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<table>
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<tr>
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<tbody>
<tr>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANZ-A</td>
<td>Archives New Zealand Auckland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATL</td>
<td>Alexander Turnbull Library Wellington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CFRT</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMS</td>
<td>Church Missionary Society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS</td>
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</tr>
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<td>DNZB</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERO</td>
<td>Education Review Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>Governor’s Archives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GBPP</td>
<td>Great Britain Parliamentary Papers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HMSO</td>
<td>His/Her Majesty’s Stationary Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IA</td>
<td>Archives of the Internal Affairs Department—formerly the Colonial Secretary’s Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JPS</td>
<td>Journal of the Polynesian Society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA</td>
<td>Archives of the Maori Affairs Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MDHS</td>
<td>Maori District High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEF</td>
<td>Maori Education Foundation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS</td>
<td>Missionary Register</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MWWL</td>
<td>Maori Women’s Welfare League</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N.d</td>
<td>No date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCEA</td>
<td>National Certificate of Educational Achievement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td>Native Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NZARE</td>
<td>New Zealand Annual Review of Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NZC</td>
<td>Archives of the New Zealand Company</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NZCER</td>
<td>New Zealand Council for Educational Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NZJES</td>
<td>New Zealand Journal of Educational Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NZJS</td>
<td>New Zealand Journal of History</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NZPD</td>
<td>New Zealand Parliamentary Debates</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
My name is John Michael Barrington. I have a BA from the University of Canterbury, an MA (1st Class Hons) and PhD from the Victoria University of Wellington, and a Diploma in Teaching (NZ). I was previously an Associate Professor at Victoria University where Crown education policy for Maori and the Maori response was a major research interest. This included co-authoring (with Dr T. H. Beaglehole) the history Maori Schools in a Changing Society.

My involvement with the Treaty of Waitangi claims process began in 1988 with the Ngai Tahu inquiry, when I was commissioned to carry out research on whether the Crown keep its promise to Ngai Tahu in 1847 that schools would be provided as part of the South Island Kemp and Murihiku purchases.

Since 1999 I have worked as a self-employed historian, preparing evidence for the Northern South Island, Northland and East Coast Inquiries, and commissioned by the Crown Forestry Rental Trust to write a new history of Government Policy and Maori Education 1840-1968. I was also commissioned by the New Zealand School Trustees Association to write the history of the Association, published as Our Community Our School, the brief including consideration of the role of Maori in the Association, and
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**Project Brief**

I was commissioned by History Works Limited (on behalf of the Crown Forestry Rental Trust) to examine Crown policies and practices relating to the provision of education to Maori in the East Coast inquiry district as follows:

The historian will examine Crown policies and practices relating to the provision of education to Maori in the East Coast inquiry district.

The historian will outline and analyse key developments in Crown policy regarding education, how these were implemented on the East Coast, and the effects of these policies and practices on East Coast Maori. Key issues for consideration include:

1. The role of Native and Board/Dept of Education schools in East Coast
2. The relationship between East Coast Maori and other Crown-sponsored education

Additional matters for consideration include:

3. The use of English and of te reo Maori in schools
4. Literacy
5. Missionary schools
6. The effect on Maori pedagogical-based education
7. The effect on te reo Maori and Maori cultural knowledge and practices
8. Government provision of primary school education for Maori
9. Primary education in Native/Maori Schools
10. Maori in Education Board schools
11. Post-primary and tertiary education and training
12. Education, culture, and land
13. Administrative change and Maori Schools; from Dept of Education to Education Boards
14. Early childhood education
15. Secondary education for Maori: Maori District High Schools and denominational boarding schools
16. Maori pupils in state secondary schools
17. Post-secondary education and training
18. War, vocation, and employment, including the promotion of trade apprenticeships for East Coast Maori rather than academic study
19. Maori experience in the classroom; teacher expectations of Maori students
20. Maori and Tomorrow’s Schools
21. Maori and NCEA
22. Kohanga reo, kura kaupapa, and wananga
CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

‘Whatever is for the good of the European children should also be provided for the Maori children. I cannot help thinking of the clause in the Treaty of Waitangi that the Maori of New Zealand should be equal with the European; but if you give a better education to the European children, how can the Maori children be equal with them’?
Tau Henare, 1927.¹

1.1 Terminology

The primary schools established by the Crown for East Coast Maori after 1867 were called Native schools until their name was changed to Maori schools in 1947, and I have retained these terms throughout. The Hawke’s Bay Education Board’s schools which some East Coast Maori children attended were frequently referred to as ‘public schools’ in official records, but I prefer to use the term ‘board schools’ as the Native/Maori schools were also public schools.

1.2 Sources

The records of the individual Native/Maori primary schools from 1867 to 1969 are mainly located in Archives Auckland. They provide a very large amount of information on each school, including inspection, examination and attendance reports, correspondence between head-teachers and chairmen of school committees with

education department officials, ministers of the crown, district health officers and others on a wide range of matters. The archives also contain some of the teacher log books in which the teacher was to record daily events in the school (including punishments) and in the community, and school committee minute books not infrequently written in Maori.

However some of these records are also held in Archives Wellington. Maori schools sometimes changed status to board schools and vice versa, and when this happened the records followed the school, either becoming part of the records of the Department of Education or of the relevant education board. This also happened when the Maori schools on the East Coast were transferred to the administration of the Hawke’s bay Education Board in 1969. This does not always make following up the history of a particular school easy. Whereas the Native/Maori East Coast primary school records went to Archives Auckland, Hawke’s Bay Education Board schools records are located in Archives Wellington. Also located in Archives Wellington are most of the files relating to various aspects of Maori school policy generally, such as those relating to health, Maori language, transport and so on.

There are therefore very extensive official records on individual Maori primary schools including those on the East Coast, sometimes extending for up to nearly one hundred years. The same comment also applies to some extent to the Maori denominational boarding schools, and to the official policy records relating to both types of schools.

Wherever possible I made efforts to identify and document the views and voices of East Coast Maori on schooling matters. In this respect some of the more useful sources were the extensive correspondence between Maori Chairmen of East Coast Native/Maori schools and a wide range of departmental officials and politicians, log books and school committee minute books where available, the speeches in Parliament of Apirana Ngata, petitions to Parliament on schooling matters by Maori, the conference and other papers relating to the work of the Te Aute College Students Association, records of meetings such as those regarding the Native/Maori District High Schools and the possible transfer of East Coast Maori schools from Departmental to Board control.
By comparison with the extensive records on the Maori schools up to 1969, my research found that the records and literature available for analysis on individual East Coast kohanga reo, kura kaupapa Maori and wananga, with there much more recent history, was meagre. This posed some limitations for my research in these institutions and meant that I had to rely considerably, and much more than I would have preferred, on the reports and reviews of the Educational Office as the single most important source.

It seemed apparent that another factor may also operate here related to institutions which are relatively new. This is that the people actually involved in getting them started and then running and maintaining them, or teaching in them at the ‘chalk-face’, often just do not have the time or energy to stand back and write descriptive or analytical articles about trends and issues relating to them. And if the number of such institutions is also comparatively small, it is likely that it will take longer for a literature about them to grow in the relevant journals. I found this to be particularly the case with regard to wananga, but the same also comment applies to some extent to the other East Coast institutions referred to. With regard to wananga generally, I have drawn on the writing that is available, such as that by Professors Linda and Graham Smith, Professor Hirini Mead, Professor Whatarangi Winiata and others to describe the general situation. But a literature search of Te Whare Wananga o Ngati Porou, for example, revealed only one item of the kind referred to, this being the 2006 Quality Audit by the New Zealand Qualifications Authority (NZQA). Where I have been able to locate relevant information I have used it. But this factor has necessarily limited the scope of the analysis I have been able to make for this section of the report.

I understand the Whai a te iti Kahuranga Report by Gardner and Parata, which was presented to the Secretary for Education in 2000, would have been a valuable additional source for this study. But unfortunately, despite my best efforts, a copy was not available at the time of writing.
1.3 **East Coast Treaty of Waitangi Claims**

Any discussion of sources needs to mention the East Coast statements of claims and I went through these my search identified the following referring to education, although I make no claim that this is a definitive list:

- Wai 646 (The gifting of land for a school);
- Wai 934 (Gifting of land for the founding of a College);
- Wai 976 (Education; Gisborne High School Endowment; Te Reo Maori, Negative impact on traditional educational perspectives); 976 amended (Tribal educational rights, values, aspirations and perspectives; Te Reo Maori; Education);
- Wai 984 (Sites set aside for schools);
- Wai 1000 (Educational deprivation);
- Wai 1025 (The level of educational achievement of hapu and iwi members);
- Wai 1074 (Poor education as a direct or indirect result of the acts and omissions of the Crown, Return to the claimants land held by any institution under the Education Act 1989);
- Wai 1082 (Failure to protect claimants us of the Maori language; Poor education as a result of the omissions of the Crown);
- Wai 1089 (Educational deprivation);
- Wai 1126 (Poor education);
- Wai 1171 (Land redesignated for school purposes);
- Wai 1186 (Gifting of land for Whareponga School);
- Wai 1266 (Land held by any educational institution under the Education Act 1989); Wai 1267 (Education);
- Wai 1286 (Fewer formal qualifications amongst East Coast people than elsewhere);
- Wai 1284 (Colonisation of the Maori language as barrier to Maori);
- Wai 1291 (Crown’s intention to replace the claimants traditional matauranga with that of a foreign language… and education; education system imposed which impacted on the claimants societal structures, values and beliefs; 1867 Native Schools Act instruction to be in English and use of Te Reo Maori actively discouraged;
• Wai 1301 (Crown should cease funding of educational and other programmes that promote the indoctrination of its Ngati Porou ‘model of kawanatanga’);
• Wai 1331 (Gifting of land for school).

Also relevant is the Waitangi Tribunal finding which established that the Crown has Treaty responsibilities towards the maintenance of the Maori language, in ‘Finding of the Waitangi Tribunal relating to Te Reo Maori’ 1986.

1.4 Organisation

As my research developed several issues emerged that appeared to be of such relevance and importance in relation to the Brief that an issues approach seemed the best way to proceed, and I discuss my findings in relation to these below. However, I generally maintained a chronological approach to developments within each of the issues discussed.

1.5 Findings

The report 1997 Education Review Office Report Improving Education on the East Coast revealed that based on census data living on the East Coast in the 1990s meant you were more likely to have no formal educational qualification than the rest of the New Zealand population, and also lower levels of educational qualifications. For example, only two percent of East Coast residents had University Bursary, 10 percent Sixth Form Certificate and one percent a university degree.

