools (Jones et. al., 1990). In addition, this school accepts students from other ethnic backgrounds providing the students have an acceptable level of Maori language and are willing to follow the principles of the school(9) (Jones et. al.,1990).

As mentioned earlier, Kura Kaupapa Maori was included in the New Zealand state educational system under the Educational Amendment Act 1989. As a result of this, Kura Kaupapa Maori have been able to receive government financial support and the administration of the schools has been more influenced by the government. Therefore, Maori parents and whanau actually have lost their administrative autonomy to some extent (May, 2004a; Smith, 1991), and the Maori parents are concerned about this fact (Smith, 1991). On this point there are two different views among scholars.

Benton (1996) and Smith (1991) express concern for the loss of Maori autonomy over Maori education under state control. Benton(1996) argues as follows:

"...There are thus many social forces and counter-forces in all aspects of Maori language ownership, control, maintenance and revitalization. Many paths, however, seem to lead away from Maori concerns to a non-Maori centre. The locus of the centre remains elusive.”(p.85)

Benton (1996) also points out that Maori cannot have their own tertiary educational institution, or "Wananga," without submitting to the elaborate accreditation procedure of the New Zealand Qualification Authority because of the terms of the Educational Amendment Act. Benton (1996) also expresses his concern over the decision making of non-Maori bureaucracy in relation to education at Kura Kaupapa Maori.

Smith (1991) provided a strong caution regarding state educational control over Maori education
by describing how Maori parents react to the state educational system as follows:

... Maori parents also chose to move outside of the state school setting in a conscious effort to resist inhibiting structural elements embedded in these schools and which were therefore perceived as generally contributing to the poor performance of many Maori pupils in state schooling. In seeking alternative schooling outside of the State system Maori parents moved to assume greater control and autonomy over the key educational decision making related to the schooling of their children. (1991 p.7)

Thus, Benton (1996) and Smith (1991) are very sceptical about government control over Maori Education through paying attention to the cultural and administrative autonomy of Maori parents and children.

On the contrary May (2004a) argues that “the benefits of state involvement outweigh their disadvantages” (2004a p.35). According to May (2004a), the state education system is now fully aware of the critical shortage of teaching materials and resources for Maori medium education, and this has led to the rapid expansion of Maori-English bilingual training programmes within teacher education, and the development of teaching materials for Maori-medium education (May, 2004a). May (2004a) also considers the incorporation into the national curriculum and assessment frameworks has also given legitimacy to the Maori medium schools, and the legitimacy has been supported by the assessments that suggest that “the academic progress of children in Kura Kaupapa is comparable to their mainstream peers, while providing the added advantage of bilingualism” (p.35). This suggestive view can be also found in the work of Keegan (1996) and Reedy (1992).

Financially, both Kura Kaupapa Maori and Kohanga Reo have actually experienced difficulties (Sugihara & Oyabu, 2005), and the shortage of teaching materials and resources has been critical (May, 2004a; Sugihara & Oyabu, 2005). The views of May (2004a) in relation to the legitimacy created by the state involvement were supported by empirical research work (Reedy,1992). In addition, the Ministry of Education’s funding led to dramatic growth in the number of Kura Kaupapa Maori during the beginning to mid-1990s. There were only six Kura Kaupapa Maori in 1990. But the number became 13 in 1992, 34 in 1995, and 59 in 1998. There was similar growth in the overall number of schools offering some level of Maori-medium education. Apart from Kura Kaupapa Maori, the number of schools which provided Maori-medium education reached 396 by 1999 (Waitangi Tribunal, 2010).

Therefore, this paper can agree with May’s view (2004a) that “the benefits of state involvement outweigh their disadvantages” (2004a p.35) although there is an increasing possibility of state encroachment and administrative involvement which might relatively reduce Maori autonomy.

1.2.3 Maori language Act and the limit of bilingualism and development of Maori Education
As explained previously in this paper, from the 1980s there have been significant developments in the revival of te reo Maori (Maori language) and in bilingual education. Politically some significant advancement in this field has also occurred. In 1986 the Waitangi Tribunal made a decision that te reo Maori (Maori language) needed to be included as a “taonga” (treasure) under the Treaty of Waitangi. Accordingly, in 1987 under the implementation of the Maori language Act, Maori language became an official language in New Zealand (Ii, 2001; Kandori, 2001; May, 2004a; May, 2005). This was a significant event because it is one of the few examples in the world in which the first language of an indigenous people has been recognized as a national language (May, 2004b).