However I do not find this surprising, because my research identified a significant number of acts and omissions which were prejudicial to the adequate provision of education for East Coast Maori by comparison with the general population.

On the one hand it can be argued that the Crown’s assumption of direct responsibility for Maori education in 1867 was proper from a Treaty point of view. But one of my most important findings was that there were several aspects of the Crown’s discharge
of its duties to Maori in education which would have been contributing factors to the poor educational outcome identified.

It was one of the reasons why many thousands of East Coast Maori received no schooling, why thousands of those who did enter a primary school failed to complete even the full primary school course, or enter a secondary school, thereby limiting their opportunities to proceed to any form of post-secondary education. The educational, employment, and life chances generally of large numbers of East Coast Maori across several generations were negatively affected by this. It was not, of course, the only factor. Aspects of limited infrastructure, limited economic development and poor health undoubtedly also contributed. But looked at from my perspective as a historian of New Zealand education it was an extremely significant one.

1.5.1 Central Control: The Crown’s Choice of an Administrative Model for Maori Education.

One of my major findings discussed mainly in Chapter 2 is that the control and administrative model chosen by the Crown for Maori education from 1867 had several negative consequences for East Coast Maori. The nature of the model needs to be briefly explained. The 1867 Native Schools Act established a national system of Crown primary schools for Maori. When East Coast Maori wished to have a primary school established under the Act the Crown placed the obligation on them to write to the Colonial Secretary requesting a school, to gift the land for the school site, provide one half of the cost of the buildings, and one quarter of the cost of the teacher’s salary, the purchase of books and repairs to buildings. The Crown’s main stated motive for these provisions was that when it came to schooling provided by the Crown for Maori a ‘self-help’ element would be good for them and ‘As a first step towards inducing the spirit of self-reliance, equal contributions either in money, land or labour’ should be made a prerequisite for receiving Crown aid. An unstated motive may well have been cost-cutting, or ‘doing it on the cheap’ when it came to Maori education.
The Crown’s requirement that it was up to Maori wishing to have a school to request one, and to gift the land for the school site lasted for many decades. It was a policy which was in marked contrast with the arrangements established by the 1877 Education Act. That placed the obligation on the Crown, through the decentralised regional education boards, to take the initiative in providing a school when the number of pupils justified it.

Another aspect of the Crown’s administrative model for Maori education which was different from that for Pakeha was that it was both controlled and administered by a single central Crown authority. This was initially by the Native Department from 1867, and then from 1878 by the newly-created Department of Education located in Wellington. Whereas the parallel system of primary schools were administered by each provincial government until 1876, and thereafter by local education boards of which the Hawke’s Bay Education Board is the relevant one for this discussion.

After 1878 the Maori school system involved the Wellington-based inspectors of Native schools making their annual inspection visits on horseback to the widely scattered Native schools on the East Coast and the others located from the North Cape to the Bluff.

Their final on-site approval was generally required for most of the vital matters connected with a developing school system, including decisions about whether establishing a school was justified, negotiations regarding gifting of land for school sites and the location of sites, building and maintaining schools and teacher residences, supervision and inspection of teachers and many other important matters.

My research found that it was a system in which delay, frequently lasting for many years, was a built-in characteristic. A standard phrase was used constantly by the Wellington-based Department of Education officials when replying to Maori who had written requesting action on such matters of vital importance to them as having a school established, or a teacher appointed, or to Chairmen of school committees or head-teachers desperate about urgently needed maintenance. This was that the matter would need to ‘await the next visit of the Inspector’ from Wellington. When an
Inspector found that a matter could not be concluded on one visit, he would generally recommend that it be held over until his next one, usually at least a year later.

The delay involved was systemic, not just an occasional matter affecting individual East Coast communities or schools. Even the Crown’s own requirement that Maori wanting a school had to first gift the land for the site frequently contributed to delay, as a result of decisions needing to be made about such matters as site selection and land ownership.

In the early part of Chapter 2, I bring together several examples, including Whakawhitira, Reporua, Tuparoa, Tokomaru Bay, Hiruharama, Whangara, Whakawhitira, Anaunia Bay, Whareponga, Mangatuna and Te Araroa, to illustrate how the need to ‘wait for the next visit of the Inspector’ impeded local developments which were crucial when it came to the schooling of East Coast children.

It needs to be acknowledged that resident magistrates assisted the inspectors of Native schools after 1867 to some extent, at least for the following two decades. They did this by playing an intermediary role of a kind, first between the Native Department and Maori parents, school committees and teachers and from 1878 between the Education Department and these groups. They sometimes assisted with school inspections, negotiations over sites for schools, and the appointment of teachers. For example in 1882 Captain Preece, in 1883 John Brooking, and in 1884 James Booth acted for the East Coast in this way. But this was not their main activity and was combined with their many other duties. Moreover they were not educationists, frequent changes in personnel were not uncommon as the above examples illustrate, and most of the more important decisions still needed to be signed off by the Native school inspectors on one of their periodic visits. At times the resident magistrates role as intermediaries further slowed down rather than facilitated progress, and by the 1880s their influence was on the decline as far as their connections with East Coast Maori were concerned.

The Native/Maori School Committees might also have acted as a middle-level of administration and intermediary between the central Department of Education in Wellington and the schools. But from their creation in 1867, and for nearly the next
100 years, they were not given sufficient authority or autonomy to accomplish this. This is certainly not to minimise the important role many played, an aspect which is discussed in the Report. But the point of most relevance here is that the Committees were not given the powers and responsibilities in the administrative structure that might have helped them (and the Department) overcome the void left by the distance of the schools from Wellington. It was not to be until 1957 that Maori school committees were given financial and other authority equivalent to that which their education board counterpart had had for many decades.

The comparison between the centralised system of control of the Native/Maori primary schools with the decentralised Hawke’s Bay Education Board should be noted. The closeness of the Board’s officials including its inspectors to the schools they were responsible for stood in marked contrast, and usually for the better, with the Wellington-based officials and inspectors responsible for Maori education. I note this difference several times in my report. The evidence leads me to make the comment quite frequently that officials in the Hawke’s Bay Education Board, and the Pakeha parents of the pupils who were their main clients, would never, in my view, have tolerated the kind of serious delays affecting the opening of schools, maintaining them, appointing teachers, and a range of other important matters which the Crown’s central control of East Coast Native/Maori schools from Wellington contributed to.

### 1.5.2 The Crown’s Response to Requests by East Coast Maori for Schools

In Chapter 2 more detailed case studies are then presented which illustrate, over and over again, the delay on the part of the Crown’s officials in meeting requests by East Coast communities for schools for their children. The effects of this in terms of children not being able enter a school at all, or much later than the normal starting age, are identified. I provide here just a few examples to illustrate the nature of my findings.

They include Hiruharama, whose residents advised the Education Secretary in 1887 that there were 53 children available for a school, but nothing further appeared on the official file for the next four years. I make a comment in relation to this example
which I found myself repeating frequently elsewhere. This was that the problem of
distance from Wellington was exacerbated by what appeared to be an incredibly ‘laid-
back’ attitude on the part of the Crown’s education officials responsible for Maori
education even when, as here, a significant number of East Coast children were
involved. It was an attitude that persisted in some instances even into the early part of
the twentieth century. When Inspector James Pope visited Hiruharama from
Wellington in 1894 Tutu Nihoniho advised him that there now 100 children who
would attend a school if one was established in the district. But even then it appears
not to have been until June 1895, eight years after the people requested the Crown to
provide a school, that one was finally open and operating.

At Tuparoa it took seven years from the initial request by residents in 1880 for a
school to one being opened. After reviewing the circumstances, my comment here
was that several hundred Maori children at Tuparoa and surrounding districts would
have missed out on schooling altogether as a result of what I describe as this ‘sorry
official saga’, which again reflected an attitude of indifference and neglect on the part
of the Crown’s senior official responsible for Maori education.

At Whangara it took 16 years from the request by the people for a school in 1886 for
one to be opened. When Pope passed through Whangara in May 1900 he commented
on the many previous requests the residents had made for a school, and reported that
he had found 48 children available to be enrolled and a further 15 under-age children
who would be ready shortly. But it was still not until late in 1902 that a school was
finally opened.

Residents at Anaura Bay requested a school in April 1882. But Pope did not visit until
two years later to inspect the site, at which time Te Hatiwira Houkamou had promised
that there would be an enrolment of 100 children. Five years later, in April 1890, the
residents were still requesting a school, but it took another sixteen months for Pope to
advise the Education Secretary that he knew the district well and had ‘often thought
there should be a school there’. He had made exactly this same comment when the
people at Tuparoa had requested a school, as did his successor William Bird when
discussing whether a school was needed at Mangatuna. And the question that needs to
be asked, in my view, is this; how is it that the Crown official in charge of Maori
education is taking such a laid-back attitude to the obvious need of Maori children for schooling this late in time, 24 years after the passing of the 1867 Native Schools Act?

Several further detailed case studies are presented illustrating lengthy delays in the opening of schools, including those at Tokomaru Bay, Mangatuna, Whakawhitiri, Rangitukia, Tikitiki, and Potaka and Whakaangi, with reference also to Whareponga.

As I have already pointed out, lengthy delays by the Crown in meeting requests by East Coast Maori for schools sometimes occurred very late in time. In the case of Whakaangi, for example, the Department of Education’s delay in not establishing a school led, in 1918, to the Hawke’s Bay Education Board advising the Education Secretary that because the Department had not agreed to provide a school the Board would provide educational facilities for the children. At Potaka, a school was finally opened in 1939 after having been requested in 1927. At Whakawhitira a school was opened in 1917 after having been requested in 1912.

1.5.3 School buildings

The non-enrolment or late enrolment of a large number of East Coast Maori children in a school was the most serious negative outcome to emerge from my research in relation to the Crown’s choice of a centralised model of administrative control of Maori education, and the attitude of Crown officials which appears to have accompanied this. But it was by no mans the only one. The delays which were characteristic of the central control model also contributed to many of the buildings in which East Coast Maori children were schooled being badly sited, poorly constructed and inadequately maintained.

In many schools this had negative effects on learning and at times even threatened the health of both pupils and teachers. What my research identified, and this can only be described as deplorable, is the extent to which this problem continued to exist in some East Coast Maori schools well into the 20th Century. This was well beyond the time, in my view, when the Hawke’s Bay Education Board, or the Pakeha parents
whose children were its main clients, would have tolerated it such circumstances. Pope himself gave an early indication of the problem in his 1881 report when he acknowledged that many of the Native school buildings were ‘not well suited for school purposes. Some of them seem to have been built on the principle that any kind of structure that would keep out the rain and give partial shelter from the wind and sun would do for a Native school’. And after the Director of Education for New Zealand, TB Strong, visited East Coast and Bay of Plenty Native schools in 1929, he wrote to the Minister of Education that ‘These schools have been managed too economically. Many of the buildings have been allowed to get into disrepair… We cannot at once make good make good the shortcomings resulting from the parsimonious policy of the past, but I trust we shall soon have the Native schools as well found as any of the Board schools’.

This was a significant acknowledgment by the Crown’s highest education official that an inadequate and inferior building and maintenance programme had existed with regard to East Coast Native schools as compared with Board schools, and as such complements and reinforces my own findings.

Numerous examples and case studies which illustrate how justified Strong’s comments were in relation to the East Coast schools are identified in Chapter Two. In relation to many of these it is not just the poor condition of many of the school buildings, classrooms, and teacher residences which constitutes the problem, serious as that was, but again the delay in carrying out essential maintenance, or building additional classrooms to overcome over-crowding.

Details of the conditions my research uncovered are presented in Chapter 2. But to convey some sense of the problem I mention here several examples. At the Tokomaru Bay Native School in 1908-9 the state of the urinals was so bad that they were condemned by the Officer of Health while investigating an outbreak of typhoid fever in the district. It took fifteen years for a new classroom to be built at the same school after the School Committee complained, in 1909, that the condition of the old one was so bad that it was ‘not right to have little children sitting for hours in such a room during winter months’.
By the 1930s, even though the Department of Education was by this time calling on the Hawke’s Bay Education Board to assist with maintenance in the East Coast Native schools, delay remained a frequent characteristic. Just as one example of this, It took 33 years from the initial request by the Whareponga Native School Committee in 1916 to have a suspension bridge re-built which was needed to cross a creek which regularly flooded and which the children had to cross to attend school, thereby impeding their regular attendance and risking their safety. Many hundreds if not thousands of school hours would have been lost by the Maori children of this district as the result of official delay in dealing with the problem.

What seemed apparent in the latter example was another aspect of an attitude displayed by the Wellington-based Crown education officials which I came across frequently in my research and which contributed to the systemic delays I identified. This appeared to be a kind of ‘out of sight out of mind’ attitude when it came to problems affecting East Coast Native schools. It was one of numerous examples where I considered it inconceivable that such a delay would have been tolerated by the officials of the Hawke’s Bay Education Board or the parents of the Pakeha children who were its main clients.

1.5.4 Teaching supplies and equipment.

Significant delays also frequently occurred in providing the teachers in East Coast schools with books, other material and equipment—the tools of the job—which were essential to enable them to carry out their teaching duties. This was also acknowledged by the Director of Education, TB Strong, after his visit to the East Coast schools in 1929, when he gave as an example the fact that ‘not a single native school I visited had received any of the new textbooks which are supplied free by the Department’. My own research uncovered numerous omissions in this respect which I also discuss in Chapter Two, and I present here again just a few examples by way of illustration. The teacher at Tokomaru Bay complained in 1879 that he had received no response from the Department to a request he had made four months earlier for books suitable for infants, pencils and school attendance registers. At Kawakawa the Teacher reported in 1879 that despite having been in the school for eight months he
had never received the books essential for the running of a school, including roll books, attendance registers, report forms, and half-yearly return sheets. At Tikitiki in 1894 ‘half the pupils are without desks, and more than a third have to be seated on anything that can be used for seats-such as empty boxes and cases, resting their slates on their knees or holding them in their arms the best way they can’. After an inspection report on Tokomaru Bay in 1900 Pope acknowledged that ‘there seems no doubt that allowances for requisites are too small’, and he suggested that if they were doubled the efficiency of the schools would be greatly increased. At Mangatuna in 1915 the Inspectors noted that while the teaching was very good the Teacher had to engage in a constant battle with Wellington to receive the supplies he needed.

1.5.5 Teachers

When the long-standing member of the Rangitukia School Committee informed the Department in 1953 that ‘We still waiting for our teacher…Our children are going backward’ he identified another problem which often had serious effects for East Coast Native/Maori schools, and one with particularly negative implications for the learning of East Coast Maori children. Here too the long-distance administration from Wellington was a contributing factor. Schools not infrequently remained non-staffed or short-staffed for quite lengthy periods. Moreover the regular supervision and inspection of the work of the teachers once they were appointed was significantly less regular in the East Coast Native/Maori schools than in those under the Hawke’s Bay Education Board, with again often negative outcomes for teaching methods and learning or the removal of unsatisfactory teachers.

Many examples are provided, also in Chapter Two, and again I refer here to just a few of these by way of illustration. At Tikitiki in 1892 the school had been closed for three months prior to the arrival of a new teacher. At Waiomatatini in the same year a change of teachers meant that ‘many of the children have for a long time been absent from school’. When the teacher at Tikitiki, David Bone, died in May 1901 56 Maori children were enrolled. But the school remained closed for six months before a new teacher was appointed. At Whareponga when the teacher left at the beginning of the
1904 school year the school remained closed until June 1905 when a new teacher was appointed.

1.5.6 Expectations of East Coast Maori Children by Crown Officials and Teachers.

In its submission to the Royal Commission on Education in 1961 the Department of Education acknowledged that ‘There are still many teachers who doubt the ability of a Maori to take mathematics or history. Part of the problem seems to be in the minds of the teachers themselves when it is suggested that “teachers thrive on practical courses” and “Maoris prefer not to enter academic forms”. And in a paper to the Royal Commission on Social Policy in 1988 Dr Richard Benton claimed that ‘the teaching force as a whole is strongly influenced by negative stereotypes of the capabilities of Maori children’.

These authors had the contemporary situation at the time of writing mainly in mind. However on the basis of my research for this report I reach an even more critical conclusion with respect to the situation historically. Various aspects of my findings in this regard are discussed in chapter 5, (‘Practical Education and Training and East Coast Maori’), Chapter 7 (‘Learning’), Chapter 8, (‘Teaching’), Chapter 9 (‘Education Board Schools and East Coast Maori Children’) Chapter 10 (‘Developments after 1970’).

My finding is that when it came to Crown education policies much lower or narrower expectations were held for Maori as a race than were held for Pakeha as a race, and for nearly 100 years after the passing of the 1867 Native Schools Act. The serious aspect of this for Maori generally, and in the context of this report for East Coast Maori in particular, was that such attitudes were not limited to many individual teachers. Rather they were embedded in the thinking of Pakeha politicians and the Crown’s most senior officials responsible for Maori education, including the Inspectors-General, Secretaries, and Directors of Education, and the Senior Inspectors and other Inspectors of the Maori schools.
The attitudes originated partly from the view that Maori were a rural people who would and should remain so, and educational policies should therefore cater for that future. And partly from the view that the personal, emotional, and for some even genetic disposition of Maori as a race suited them much more than for Pakeha as a race to schooling of a practical rather than academic kind. This was reflected throughout the history of the Maori schools in statements by the Crown’s education officials such as ‘The natural genius of the Maori lies in the direction of manual skills’ and ‘Maori boys and girls would be better occupied in learning something of the dignity of labour’. The expectation of officials was that the appropriate place of Maori in the social scale was at the lower end, whether as rural labourers, manual workers, or later, after World War 11, as tradesmen. Such attitudes condemned successive generations of East Coast Maori to limited educational, occupational and life opportunities generally.

As mentioned above this aspect is discussed in several sections of my report. But I shall refer here briefly to my findings in relation to one example of it because of the extent to which it highlights the points raised above, demonstrates how late the attitudes held by Crown officials described persisted, and has particular relevance for East Coast Maori. The fact that it represented, in my view, one of the most inequitable and poorly conceived and executed examples of educational planning in New Zealand’s entire educational history, and it was planning for Maori including East Coast Maori which was involved, should also be noted.

This was the Crown’s decision at the end of the 1930s to develop secondary education for Maori in the form of new Native (renamed Maori in 1947) District High Schools in such main areas of Maori population as the East Coast, at Te Araroa, Ruatoria and Tikitiki, and in Northland.

It was the Crown’s concept of secondary education for Maori in 1940 that was therefore now being proposed. But official thinking behind the curriculum of the new secondary departments reflected and highlighted the long-standing persistence in official quarters of narrow and limited stereotypes of Maori ability and potential. It also demonstrated the continuation of the idea that most Maori would remain a rural-based people, despite it having become increasingly obvious by now to several more
perceptive observers, including Apirana Ngata, that this was going to be unrealistic for the majority.

One of the Crown’s motives in developing the new Native district high schools was that education officials responsible for Maori education had achieved only limited success with their efforts over the previous fifty years to persuade the boards and principals of the Maori denominational boarding schools to give more emphasis to practical rather than academic subjects. Creating secondary schooling specifically for Maori but now controlled by the Crown, would finally enable them to achieve this outcome they preferred.

Another factor was that the extremely small number of Maori children proceeding from primary school to a secondary school in comparison with Pakeha was beginning to draw national attention. Up until 1940 the main way in which a comparatively small number of Maori had managed to enter a secondary school was by enrolling at one of the Maori denominational boarding schools such as Te Aute and Hukarere. But despite the rapidly increasing Maori population, total enrolment at these schools in 1940 was approximately the same as it had been in 1880. By 1940 the only district high school with a secondary department on the East Coast was located at Tolaga Bay under the Hawke’s Bay Education Board. Significantly, that was also one of the few locations on the East Coast that also had an education board school under the Board. Also significantly, the Board had administered district high schools with secondary departments since the 1920s at Te Karaka, Waipawa, Waipukurau, Wairoa and Woodville.

In outlining the curriculum for the new high schools in the Department of Education’s annual report to Parliament, the Senior Inspector of Native Schools, TA Fletcher, prefaced his remarks by re-stating a typically negative stereotype about Maori ability, describing Maori as being ‘not sufficiently far removed from his past to be well adapted for commerce, with its demand for strongly individualistic traits, which are in strong contrast to his ancient mode of living’. It should be noted that it is the Crown’s most senior official with specific responsibility for Maori education who is holding such a view in 1940. But I present further evidence in the report to demonstrate that he was by no means alone in holding such a view.
Official thinking behind the new secondary departments was that the curriculum would be almost entirely practical without any provision for conventional secondary school subjects leading to external examinations. The ‘core of both schemes is home-making’, the Department’s annual report announced, and the main qualifications of the teachers was to be ‘an appreciation of modern trends in education, ability in some practical skill such as carpentry or home-management and faith in the inherent virtues of the scheme’.