However, the Language Act does not allow Maori the right to use or to demand the use of Maori language in the public domain, although people can use oral Maori in courts of law, in some quasi-legal tribunals (May, 2004b), as well as in parliamentary debate. In addition, although the development of Maori education has been magnificent over last 20 years, it is still only a very small percentage of the whole of state provision of New Zealand education (Ii, 2001; May, 2004b). In fact in 2001, as far as Kohanga Reo were concerned, there had been a decline in numbers from the 1997 high of 767 to 560 at which 9,500 Maori pupils were still receiving their early education (May, 2004b; May, 2005). By 1997 there were four Wharekura (Maori medium secondary school), and three Whare Wananga (Maori medium tertiary institution). But there is limitation on the development of these institutions (May, 2004b). Such facts demonstrate that the operationalisation of full bilingual and bicultural (full immersion) education through Maori education in New Zealand is still very limited and the support of Maori language and culture at schools has fallen far short of the biculturalism Maori have been seeking (May, 2004a; May, 2004b).

The above development of full-immersion Maori language education has also very much influenced the development of partial-immersion models of Maori language education within mainstream New Zealand schools (English medium schools). Consequently in 2001, 25,580 Maori students enrolled in some kind of Maori language education. This is 17% of the total Maori student population. 87% of them were primary school students. But the lack of teaching and material resources for teaching Maori language and culture were the main concerns within these schools (May, 2005). In addition, Maori lacked control in educational decision making within the mainstream schools (Jones et. al., 1990), and a further cause for serious concern among Maori educationalists was government encouragement for schools to teach Taha Maori through a multicultural curriculum (Department of Education, 1984a; Department of Education, 1984b; May, 2004a; May, 2004b).

The next section presents the details about these concerns.
2. Tension between biculturalism and multiculturalism

Since New Zealand's initial steps in implementing a multicultural policy in 1986, the ethnicity of New Zealand society has become more diverse, a fact illustrated by fast growth of the Asian population (from 2.9% to 8.8% between 1991 and 2006) (Statistics New Zealand, 2006). In addition, in 1991 a further amendment was made to New Zealand immigration policy and law with the introduction of a "points system" which is very similar to those used in Canada and Australia. With this points system, migrants with desirable skills and money for business investment could migrate into New Zealand more easily (Bedford et. al., 2000). However, the amendment was introduced without the appropriate consultation with Maori representatives. This caused serious concern and scepticism regarding multiculturalism among Maori who considered such action as a denial of biculturalism and the political rights of Maori (Bedford et. al., 2000; Walker, 1995). (10)

The New Zealand education system also became the focus of similar concern and scepticism among Maori educationalists. In the 1980s the Department of Education tried to introduce a multicultural curriculum through the notion of "taha Maori" (meaning, literally, "the Maori side"). By introducing the curriculum the government was presenting the idea that biculturalism between Maori and Pakeha (New Zealand Europeans) could become a stepping stone to the achievement of multiculturalism (Department of Education, 1984a; Department of Education, 1984b; May, 2004a; May, 2004b). Maori educationalists believed the idea could cause "the relegation of Maori to the status of a single group among many (albeit a large and influential one), via advocacy of multiculturalism" (May, 2004b p.250). This concern came from the possibility of losing, through the medium of multicultural education, the rights of Maori guaranteed in the Treaty of Waitangi (May, 2004a; May, 2004b).

In addition, control of the policy of providing the education for "Taha Maori" has remained strongly with Pakeha educationalists and administrators (Jones et. al., 1990; May, 2004a; Smith, 1990). Therefore, "the political, social and economic domination of Maori is facilitated by a schooling and education system that serves the interests of dominant Pakeha society" (Jones et. al., 1990 p.152). Maori have opposed the situation strongly, and within international law Maori have argued that they need to have their educational rights, as well as wider social and political rights in New Zealand (May, 2005). Their arguments have been continuously expressed through the notion of "biculturalism" and the rejection of "multiculturalism". Maori educationalists considered that advocacy of multiculturalism is almost meaningless rhetoric if bicultural commitments within education cannot be addressed meaningfully (May, 2004b). In fact, as mentioned earlier, the situation of teaching Maori language and culture at schools has fallen far short of the biculturalism that Maori are willing to seek (May, 2004a; May, 2004b). Maori have also been arguing that "multiculturalism" is for the benefit of the dominant Pakeha group (Benton, 1988; May, 2004a; May, 2005). May (2004b) has summarized this Maori view of "multiculturalism" as follows:
Indeed, multiculturalism was seen as a useful ideology for containing the conflicts of ethnic groups within existing social relations rather than as the basis for any real power sharing between Maori and Pakeha and, from that basis, other ethnic groups. (2004b, p.251)

As a result of these arguments the policy of multicultural education was abandoned in New Zealand\(^{(11)}\) (May, 2004b). However, the Ministry of Education’s handbook published in 1999 for schools and teachers to assist students with non-English speaking backgrounds (Ministry of Education, 1999) provides the key points of the New Zealand Government’s policy on migrant education and multicultural education.\(^{(12)}\) The policies seems to be, theoretically at least, encouraging towards multicultural education because the Government is aware of its value, and has embraced key concepts of “multicultural education” such as “equal educational opportunities among students from various backgrounds” and acknowledging and valuing “students’ cultural diversity (inclusive school)”. However, according to Banks (2010) and May (2002a), effective (critical) multicultural education\(^{(13)}\) requires the renewal of the whole school culture and curriculum based on the ideas of “multicultural education”. Banks (2010) presents the concept of “Multicultural education” as follows:

Multicultural education is at least three things: an idea or concept, an educational reform movement, and a process. Multicultural education incorporates the idea that all students - regardless of their gender and social class and their ethnic, racial or cultural characteristics - should have an equal opportunity to learn in school. Another important idea in multicultural education is that some students, because of these characteristics, have a better chance to learn in schools as they are currently structured than do students who belong to other groups or have different cultural characteristics. (p.3).

Most New Zealand schools have not actually revised their school culture and curriculum based on the above ideas\(^{(14)}\) (May, 2002a; Pang, 2002). Franken and McComish (2003) report that schools they approached for their research, focussed on acknowledging and valuing cultural diversity within the school in their own ways. “Inclusive school policy”\(^{(15)}\) advocated in the handbook (Ministry of Education, 1999) had not been fully achieved. In addition, the handbook (Ministry of Education, 1999) defines “culture” as “people’s culture, history and heritage” and it suggests providing multicultural festivals and celebrating cultural diversity (p.25). This means that the handbook (Ministry of Education, 1999) aims at teaching and valuing many different heritages and traditions based on the notion of “cultural pluralism”. The approach to multicultural education in the handbook (Ministry of Education, 1999) can be considered as “benevolent (liberal) multicultural education” which is not considered to lead to the creation of social and political equality of ethnic minorities in a nation state (Mabuchi, 2010; May 2002a).\(^{(16)}\) This also means that the government has been willing to conduct multicultural education which is based on the idea of benevolent (liberal) multiculturalism in the climate of tension between “biculturalism” and “multiculturalism”. This cannot lead to the creation of social and political equality of ethnic
minorities and may provide for the promotion of the dominance of Pakeha in New Zealand as the New Zealand Government was willing to do under the education of “Taha Maori” (Irwin, 1989; May, 2002b; May, 2005). Although the ethnic situation of New Zealand society has changed dramatically and has become more culturally diverse since 1999 as mentioned earlier, no new handbooks have been published. Therefore, conducting the above current multicultural education policy cannot resolve the tension between biculturalism and multiculturalism in New Zealand. The tension has still not been readily resolved in New Zealand.

In the next section this paper will consider how this tension may be resolved in relation to the rights of national and ethnic minorities.

3. Considerations (Possible resolution of the tension between biculturalism and multiculturalism)

3.1 National and ethnic minorities

Before considering possible resolutions to existing tensions, a brief explanation of the concepts of national and ethnic minorities originally presented in the work of the highly influential political theorist Will Kymlicka (1995; 2000) is discussed.

According to Kymlicka (1995; 2000), national minorities have been living in particular territories in a nation state historically. But because of colonisation, conquest, or confederation the minority groups have received their minority status. The examples of these groups are the Welsh in Britain, Catalans and Basque in Spain, Bretons in France, Quebecois in Canada. Thus, Maori in New Zealand can be considered as “a national minority” (May, 2002a; May, 2004b; May, 2008). Ethnic minorities are those who have migrated from their country of origin to their host nation, or forcibly relocated (in the case of refugees) (Kymlicka, 1995; May, 2002a; May, 2004b; May 2008).