My report then proceeds in Chapter 5 to a detailed examination of the opening and early years of the secondary departments of the Native/Maori district high schools on the East Coast. A particularly revealing exchange occurred when the Director Education, Dr Clarence Beeby, travelled to a hui in Te Araroa to outline their curriculum and in the course of his remarks advocated the virtues of an education for the hands rather than the head. He was advised by parents present that they wanted their children to be taught Latin and typewriting, and one of the elders asked him if he had studied Latin at school. When he admitted to six years of learning the response was, ‘Yes, and look where it got you’.

The example is revealing because it conveys that East Coast Maori parents, like most parents everywhere, wanted the best for their children, and a curriculum that was comprehensive enough to enable them to achieve that. But what they were meeting instead was an official outlook ingrained over many decades that was premised on a very narrow view regarding the educational opportunities that ought to be available to Maori. My findings demonstrate that East Coast Maori strongly resented the idea, exemplified in official thinking, that somehow coming off the standards regarded as the norm for secondary education for other students should somehow be acceptable for their children.

During the 1920s and 1930s greater emphasis was being given to practical activities like agricultural clubs and garden plots in all New Zealand’s rural primary schools. But my findings also indicate how this aspect was emphasized in the East Coast Native primary schools to an extent far beyond anything that was being attempted in education board schools. It was reflected in comments such as those by Fletcher in an
inspection of Tikitiki in 1936 that more time needed to be given to handwork activity and, if necessary, Arithmetic could be reduced by thirty minutes to facilitate this. Or the instructions by Dr Beeby to the Head of Waiomatatini in 1941 that the Department regarded the adequate use of a building for crafts as ‘of more importance than the giving of academic instruction in the classroom’. As I point out, both Maori parents and the parents of Pakeha children attending the schools objected from time to time at the extent of the practical emphasis.

Most of those comparatively few East Coast Maori children who managed to proceed with their schooling beyond the primary stage prior to 1940 attended one of the Maori denominational boarding schools, particularly Hukarere and Te Aute, and I identify examples of East Coast primary schools which contributed pupils to them.

Because of this particular East Coast connection with these schools my report examines in Chapter Five the Crown’s policy with regard to them. While they were private schools with their own independent principals and boards of governors, the Crown’s provision of scholarships to selected pupils gave it the right of inspection and a view as to the most desirable policy they should follow. This gave it some leverage over the boards, who came to rely on scholarship students to augment the private ones enrolled as a means of financial survival. Te Aute particularly stood out amongst the other boarding schools from the 1880s because its Headmaster, John Thornton, unusually for the time, believed that the Maori boys should have the same opportunities as Pakeha boys, consequently insisted on offering the University Entrance examination, and encouraged the boys to succeed and enter university and professional occupations. It was no coincidence that it was during his time that the group of young Maori, including Ngata, Buck, Pomare, Kohere and others graduated, formed the nucleus of the Young Maori Party, and went on to distinguished careers in law, politics, medicine anthropology and the church.

However the response of Education Department officials to Thornton’s approach was to mount a sustained attack on the academic emphasis at Te Aute which was to last for at least 40 years up to 1940, and included attempts to influence the Board to give the greatest emphasis to practical manual activities and develop a school farm as the College’s main emphasis. I point out that the attitude of the Crown education officials
was brought out, revealingly, when they gave evidence to a Royal Commission into the Te Aute and Wanganui School trusts which sat in 1906. The details are in the Report, but shall give here a brief indication of the attitudes referred to.

The Crown’s top education official, George Hogben, the Inspector-General of Education, told the Commission that Hukarere had already at his suggestion dropped Latin and he would also ‘right away drop Latin, Euclid and Algebra out of the Te Aute curriculum altogether’. He also stated that when the plans for agriculture and other practical subjects were fully established Te Aute would have no role to play in preparing boys for matriculation and higher education. As I point out, comments of a similar kind were made to the Commission by other education officials, including past and current Inspectors of Native schools. They also continued to be made in the Department’s annual reports to Parliament on Maori education in the ensuing years, such as Inspector Bird’s triumphal statement in the annual report for 1913 that ‘In none of the secondary Maori schools at the present time is there any attempt or desire to give what is usually understood by a “college education”, and two years later that ‘So far as the Department is concerned there is no encouragement given to boys who wish to enter the learned professions’.

It is important to note, as I do, that Apirana Ngata, was one of the Commissioners and he also advocated an increase in opportunities for Maori boys to become farmers, because of the importance of this for utilising the remaining Maori land. But the main difference between him and Crown education officials was that he never saw a narrow focus on practical education as the main or only emphasis. Rather, he advocated throughout his career education and training of a kind that would enable Maori to enter the full range of occupations, including the professions, farming, trades, and as skilled labourers.

Officials were certainly successful to some extent in moving the work of the schools in the practical direction they were so enthusiastic about for Maori. But not entirely so, because in time most of them managed to also maintain an academic stream, largely because Maori parents insisted on it. As the Te Aute College Headmaster, E Loten, advised the Minister of Education in 1930, ‘a Maori parent is exactly the same
as a European …when I suggest an agricultural course they want their boy to take matriculation’.

As a result a comparatively small number of pupils who attended, including those from the East Coast, were able to proceed to some form of further education and enter a range of occupations. But the official policy which had been followed undoubtedly contributed to reducing the opportunities of many others. It is only possible to speculate how different the comparatively low level of educational qualifications and professional training achieved by East Coast Maori compared with the national average might have been if it had been the kind of educational philosophy held by John Thornton rather than that of the Crown’s officials which had prevailed.

My report goes on to demonstrate, also in Chapter Five, that the belief amongst officials and many teachers that Maori were particularly suited to practical learning was not limited to the Maori District High Schools, Maori primary schools, and Maori denominational boarding schools. Nor was it an attitude that had disappeared even by the 1960s, as demonstrated by evidence to the Royal Commission on Education in 1961, the Royal Commission on Social Policy in 1988, and on the East Coast by reference to examples in East Coast mainstream secondary schools.

Much of the above discussion regarding expectations has focussed on my findings regarding the Crown’s official policies for Maori education with particular relevance for the East Coast. However in other sections of the report, particularly Chapter Seven (Learning) and Chapter Eight (Teaching) this aspect is examined more with reference to the school level, and particularly the attitudes held by the Inspectors of East Coast Native/Maori primary schools and the teachers who taught in them. In the section above it will have been apparent that on the basis of my findings I am critical of aspects of Crown educational policy for Maori in general and its impact on East Coast Maori in particular. And this same critical attitude will also be apparent to some extent in relation to the findings I am about to discuss. But it is important to emphasize that my findings were by no means entirely critical, particularly when it comes to some of the individual teachers who taught in East Coast Native/Maori schools. In the history of schooling on the Coast there were always some teachers who were dedicated to their pupils, who encouraged them on a path to success as
measured in both the Maori and non-Maori worlds, and who gained the respect and affection of the community as a result of their efforts.

That many Maori students progressed slowly through the standards in the Native schools particularly during the first three or four decades after 1867 is well known, and even in board schools, such as those under the Hawke’s Bay Education Board, quite significant numbers of Pakeha pupils were still not proceeding beyond Std.4 by 1890. Some of the reasons for the slow progress of many Maori pupils are well known. Initially the syllabus of instruction only went up to Std 4, although in time able pupils were expected to be able to attempt the work for Standards V and VI of the board schools. Maori students often enrolled at a later age than their Pakeha counterparts, and they had to wrestle with a new language, English, in what must have seemed to many the alien atmosphere of the typical nineteenth century New Zealand primary school. Even in 1928, only 3.6 percent of Maori pupils in Native schools were in S6 and only a tiny percentage of those enrolled passed the proficiency examination marking the successful completion of the primary school course.

However as I read the records on the East Coast Native/Maori primary schools it seemed apparent to me that another factor was often operating. This was low expectations of East Coast Maori children on the part of the Crown’s inspectors and many teachers. I began to find (see Chapter Seven) many examples, even after 1900, when the highest level any pupil in a school reached was S.111 or S.1V. This meant, of course, that they would never attain the Proficiency Certificate marking the successful completion of the primary school course.

Despite this, any comment by the Inspectors about slow progress was extremely rare. Indeed quite the contrary. Many of their reports were fulsome in their praise of the work of the teachers, despite the lack of progress into higher standards. Even as time progressed into the 1920s, examples persisted of schools where many pupils still rarely appeared to get into the upper standards, a situation which had existed in some of them for many years. Yet this was now well beyond the time when slow progress through the standards by pupils could be rationalised or excused on the grounds that the school was in its early stage of development, or the pupils needed to come to
terms with new school routines, or the English language, so progress was inevitably going to be slow.

The evidence strongly conveyed to me that this was a systemic problem, originating in the low expectations of the Crown’s education officials for East Coast Maori pupils generally, not merely one originating from the attitude or reporting style of any one individual Inspector. Yet there was a common tendency, ironically, to put the blame primarily on Maori if greater success was not being achieved, because of what were constantly described as ‘Maori errors’ in the language work, or on living conditions, or on Maori suitability for practical rather than academic study.

My report identifies this aspect over and over again, with evidence from numerous reports by the inspectors on the schools, including Hiruharama in 1909 and 1925, Whareponga and Tokomaru in 1913, Tokomaru in 1925, Whareponga in 1925 and 1927, Tuparoa in 1912 and 1926, and other examples.

However it should also be noted, again, that throughout this period there were always individual pupils with ability, aided at times by supportive teachers, who managed to overcome or break through the systemic problem described. I give examples of some pupils who went on from an East Coast primary school to one of the Maori boarding schools, matriculated, and achieved considerable subsequent success and distinction. But these individuals were very much the exceptions. The general overall picture was one of low expectations contributing to limited achievement.