Kymlicka (1995) observes that most states include a combination of both national and ethnic minorities. The positions of national and ethnic minorities can be expressed by the terms “multinational” and “polyethnic”. However, most countries are not willing to acknowledge this combination in their public policy (Kymlicka, 1995; May, 2002a; May, 2004b; May, 2008). Therefore, the USA, Canada and Australia call themselves “immigration societies”. These countries can admit their polyethnicity, but they are unwilling to distinguish and recognize the rights of national minorities such as Native Americans, Hawaiians, and Puerto Ricans in the USA, Native Canadians and Quebecois in Canada, and Australian Aboriginals and Torres Strait Islanders (Kymlicka, 1995; May, 2002; May, 2004b; May, 2008). In some European countries such as Belgium and Switzerland the right of national minorities have been recognized for a long time, but these countries are not so accommodating to a polyethnic society (Kymlicka, 1995; May, 2002a; May, 2004b).

3.2 Multinational and polyethnic rights

Recognising both national and ethnic minorities, and accepting the rights of both groups
appeared to be the key challenging issue in making public policies in pluralistic modern states (Kymlicka, 1995; May, 2002a; May, 2004b). On this point, Kymlicka (1995) argues that national minorities can claim their “self-government rights “and ethnic minorities can do the same for their “polyethnic rights”.

Claimants to ‘Self-government rights’ can claim that the nation-state is not only politically controlled by the national majority group. National minorities have the right to be included politically and to send their representation to the public sector. This should include the retention and representation of their language and culture (Kymlicka, 1995; May, 2002a; May, 2004b). This can be seen clearly in the bicultural commitment of New Zealand under the Treaty of Waitangi (May, 2002a; May, 2004b). The important point of providing the right is their permanent status (Kymlicka, 1995; May, 2002a; May, 2004b).

Polyethnic rights of ethnic minorities are different from the above rights of national minorities. Polyethnic rights are an attempt to help ethnic minority groups to “express their particularity without fear of prejudices or discrimination in the mainstream society” (Kymlicka, 1995 p.30). This means that the rights are intended to support ethnic minority groups in expressing their cultural, linguistic and religious heritage in the private sector, without hindering their success within the economic and political institutions of the dominant national society. Therefore, “unlike self-government rights, polyethnic rights are usually intended to promote integration into the larger society, not self-government” (Kymlicka, 1995, p.31). In this way integration is more a reciprocal process, the advantage for the ethnic minorities being that they are not merely absorbed by the nation’s dominant ethnic group (May, 2004b). As with self-government rights, polyethnic rights are also considered as permanent ones because they try to seek to protect cultural and linguistic differences rather than eliminate them (Kymlicka, 1995).

These rights (self-government rights of national minorities and polyethnic rights for ethnic minorities) can be considered as distinctive ones, and these kinds of rights do not appear to be mutually exclusive. Kymlicka (1995 p.33) explains this as follows:

‘For example, indigenous groups may demand both special representation in the central government, in virtue of their disadvantaged position, and various powers of self-government, in virtue of their status as a “people” and “nation”. But these rights need not go together…Conversely, an economically successful immigrant group may seek polyethnic rights, but have no basis for claiming either special representation or self-government, etc.’

Therefore, applying the distinction of these rights could let us overcome the tension between biculturalism and multiculturalism in New Zealand, at least theoretically (May, 2002a; May, 2004b). Putting the above rights into operation may possibly reduce the scepticism and concern about multiculturalism among Maori. But the key question is how these rights may be
operationalised in education. This will be explored in further research.

Note:

(1) Maori education includes the following:
   - Maori medium education:
     The education through Maori language as a medium. This includes bilingual education between Maori language and English and immersion programmes of Maori language.
   - Maori language education:
     The programmes of teaching Maori language.
   - The programme of teaching Maori culture.

(2) The changes in these figures occurred between 1991 and 2006. This has led to a situation where the proportion of the ethnic groups with a non-English speaking background (NESB) in New Zealand has increased. The number of NESB students has also increased enormously. The situation in New Zealand has become similar to other countries with long histories of migration such as Australia, the USA and Canada (Bedford et. al., 2000).