Douglas Ball was appointed Senior Inspector of Native Schools in 1930 and his reports occasionally demonstrated a more positive approach than his predecessors to the progress of East Coast Maori children through the primary schools. But he and other Departmental officials maintained the official enthusiasm for practical education and a future life on the land as a dominant priority, and Ball appears to have given little attention to the need to extend opportunities for schooling beyond the primary stage. Moreover during the 1930s many East Coast teachers continued to have an attitude of low expectations towards their pupils, or the inspector continued to make no comment on slow progress, as I demonstrate at Tuparoa in 1932, Waiomatatini and Horoera in 1936 and Rangitukia in 1938.
1.5.7 Attendance

My research also revealed that over the history of the East Coast Native/Maori primary schools the learning of many pupils was seriously and negatively affected because an innumerable number of school hours were lost as the result of non-attendance or school closures for various reasons. Examples of these which I identify in Chapter Seven (and also in several other chapters) included pupil (and sometimes also teacher) illness, teaching vacancies remaining unfilled, poor teaching giving children little incentive to attend, the rigidly enforced assimilation policy at least up to 1930, over-harsh discipline, a ‘laid-back’ attitude on the part of Departmental officials to ensuring a school was available when wanted, poor location of schools making them subject to flooding or requiring long travel to school by pupils, poverty requiring older children to stay at home to help maintain the family, limited physical infrastructure in the form of bridges and roads, seasonal labour demands requiring a whole family to move in search of work. Some of these difficulties were still affecting attendance well into the 1950s and 1960, as with the examples I give of access to the Waiomatatini, Mangatuna Potaka, and Horoera Maori Schools.

1.5.8 Teachers

While the role of teachers had already been referred to several times earlier in my report, in Chapter 8, I examine this aspect more closely. Finding enough qualified and trained teachers for the expanding primary school system, particularly in rural areas, was a serious problem in New Zealand education generally at least until 1900. But nowhere does this comment apply more than in relation to staffing of the Native schools, located as many of them were in fairly remote areas of the country, and the effect of this for the learning and achievement of many East Coast Maori children was often very negative.

James Pope commented about the teachers in Native schools in 1892 that there were ‘undoubtedly some who should seek more congenial employment’. Even as late as
this, in the Department of Education’s annual report to Parliament, he described them as consisting ‘For the most part of persons who were quite inexperienced as teachers when they took up the work’. My report draws attention to the research of Dr Colin McGeorge on the qualifications, status and mobility of teachers in the Native Schools between 1880 and 1920. This is revealing. McGeorge concludes that while the majority of teachers in board schools entered teaching through the pupil-teacher system, those in Native schools entered as adults from a variety of other occupations, and although they were classified according to the same general scheme as other teachers they ‘remained as a group woefully ill-qualified by that criterion’.

The use of corporal punishment by teachers and the appointment of Maori as teachers is examined in Chapter Seven. But my most important finding relates again to expectations. It appears to have taken at least until the early 1950s for the Crown’s education officials to realise that they needed to affirm that Maori pupils should be treated equally with Pakeha when it came to expectations and the opportunity to enter the full range of occupations. And with this, came a new realisation of the importance of communicating this to the teachers of Maori pupils. In a paper he presented in 1952 a Maori School Inspector, WA Goodwin, acknowledged that on the evidence available in the Department’s reports Maori children were still passing through the primary classes in Maori schools at a much older age on average than European pupils in board schools, and doubts existed as to whether Maori children were being fully extended. This was reinforced by the Senior Inspector of Maori schools, W Parsonage, also in 1952, when he finally, in a departure from the views held by all his predecessors, advised teachers that there was little evidence that a larger percentage of Maori as compared with Europeans had ‘the aptitude or desire for farming’.

It should also be noted that it took Parsonage until 1952 to decide it was necessary to inform teachers that the way in which the terms ‘practical' education’ and ‘activity methods’ had been used in Maori education now also needed to be re-examined. He acknowledged that in the past many had interpreted ‘practical education’ as meaning the Maori child was ‘basically different from Pakeha children’, and that ‘the Maori child needs an education which is mainly of a manual character’. But he now described such as an interpretation as doubly faulty; it had been ‘a generalisation applied to all Maori children’ and was ‘too narrow an interpretation of the term
“practical”. He acknowledged that there was ‘no scientific evidence which would warrant our assuming that Maori children do not possess the same range of innate abilities and aptitudes as the children of any other race. There is no such person as “the average Maori child”. Maori children differ from one another just as do the children of any other race. There are Maori children who are fitted to progress from a verbal or academic type of education. There are others for who the approach must be along more concrete or practical lines’.

On the one hand I find it extraordinary that it took the Crown’s most senior official directly responsible for Maori education this late in time to make such an acknowledgment. Yet on the other it is not surprising, given the history of Crown education policy for Maori over the preceding seventy years, and with the relatively recent example of the Native/Maori District High Schools in mind. Over that whole period, equivalent statements about the potential of Maori being equal to that of Pakeha, and the implications of that for education policy had been either extremely rare or non-existent. When they had been made it had not been by the Crown’s education official, but by individuals such as John Thornton, Headmaster of Te Aute College, and Maori leaders such as Apirana Ngata.

With respect to teachers and East Coast Native/Maori primary schools which I also examine in Chapter Eight, I found evidence of teachers who in Pope’s comment about the Teacher at Tokomaru Bay in 1880 knew ‘nothing about the art of teaching’, and of East Coast Maori petitioning the Department to remove teachers they found incompetent or otherwise unsatisfactory. But also Teachers who demonstrated the capacity to improve after initially unfavourable inspection reports, and a few, such as the Teacher at Tikitiki in 189, who the people regarded highly and pleaded with the Department that he should not be transferred.

One aspect which was unsatisfactory from the viewpoint of learning by Maori East Coast pupils was the reluctance of the Department to deal promptly with teachers who were unsatisfactory, and the example I provide of the Head of Rangitukia during the 1930s not only highlights this problem but also demonstrates how late in time it persisted. Moreover even into the late 1930s there is evidence that teachers were sometimes considered as suitable for appointment to East Coast Native schools who
would not have been appointed to a board school. And the comment I record by a newly appointed teacher to Anaura Bay in 1944, that he had been ‘pleasantly surprised at the natural intelligence of the children’, was an example of the persistence of low expectations or negative stereotypes about East Coast Maori children, again very late in time.

1.5.9 The Crown’s Requirement That Maori Contribute to Their Own Schooling.

The obligation the 1867 Native Schools Act placed on those Maori wishing the Crown to provide a school to gift land for the school site and provide a proportion of the cost of the school buildings and teacher’s salary, was referred to earlier and is discussed in Chapter 3. When the gifting of land for a school site by East Coast Maori is mentioned I refer to it, and in Chapter Six (‘Contribution by East Coast Maori to their own schooling’), I again refer briefly to the gifting of land, and particularly the way in which the acreage demanded by the Crown increased over time. But I do not examine the gifting of land in detail as this is being done in another report.

What I do examine in Chapter 5 is the other ways in which East Coast Maori contributed to their own schooling. Particularly when considered in the context of the history of New Zealand state education generally, the obligation on Maori to contribute in this way (in addition to the gifting of land) strikes me as extraordinary in two ways. The first of these was that in financial terms it would have added up to a very substantial transfer of resources by local Maori communities, many of which were already often economically disadvantaged. And the second aspect was the inequity involved, in that no similar requirement was placed on Pakeha to contribute to their own schooling. With the parallel system of ‘free and compulsory’ education established by the 1877 Education Act and administered by regional education boards was that when there were sufficient Pakeha pupils in a district to justify it the Crown, acting through the board, would build a board school.

With specific reference to the East Coast I point out in Chapter 5 that in 1872 A. H. Russell, the Crown’s Inspector Native Schools, reported that he had arranged for the
establishment of schools, school-houses or furniture at Tolaga Bay for £165.10, and at Tokomaru Bay for £177.10. He had arranged for the whole expense to be paid in the first instance by the Crown under Clause 3 of the 1867 Act, and then commented ‘but I believe few cases can arise in which one half of this expenditure should not be returned to the Government by the Natives, and I have accordingly made this a condition of a schoolhouse being erected in each of the foregoing localities’. My report goes on document further contributions made by East Coast Maori in relation to a significant number of schools, including a contribution of £500 by Tokomaru Maori in 1924 to assist with the construction of a new school when the exiting one was burnt down, and later a further ‘large sum’ for additional improvements.

1.5.10 The Crown’s Language and Cultural Policies for the Native/Maori Schools.

My report examines the above topic particularly in Chapter 4. The Crown’s insistence on the English language only as part of the assimilation policy is discussed, as is the somewhat ambivalent attitude held by many Maori regarding this policy. Some supported the English only policy on the grounds that they already knew the Maori language and therefore primarily sent their children to school to learn English which it was going to be necessary for them to master if they were to hold their own in the future. Whereas others favoured a bi-lingual approach, and others yet again would have nothing to do with the schools for many years following their experience of war and land confiscation, or a fear that their own Maori language and culture would be undermined in the English government school.

However no such ambivalence regarding language policy was felt by the Crown officials responsible for educational policy and practice for Maori. My findings demonstrate that for approximately one hundred years after the passing of the 1867 Native Schools Act a succession of the Senior Inspectors in charge of the Native/Maori primary school, including Bird, Porteous, Ball, Fletcher and Parsonage, encouraged and supported by the Crown’s highest education officials in the form of Secretaries and Directors of Education, and Ministers of Education like Ronald Algie even in the 1950s, consistently refused to permit the use of Maori in the schools, as it
seems reasonable under the terms of the Treaty that they should have. The possible exception was James Pope from 1880, but even his comparatively more enlightened attitude was limited to permitting Maori to be used in the junior classes, and then only to assist with the learning of English. As soon as English was mastered Maori should be dispensed with. And towards the end of his term as inspector he also adopted the more strident opposition to any use of Maori demonstrated by William Bird who was to succeed him. Some officials, including Bird and TB Strong, the Director of Education, went further that not permitting the use of Maori in the schools. They actively denigrated the language, the former predicting favourably in 1918 that it would ‘finally disappear as a spoken language’, and the latter in 1931 that ‘the natural abandonment of the native tongue inflicts no loss on the Maori’. I also present my findings in this chapter on punishment for speaking Maori, and other aspects of assimilation such as the texts in use in the schools.

After this general overview of the language and assimilation policies I then discuss my findings in relation to their implications for East Coast Maori children. These include examples of the emphasis on English in East Coast Native/Maori schools, and the views on the matter of the East Coast leader Apirana Ngata and educationist Wiremu Parker. This is followed by examples of the policy of excluding Maori, and the way in which the Inspectors in their reports on East Coast Schools even into the 1950s constantly used the disparaging term ‘Maori errors’ when discussing the teaching of English.

The Crown’s decision from 1930 to permit aspects of Maori culture such as songs, and weaving and carving to be included in the curriculum of the Maori schools, but to continue to exclude the Maori language, is also examined. I present a general overview of the factors contributing to the decision and the extent of its impact, and then report on my findings with respect to these aspects in East Coast schools.

In this chapter I also report my findings regarding various forms of racial discrimination East Coast children sometimes experienced. These included examples of racist comments by teachers about Maori in the community they were working in, which were ominous with respect to the attitudes and expectations they were also likely to hold with regard to their pupils, Pakeha parents deliberately by-passing a
Maori school when it was the closest one to their homes, or refusing to allow their children to attend one, and Pakeha parents opposing the transfer of a board school to the Department when Maori pupils had become by far the majority.

1.5.11 **East Coast Maori Children in Hawke’s Bay Education Board Schools.**

Some East Coast Maori children attended schools administered by the Hawke’s Bay Education Board after 1878. In Chapter 9 I select three such schools, Waipiro Bay, Tolaga Bay and Te Puia Springs, as case studies to examine their experience.

Based on my reading of inspection reports on the schools I formed several impressions. One was that East Coast Maori pupils in board schools were often regarded as something of a nuisance who held back the Pakeha pupils. A second, linked to the first, was that there was a preoccupation with their perceived problems, of which the difficulty of mastering English was the one most frequently mentioned, and the one viewed as limiting their ability to progress into the senior standards. A rather negative and at times blaming the Maori pupils tone was often evident, combined with an attitude of low expectations regarding them or stereotyped views about their abilities and interests. If held by the Inspectors, these would certainly have been communicated to the teachers.

Another aspect which stood out was the absence of constructive suggestions by the inspectors to teachers about how perceived problems might be improved. Very often the inspection reports identify a problem, indicate that it limits the progress of the Maori child, but that is the end of the matter. There is often little to suggest that the Maori pupils are being regarded in a way that is likely to facilitate their learning and development in what is, for them, the already totally European and often alien environment of the typical Board school. More often than not the attitude seemed to be that the Maori pupils have these impediments which do not readily lend themselves to improvement, so limited success if inevitable. The ‘warehousing’ of Maori pupils in classrooms was a term that not infrequently came to mind.
I formed a definite impression from inspection reports that the physical condition of many of the buildings in those Hawke’s Bay Education Board schools where East Coast Maori children formed the majority, were often markedly inferior to those in which mainly Pakeha children were enrolled, and this often had seriously negative implications for their learning.

1.5.12 Developments After 1970

In Chapter 10 developments after 1970 are examined. The results revealed that after the transfer of the Maori primary schools from the Department of Education to the Hawke’s Bay Education Board in 1969, inspection reports continued to identify the persistence of difficulties affecting some aspects of learning and teaching in several of them well into the 1980s, and examples of this are provided. But it is also important to emphasize that solid progress was also reported in several of the schools.

My consideration of early childhood education included first identifying important developments generally in the development of early childhood education for Maori, including the growth of Te Kohanga Reo. I then selected several East Coast kohanga as case studies. With respect to these, it seemed to me that there some tension was evident between the original purpose and nature of kohanga, and the growth of compliance requirements by the Crown. I found it to be very common for ERO reports on the East Coast kohanga selected to give high praise to the efforts whanau and teachers were making in providing instruction in te reo Maori and other Maori cultural aspects. But then there was then followed quite commonly by criticism, often of a quite severe nature, of a failure to meet some aspects of the Crown’s compliance requirements in such areas governance, training, meeting early childhood regulations, developing personnel policies, health and safety procedures, financial management policies, long-term plans, assessment of children’s progress and others.

During the initial years of kohanga the four cornerstones of the movement (the pou) were te reo (total immersion), accountability, health and well-being and whanau management. But my reading led me to wonder whether the extent of the current emphasis by the Crown on compliance aspects could mean that the next generation
may increasingly ask the question; ‘is my main purpose in sending my mokopuna to kohanga still that of wanting them to be immersed in our language and culture, or having the kohanga meet all these other requirements?’.

The growth of early childhood education and within it te kohanga reo which is discussed and seems relevant to the above. As a movement inspired and initiated by Maori, with an emphasis on the language and culture, kohanga particularly flourished during the first ten years, with a huge amount of support from Maori including kaumatua and the next generation of strong Maori speakers. It appears to be that a large Maori infrastructure existed in the background supporting kohanga development, much of it of a voluntary nature, which was critical to its success. In these respects the success of kohanga was the success of the people rather than of the Crown and its agents.

As the initial administering authority the Department of Maori Affairs was obviously very pro-Maori in its thinking with regard to supporting kohanga, and this included not unduly imposing its own compliance requirements. However kohanga were then transferred to the Ministry of Education, a very large bureaucratic organization with a different set of cultural priorities.

Kohanga peaked in terms of numbers after the first 10-15 years, but there has been a gradual decline ever since, from over 800 to 500 kohanga, and in numbers of children enrolled from 16,000 to just over 10,000. From my reading for this report that decline is at least partly attributable to the huge compliances placed on kohanga by the Crown itself. But might not the danger of that be that some of the very aspects which drove the initial success of kohanga can begin to be strangled, as kohanga begin to shift to some extent from their original cultural base and purpose to spending huge amounts of time and effort meeting compliance requirements? That would seem to be a question that may need to be addressed and one for the next generation to decide.

Demographic changes relating to Maori also appear to have had some relevance and influence. Is there, for example, less kaumatua support in some districts today than was the case during the formative years? Has there been an effect stemming from the movement to urban areas of many of the generation that supported the initial
development and maintenance of kohanga, many of were fluent or semi-fluent in Maori?

There are other matters which appear to be relevant to kohanga, both on the East Coast and generally. Apart from the matter of compliance raised above, is the Crown living up to its responsibilities? The position now is different from when kohanga began, because Maori is now one of two official New Zealand languages. When it comes to early childhood education, and for that matter education generally, how adequate is the Crown’s response in relation to the Maori language? Amongst the other issues or questions which emerged from my research were the following. The Ministry of Education has a ten year strategic plan for early childhood education, and as part of that it wants to have teachers with fully approved qualifications appointed to kohanga. If such teacher are appointed the rate of funding to the kohanga increases. However the whole matter of teachers appears to be one needing to be further addressed, one argument being that there should be a special funding rate for kohanga which recognises the importance of the Maori language and culture within the nation, and the special features of kohanga within early childhood in relation to this. But for this to happen requires a willing response by the Crown. Currently the Te Kohanga Reo National Trust Board oversees and administers kohanga, which is convenient for the Crown because instead of dealing with 500 individual kohanga it only has to deal with the one authority. Under an agreement with the Crown for the provision of service, the Trust provides advice and support, funding and oversight of the discretionary grant scheme. However the dollar value of the agreement with the Ministry of Education has not changed since 1995, despite compliance costs having increased markedly since that time, with the result that the Trust is tending to be constantly squeezed at the margins.

A 1997 Education Review Office Report, *Improving Education on the East Coast*, which examined education in early childhood and schools, is discussed. This identified issues impacting on school performance and what needed to be done about improving it. I then selected four mainstream East Coast primary schools to examine subsequent developments after 1997 and report on the results I found.
A section of this chapter is also devoted to mainstream secondary schools on the East Coast, and some of the issues arising in relation to these, including at times some quite severe criticism about aspects in inspection reports during the initial years after 1970. To bring the discussion up to date I then selected the most recent ERO reports available to me at the time of writing on five full East Coast secondary schools and two area schools which contain secondary departments. The discussion then proceeds to an examination of Tomorrow’s Schools, and the growth of kura kaupapa Maori and wananga.
CHAPTER 2: MISSION SCHOOLS THE CROWN AND THE EAST COAST

2.1 Introduction

2.1.1 The English Background

In England no schools had been established by the central government by the eighteen-fifties, the primary schooling which did exist being provided primarily by essentially religious-based voluntary organizations or other forms of private venture. Government involvement was limited to a system of parliamentary grants to the religious bodies providing schools, introduced in 1837, the total sum involved being £20,000 per annum to cover the whole of England and Wales. A system of school inspection was also introduced.2 This was essentially, the system the English colonists brought to New Zealand and relied on, certainly until the 1850s and the establishment of the provincial governments.3 For the schooling of Maori, the Crown initially relied on the existing mission schools as the main means of provision, limiting its role to financial and other assistance until 1867.

2.2 Mission schools

In the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries the Church Missionary Society (CMS), a Church of England organization, expanded its activities in Africa, India,

3 John Ewing, Origins of the Primary School Curriculum 1840-1878, Wellington, 1960, p.3.
Australia and New Zealand. The aim of the CMS was to ‘promote the glory of God by the promulgation of the Gospel of Christ according to the doctrines and disciplines of the Church of England amongst the heathen’.\(^4\) In 1814 the Committee of the CMS reported that they had ‘Opened a Separate Fund for the Establishment and Support of Schools Among the Heathen’ which was described as an act of considerable importance and ‘peculiar promise’.\(^5\)

The schools were to play a key part in the Society’s work, as the means by which the children could be ‘trained up in the knowledge of those divine Truths, by which under the blessing of God they will be rendered useful members of society, and heirs of glorious immortality’. Moreover it was hoped that the children, so schooled, would also influence the parents.\(^6\) God revealed those Truths in the Bible; therefore one must learn to read. So in New Zealand as in all their other fields of labour the missionaries, after creating the conditions to make it possible, sought to set up schools and teach the heathen to read.