(3) In 1977 the first officially accepted English-Maori bilingual primary school was seen at Ruatoki, which was one of the last predominantly Maori speaking communities. After this, more bilingual Maori schools appeared and assisted in the effort to revive Maori language (May, 2004a).

(4) Total immersion in te reo Maori means that the children in Te Kohanga Reo have been taught all teaching contents in Maori. Teachers and students have been using Maori as their medium language at school.

(5) These developments were extended to secondary level (Wharekura) and tertiary level (Whare Wananga) by the middle 1990s (May, 2004a).

(6) The word ‘iwi’, which commonly carries the meaning of ‘tribe ’in English, defined the largest socio-political unit in the Maori world in pre-modern times. In effect, it comprised a number of related groups who were tied or bonded through being descended from ‘tipuna’ or ancestors shared in common (Ka’ai et. al., 2010).

(7) The Educational Amendment Act requires New Zealand educational institutions to observe the Treaty of Waitangi and establishes the legal framework for considerable restructuring of the New Zealand education system (Marshall, 1991).

(8) May (2004a) summarizes the key principles of the Education Amendment Act as follows:
   1. Rangatiratanga (Relative autonomy principle for Maori)
      A greater autonomy over key decision making in schooling...
   2. Tanga Tuku Iho (Cultural aspiration principle)
      In Kura Kaupapa Maori, to be Maori is taken for granted...
   3. Ako Maori (Culturally preferred pedagogy)
      Culturally preferred forms of pedagogy are employed, such as peer tutoring and collaborative teaching and learning...
4. *Kia piki ake i nga Raruraru o te Kainga* (Mediation of socioeconomic difficulties)
   Although Kura Kaupapa Maori cannot, on its own, redress the wider socioeconomic circumstances facing Maori, the collective support and involvement provided by the whanau structure can mitigate some of its most debilitating effects.

5. *Whanau* (Extended family principle)
   The whanau structure provides a support network for individual members and requires a reciprocal obligation on these individuals to support and contribute to the collective aspiration of the group...

   Kura Kaupapa Maori is concerned with teaching a modern, up to date, relevant curriculum (within the national guidelines set by the state)…The aim is not to force choice of one culture and/or language over another, but the provision of a distinctively Maori education environment that is able to effectively promote bilingualism and biculturalism. (May, 2004a pp.33-34)

(9) In 1990 students from various backgrounds including Pakeha (New Zealand European), Japanese and Yugoslavian attended Kura Kaupapa Maori schools (Jones, et.al., 1990).

(10) Just before the adoption of this amendment the Minister of Immigration had a meeting with 13 Maori leaders in Auckland and 14 in Wellington to consider the new amendment. Many of them opposed the amendment proposal. However, this was ignored by the government, and the immigration amendment act was implemented (Bedford et. al., 2000; Walker, 1995) This lack of an established procedure involving Maori in consultation over immigration policy caused serious concern among Maori (Bedford et. al., 2000; Walker, 1995). Walker (1995) considered multiculturalism to be a direct denial of biculturalism between Maori and Pakeha (New Zealand European) as the New Zealand Government tried to neutralize Maori claims for justice by using this.

(11) May (2004b) explains that multicultural education operationalized in other countries such as USA has not been actively pursued in New Zealand since the 1980s except in some particular schools. However, multicultural education may be considered as a possible option for New Zealand education once again because of the recent socio-demographic changes in the country (May, 2004b).

(12) The key policies provided in the handbook (Ministry of Education, 1999) were as follows:
   - The New Zealand curriculum provides all students with equal educational opportunities.
   - The New Zealand curriculum reflects the multicultural nature of New Zealand society.
   - Schools need to acknowledge and value students’ cultural diversity (inclusive school).
   - Schools should be proactive in seeking the involvement of parents from a range of cultural backgrounds.
   - Schools need to encourage NESB students’ parents to join in school activities.
• Schools need to build trust in relationships with NESB students' parents.

(13) This paper uses the term, "effective multicultural education" which can lead to the achievement of social and educational equality of ethnic minorities by effectively following the ideas of both Banks (2010) and May (1999; 2002a).

(14) May (2002a) reports that Richmond Road Primary School in Auckland has actually operationalized "Critical multicultural education" (effective multicultural education) at school wide level since the early 1990s although this is uncommon in New Zealand.