2.2.2 The Crown and the Missionary Schools.

British Colonial policy in the late 1830s was influenced by the views of the colonial reformers on the appropriate form of government for a British colony, and the evangelical humanitarians. Within both perspectives, Victorian notions of a racial hierarchy existed, whereby the ‘races’ of the world were perceived in hierarchical terms ranging from inferior to superior, from ‘savage’ races through to the ‘civilised’ races, with the British believing themselves to represent the pinnacle of ‘civilization’. Such views contributed to a policy of assimilating Maori into European society. James Belich highlights this when he states that:

From the establishment of the first mission station in New Zealand in 1814, the main policy of Pakeha towards Maori was to convert them

\(^5\) Missionary Register (MR), vol.1., 1814, p.29.  
\(^6\) Ibid., p.20.  
\(^7\) This is a summary account. For a fuller discussion of the missionary background and schooling see J. M. Barrington and T. H. Beaglehole, *Maori Schools in a Changing Society- An Historical Review*, Wellington, 1974, Chapter 2.
into Brown Britons. Conversion was cheaper than conquest, but a humanitarian motive should also be acknowledged. To people who could conceive of no higher state than Britishness, making it available to ‘natives’ seemed an act of enlightened generosity.\(^7\)

In addition to the emphasis on assimilation there was another important aspect here with implications for the Crown’s future efforts in the area of Maori schooling. This was that despite a resilient strain of thinking that deemed them irreparably inferior, Maori were generally regarded quite highly among indigenous peoples on the Victoria hierarchical scale, and therefore more capable of ‘advancement’ than, for example, Australian Aboriginals. More importantly, while most Europeans viewed Maori as culturally inferior, they did not necessarily regard them as biologically inferior, meaning they were assumed to be capable of advancement up the racial scale. The emphasis was therefore on their ‘defective’ culture and civilisation, rather than inherited and immutable biological inferiority. The former could be ‘fixed’ through appropriate application of assimilation policies, the latter could not.\(^8\)

In terms of British Colonial policy the instruction Lord Normanby gave to Hobson before his departure for New Zealand is relevant this discussion. These required that the civilization of Maori be promoted by the ‘establishment of schools for the education of the aborigines in the elements of literature’, but with the condition that:

\[
\text{until they can be brought within the pale of civilized life, and trained to the adoption of its habits, they must be carefully defended in the observance of their own custom, so far as these are compatible with the universal maxims of humanity and morals.}\]

\(^9\)

The way in which Hobson was to carry out these behests was outlined by the Colonial Secretary, Lord John Russell, in instructions to him on his appointment as Governor. He was to encourage and work through the established missions and to aid, from the public revenue, the efforts of the missionaries to ‘educate and instruct their proselytes’. Russell advised him that:


\(^8\) I am grateful to Dr Vincent O’Malley for initially drawing this point to my attention. Professor Belich has written on the subject at greater length in ‘Myth, Race and Identity in New Zealand’, New Zealand Journal of History (NZJH), 31, 1, 1997, pp.9-22.

\(^9\) Normanby to Hobson, 14 August 1839, Great Britain Parliamentary Papers (GPP) 1840, 238, p.40.
The education of the youth among the aborigines is of course indispensable to the success of any measures with them… for their ultimate advancement in social arts, and in the scale of political existence. I apprehend, however, that for the present, this is duty which could be properly undertaken only by the missionaries, or at least on some system to be formed in concurrence with them.10

Given the success the missionary bodies had already had in establishing schools for Maori, and publishing large numbers of the Bible and other books printed in Maori for instruction in schools and outside of them, the decision to initially limit government involvement to assisting their efforts was both practical and realistic. Hobson’s policy of preservation of Maori interests and welfare was to be carried out through the appointment of a Protector of Aborigines. This person was to be the Governor’s advisor on Maori affairs, and was to arrange for the purchase of land from Maori. The CMS missionary, George Clarke, was appointed to this position in 1841.11 The Department thus formed was soon expanded by the appointment of Edmund Halswell who had been sent to New Zealand by the New Zealand Company as Protector for the Southern District and Commissioner for the management of Native Reserves, and Clarke was promoted Chief Protector.

Halswell’s instructions did not mention education, indeed the view was taken that ‘now that the whole of New Zealand has been officially proclaimed to be part and parcel of the Queen’s Dominions, the Duty of Protecting and Watching over the Welfare of the Native Born Subjects of her Majesty in New Zealand has devolved entirely and exclusively on her Majesty’s Government’.12 But as Protector for the Southern District Halswell took his instructions not from the Company but from Clarke, and he was told to confine the appropriation of the funds realized from the reserves, which were to be let by tender, strictly to the ‘education and religious instruction of the Natives’ until further instruction should reach him. This seemed to consist of fencing and repairing the churches at Te Aro and Pipitea, assisting the sick, and, in prospect-paying a Native schoolmaster and carrying on a school for Native

10 Russell to Hobson, 9 December 1840, GBPP, 1841, 311, p.23.
11 Barrington and Beaglehole, p.37.
12 John Ward to Halswell, 13 October 1840, New Zealand Company Records (NCR), 102/2. Archives New Zealand Wellington (ANZ-W)
children. No record of any such school is available, and it seems unlikely that one was started. A few months later, Shortland, the Colonial Secretary, wrote to Halswell specifying how the proceeds if any were to be spent and no mention was made of schools.

In 1842 the Chief Protector was informed that in addition to the use of the proceeds of the New Zealand Company Reserves, the British Government had directed that whenever land acquired from the Maori was sold in the Colony, a sum of not less than 15 nor more than 20 percent of the purchase money should be credited to the Protector’s Department to be used for ‘promoting the health, civilization, education, and spiritual care of the aborigines’. The money left after the Department’s expenses had been met, was to be administered by a committee of trustees consisting of the Bishop, the Chief Justice and the Chief Protector. It was to be:

applied by them in the establishment of schools for the education of the youth among the aborigines, and a furtherance of such other measures as may be most conducive to the spiritual care of the Native race, and to their advancement in the scale of social and political existence.

The Trustees planned to build in every town a hostel for visiting Maori, and to found:

at a convenient distance from the chief tribes, boarding schools...where religious instruction and all the good and useful arts and habits may be taught, from the earliest age. The children to be fed, taught, and clothed from the produce of the native reserves.

Although this was a recurring idea and the plan upon which many missionary schools were later to be run, little eventuated directly from this committee which did not get off to an auspicious start. The Chief Justice decided the position was incompatible with his position, and resigned, while the Protector became immersed in land purchases and claims leaving the Bishop as effectively the only member.

---

14 Shortland to Halswell, 24 December 1841, NZC, 3/2, ANZ-W.
15 Shortland to G.Clarke, 26 July 1842, Turton, D., pp.3-4.
As far as schooling is concerned little or nothing was done by the Department of the Protector. While it was intended to carry out the imperial policy, part of which was the support of mission schools, the preoccupation of the protectors with the purchase of land and settlement of land claims interfered with their other duties. The annual estimates of the Protector’s Department are significant in considering its activities. Apart from the salaries and travelling expenses of the officials, only £200 was allowed for the sundry expenses of the Department. The officials simply did not have time to carry out the constructive policy that the Colonial Office had intended for the ‘civilization’ of the Maori.

2.3 The 1844 Native Trust Ordinance

In 1844 Governor Robert Fitzroy, who briefly succeeded Hobson as Governor, recognized the complete failure of the Protectors to promote the ‘civilization’ of the Maori and his answer was to enact the Native Trust Ordinance, the preamble to which stated:

> Whereas the Native people of New Zealand are by natural endowments apt for the acquirement of the arts and habits of civilized life, and are capable of great moral and social advancement. And whereas large numbers of people are already desirous of being instructed in the English language and in English arts and usages. And whereas great disasters have fallen upon uncivilized nations on being brought into contact with colonists from the nations of Europe, and in undertaking the colonisation of New Zealand Her majesty’s Government have recognized the duty of endeavouring by all practical means to avert like disasters from the native people of these islands, which object may be best obtained by assimilating as speedily as possible the habits and usages of the Native to those of the European population.17

The Board established by the Ordinance would put land and money aside to further develop schooling:

> For the instruction of the Native people in the English language, and for a systematic course of the industrial and moral training in English usages, and for providing for the relief of the sick, and generally in such a way as may be most conducive to the bodily and spiritual

17 Southern Cross, vol.2, no.64, 6 July, 1844.
welfare of the Native race, and to their advancement in the scale of social and political advancement.\textsuperscript{18}

The next Governor, George Grey, did not gazette the confirmation of the Ordinance and it therefore lapsed. But the idea of rapid assimilation, so clearly embedded in it, was to remain a cornerstone of Crown education policy for over a century. It was Alan Ward suggests ‘its most serious flaw because it meant it was emasculated by European attitudes of racial or cultural superiority’.\textsuperscript{19}

\section*{2.4 The 1847 Education Ordinance}

Governor Grey turned his attention seriously to schooling and in 1847 an Education \textit{Ordinance} was passed by the Legislative Council. It was a comprehensive measure applicable to both races, although Grey proposed in the first instance to apply its provisions chiefly to the education of Maori and half-caste children.\textsuperscript{20} Grey refrained from setting up any new educational organization, considering that the three main religious missions ‘although their peculiar object was the spread of the Gospel…had, to the best of their ability, made some provision for the education of youth’.\textsuperscript{21}

In the event the Ordinance was to be a major tool of the assimilation process. There was to be only one official language, and that language was English. Section 3 of the Ordinance, which now required the mission schools to alter their policy and provide instruction to Maori in the English language, read: ‘In every school to be established or supported by Public Funds, under the provision of the Ordinance, Religious Education, Industrial training, and instruction in the English language, shall form a necessary part of the system to be pursued therein’. The Crown’s other requirements, embodied in the Ordinance, were that there must be religious education, industrial training, and annual inspection by Government-appointed inspectors.\textsuperscript{22}

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{18} Ibid., p.117.
  \item \textsuperscript{19} Alan Ward, \textit{A Show of Justice – Racial ‘Amalgamation’ in Nineteenth Century New Zealand}, Auckland, 1974, p.39.
  \item \textsuperscript{20} G.Grey to Earl Grey, 9July 1849. \textit{GBPP}, 1850, 1136, p.191.
  \item \textsuperscript{21} Ibid
  \item \textsuperscript{22} Ibid.
\end{itemize}
The passing of the Ordinance encouraged the further establishment of industrial boarding schools which it was believed would be more successful in promoting assimilation by removing Maori children from their home environment and ensuring regular attendance and Christian habits were maintained. Grey recommended that as the mission schools were to give industrial training, and a grant of sufficient land should be given to each of them to enable them to produce all the supplies they needed to become self-sufficient. Maori would be given instruction in ‘improved modes of agriculture’ which, because they were viewed primarily as an agricultural-based race, would benefit themselves, the European population and the whole country.

When land was set aside for educational purposes it was the Anglicans who benefited most. They were granted 5756 acres between 1846 and 1853, compared with 876 acres to the Wesleyans and 513 to the Roman Catholics. The Anglicans were also to be advantaged in terms of financial aid, receiving £22,364 over the same period, compared with £6,466 to the Wesleyans and £4,447 to the Roman Catholics.

By the mid-1840s the fortunes of the missionary village day schools had begun to decline, and the passing of the 1847 Ordinance reinforced the need for the missions to consider changes in their approach. The growing awareness of the importance of teaching English, and some of the difficulties attached to doing it effectively, was another factor leading to boarding schools or ‘central’ institutions being viewed as a way of drawing together the most able Maori youth away from their home environment, and giving them a much more intensive education than was possible in a village day school.