(15) The factors of "The inclusive school" indicated in the handbook (Ministry of Education, 1999) are:

• Acknowledging and valuing cultural diversity
• Representing community diversity
• Involving the community in school life
• Building trust in relationship with parents

(16) There has been some significant debate about the approach to multicultural education and its effectiveness. The approach to multicultural education which has been operationalized in North America, Western Europe and Australia appears to be "liberal multiculturalism (benevolent multiculturalism) (May, 1999; Mabuchi, 2010). The principal notion of this type of multiculturalism is "cultural pluralism" which provides "the idea of including, recognizing, and valuing the different cultural heritages of all students within the classroom" (May, 2002a p.10). This type of approach to multiculturalism tends to maintain the power imbalance between minority ethnic groups and the majority group in a society, and it cannot attain the social and educational equality among these groups (Mabuchi, 2010; May, 2002a). On the other hand critical multicultural education can foster social and political participation of ethnic minority groups, and can lead to true social and political equality among the ethnic groups (Mabuchi, 2010; May, 1999; May, 2002a).

(17) Kymlicka (1995) also includes a third right, i.e. special representation rights available to groups that have been discriminated against because of their gender, sexuality, or disability etc. Once the discrimination has been removed, the need for such rights can be eliminated. These rights can be considered as temporary.
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ニュージーランドにおけるマオリの教育とバイカルチャリズム
およびマルチカルチャリズム

オークランド大学大学院研究生 松本 晃徳

ニュージーランドでは、主に英国からの移民によって19世紀に建立されて以来、英語が学校教育にとって最も重要な指導科目と考えられてきた。同様に、マオリの同化政策を標榜する植民地政府にとって、マオリ語、マオリの英語修得の最も妨げになるものとみなされてきた。しかし、1980年代に入ってからマオリと英国植民地政府との間で締結されたワイトレビュー条約（1840年）の中に記載されているマオリの権利に対する見直しやそれに伴うマオリの言語や文化的尊重に対する世論が高まり、マオリ語やマオリ文化の教育の復興がなされるようになった。この復興運動の一環としてマオリ語の完全化イマージョン教育を施し、マオリの言語や価値観および精神性をマオリの子供たちに教育するという目的の学校であるテ・オランガ・レオ（就学前教育学校）が、1982年に開設された。その後、初等教育、中等教育、さらには高等教育にもこうしたマオリの教育を通じたマオリの目指すマオリとヨーロッパ移民（パケハ）との共生＝バイカルチュラリズム達成への教育が逐次開発してきた。

ところで、その一方で、1986年にニュージーランド政府は移民の国籍を問わない移民法を初めて施行し、ニュージーランドは実質的な多文化主義国家へと歩み始めた。1990年代に入ると多数のアジア系移民も流入するようになった。また、学校教育においては、1980年代の半ばには、ニュージーランド政府は、マオリ語やマオリ文化の指導をニュージーランドのバイカルチャリズム教育の一環として推進することを促す反面、このバイカルチャリズム教育が、その後の多文化主義への礎になることを目標とした新しい学校カリキュラムの導入を試みた。しかし、この政府の多文化教育政策には、マオリの教育者をはじめとして、ワイトレビュー条約の遵守とバイカルチャリズムを主張する多くの反対者を生み出すことになった。その結果、この多文化教育カリキュラムの導入の実現はならなかった。ここに、「マオリとパケハ（ヨーロッパ系住民）とのバイカルチャリズム」を標榜するマオリとニュージーランド政府が追求しようとする「多文化主義」との相克が生まれてきた。

「マオリの教育の発展」に伴う「バイカルチャリズム」と「多文化主義」の相克に関する問題は、現在、ニュージーランド社会や教育の重要課題の1つであるが、日本の研究者が執筆したこの課題に関する研究論文は、数少ない。そこで、この論文では、最初に、マオリの教育の発展について概観し、その発展に伴うニュージーランドの「バイカルチャリズム」の現状と限界について明らかにする。次に、1980年代から進め始めた「多文化主義」と「バイカルチャリズム」との相克を解明する。そして、最後に、マオリの有する「ナショナルマヨリティの権利」と移民や難民としてニュージーランドに移動してきた他の少数民族の有する「エスニックマイノリティの権利」という概念を駆使しながら「多文化主義」と「バイカルチャリズム」との相克の解決の糸口をも考察する。