The grants of land made by Maori and the Government as endowments and farms for the schools amounted to a considerable area. Moreover Government grants were not the only assistance the Maori mission schools received. It also provided livestock and farm equipment to the schools. And in many places, Maori also contributed in other

23 G.Grey to Earl Grey, 22 March 1849. G25/4, 49/33, ANZ-W.
25 Ibid
ways towards the cost of the schools, sometimes in cash, generally in food. In spite of
this somewhat unsystematic financial organization, the four years from 1848 to 1852
saw some solid progress in the establishment of the church boarding schools. By
1851, between 700 and 800 Maori attended the Government aided schools, and in the
next few years further schools were started.26

Grey left New Zealand in 1853, but before going he sought to put the Maori mission
schools on a sounder financial footing. Under the 1852 Constitution, the sum of
£7000 was to be placed annually on the Civil List to be used by the Governor for
Maori purposes. Grey proposed that the greater part of these funds ‘should be devoted
towards the consolidation and extension of that system of education which after an
experience of several years has worked with such very successful results’.27 He
secured the approval of the Secretary of State for the following appropriations: the
Church of England £3,500; the Wesleyan Society £1,600; the Roman Catholic Church
£800.28

I have provided a few examples below to illustrate the kinds of assistance from the
Crown various mission schools received:

- Between 1848 and 1858 over 500 acres more was granted to the Wesleyans
  for the Wesleyan educational institution alone, and in 1852 Governor Grey
  authorized £600 to the Wesleyans for new buildings.29

- At Waimate in 1852 the Governor directed that a sum not exceeding fifty
  pounds should be issued to the C.M.S. boarding school to purchase a horse
  and a plough for the agricultural work.30

---

27 G.Grey to Newcastle, 16th June 1853, Appendices to the Journals of the House of Representatives
(AJHR), 1856, A-7.
28 For a full description of the Grey plan see I.A. Colonial Secretary, (C.S) 1/144, 56/2240, ANZ-W.
29 Barrington and Beaglehole, pp.48-49.
30 Ibid.
• In the Waikato, regular Government grants were made to the schools of the Rev. R. Maunsell at Waikato Heads, the Rev John Morgan at Otawhao and the Rev. B. Y. Ashwell at Kaitotehi.31

• To keep his school going, Maunsell had to solicit other grants and Governor Grey responded not only with horses, a cart, and the wages of an agricultural labourer who acted as an instructor and farm supervisor, but also by authorizing payment of the school’s debts in 1852 and a special grant of £400 when Maunsell moved the school to Kohanga in 1853.32

A further aspect of Crown policy which it is relevant to mention here was encapsulated in a statement by Governor Browne in 1857, when he wrote ‘I am satisfied from the date of the Treaty of Waitangi, promises of schools, hospitals, roads, constant solicitude for their welfare and general protection on the part of the Imperial Government have been held out to the Natives to induce them to part with their land’. (Author emphasis).33

This confirms the fact, as O’Malley pointed out, that schools were frequently offered to Maori communities as part of the collateral benefits of entering into land transactions with the Crown in the period to 1865. It is well known that such promises were made to Ngai Tahu. But in fact, as Governor Browne’s statement shows they were part of standard Crown purchase policy.

2.5 The Native Schools Act 1858

This Act marked the first legislative provision specifically for the support of Maori education, making available an annual sum of £7,000 for a term of seven years, and it received wide general support in the Assembly. It was limited to schools ‘in connection with some religious body’, and aid was only to be given where pupils were both boarded and educated with ‘Instruction in the English language and in the

31 Ibid, p.50.
32 Ibid, p.51. For a fuller account see Barrington and Beaglehold, pp.52-62.
ordinary subjects of English primary education, and industrial training’ also required.34

2.6 Decline of the Mission Schools

The wars of the sixties marked the end of the plan begun by Grey that the Government should work with the religious bodies in building a system of Maori education. But even allowing for the general disturbances it could hardly be said that the system had achieved success. By 1865 the mission schools were virtually empty, and other schools for Maori had disappeared. It was reported that the mission boarding schools which a few years before had enrolled between 700 and 800 pupils now had a total of 22.35

In 1861, Gore Browne wrote that with the education of the Maori entrusted to the religious bodies:

the effect has necessarily been confined to certain districts. There is no school at all north of Auckland, no school has ever existed in many of the most populous places….Government is not less bound to care for the secular instruction of its people than the Church is for their religious teaching.36

Apart from these practical reasons the denominational system was now regarded as open to objection on grounds of principle: ‘The plan at present adopted’, wrote Rolleston:

of giving money to religious boards on condition of its only being used in schools in connection with some special denomination would seem wrong in principle, and is likely eventually to lead to considerable complication…it is a serious question whether the Government ought directly to countenance religious differences to suit their own temporary convenience.37

34 New Zealand Parliamentary Debates, (NZPD), 1856-58, pp.138-9, 152.
36 Gore Brown, Memorandum to his Council, 25 May 1861, AJHR, 1861, E-3a, p.4.
2.7 Provincial government

The 1852 Constitution authorized the establishment of Provincial governments elected by the propertied settlers of the various Provinces whose responsibilities included district schools as well as hospitals, police and charitable aid. Ward points out that ‘the Provinces declined to assume responsibility for Maori health and education, except in individual cases where the general Government transferred funds’, because few Maori in the towns paid rates and the indirect taxation went to the general Government in Auckland.38

2.7.1 The Provincial government and the East Coast

This view is confirmed by John Parker, certainly as far as Hawke’s Bay is concerned. In the course of a 269-page MA thesis on Education in Provincial Hawke’s Bay he concluded that:

One aspect that the Provincial Council did not interest itself in was the education of Maori youth. No doubt this was due to the fact that the Central Government had voted funds for this purpose and that the Maori schools were under the supervision of the Inspector of Native Schools. The Provincial Council made no attempt to go to the assistance of Te Aute College when it closed in 1859, due primarily to lack of funds…Certainly the Provincial Council made no special provisions for the promotion of education of Maori children; in fact, it is doubtful whether any Maori children attended the Government aided schools. The records are silent on this point.39

And I found nothing in my research to suggest that the situation north of Gisborne was any different during the Provincial Government period with respect to the provision of schooling for Maori.

2.8 Missionaries Mission Schools and the East Coast.

38 Ward, p.92.
The activity of the missionary William Williams and his family on the East Coast and the advent of Pai Marire has been well documented.  

The question that needs to be examined here is whether or in what ways the Crown assisted financially or in any ways with mission schools that were established on the East Coast, as it did in some other parts of the country? In this context, the term ‘school’ needs to be discussed. Its usage in the writings of the missionaries did not necessarily correspond with the model of exclusively children being brought together between a certain age for instruction, but rather it was commonly used more widely to include the instruction of adults as well as children, and religious instruction of various kinds was a major component of the teaching.

Raeburn Lange suggests that Christian teachings were probably initially brought to the northern East Coast by Taumata-a Kura from the Waiapu River area, one of several members of Ngati Porou captured by Nga Puhi in the 1820s and removed to the Bay of Islands Returned to the East Coast by the C.M.S. in 1934, ‘he began instructing his fellow Ngati Porou in the rudiments of literacy and Christian doctrine’, and gained such a positive response that in 1838 the missionaries decided to go and witness it for themselves.  

Amongst the many accounts of missionary activity on the Coast is the report by H. Williams in 1838, of him accompanying six married Maori teachers and their wives in the Columbine, three to be based at East Cape and three at Turanga. Williams wrote that: ‘At all the Pas, both at the East Cape and Turanga all seemed perfectly prepared to receive Christian instruction and their repeated and strong solicitations for teachers …should not be longer neglected…The demand for books was very great and general’. The intention was that the Maori Teachers would be able to start schools as

---


well as take services, and with this aim in view Williams ‘distributed 500 slates, a few early lessons, and catechisms’. 43

It is evident from other accounts that, particularly after 1839, there was an insatiable demand for books and reading matter of all kinds, William Williams describing how when he arrived on the Coast in 1939 he found books ‘all the cry’. 44 At Rangitukia ‘The supply of small prayer books is very acceptable and all are anxious to possess them. The six natives who carried our luggage yesterday the distance of 18 miles preferred the prayer book to any other payment’. 45 Williams wrote that at Uawa ‘an elderly man stopped me to request that I would leave some of our (Taonga) treasure at this place.” I cannot read”, he said, “but my son can and we have no prayer book”. 46

Thousands of books were distributed in the mission’s early years. In April 1840 Williams wrote that ‘The demand for books is very great. The few I have had namely 1,500 prayer books and 1,200 Testaments have been swallowed up as soon as they appeared and now I want 3,000 of the former and 500 of the latter’. 47

At Rangitukia in 1839, the Maori Teacher, James Kiko, advised the missionaries Richard Taylor and William Williams that he had ‘made a good start with his school’ – 75 men, 70 women, and 38 children were in his classes, and although none were as yet able to repeat the catechism, Williams was gratified to see so many willing to learn. A few of the younger Maoris were beginning to read, but they had only six books to share. 48

When they visited Whakawhitira, Williams and Taylor celebrated the Lord’s Supper with the three teachers and their wives, ‘and before leaving Williams addressed 300 to 400 Maoris in their new and very well built chapel. At every place in Waiaupu which they visited they found some of the slates which Henry Williams had left with the teachers, and they all seemed to be in constant use. 49

43 Ibid.
44 W. Williams, Journal to the CMS IV, p.545.
47 Sanderson, p.15.
49 Ibid, p.65.
Sanderson claims that during the early years the number of East Coast Maori attending schools was large, at least by comparison with later years, but ‘especially after the first few months of 1840 it was only a small proportion when compared with the thousands attending Sunday services and even smaller when compared with the total population, all of whom seemed to want books.’ In support of this he cites Williams, who wrote in his Journal in May 1840 that 250 people had attended Sunday service of whom only 150 stayed behind for school.

Jane Williams not only assisted with the schools at Turanga when her husband was away, but also opened a boarding school for girls in which one of her daughters, Maria, played a prominent role. In 1845 she wrote to her sister in law that: ‘At present I only have those who can profess to read (but some of them can read well)…I have generally about 20.’ However she also felt that the level of literacy attained was often rather superficial, and complained that progress was limited because once her pupils could decipher the letters and transfer the words from their written to local form, they stopped attending without necessarily having understood the meaning involved. The Rev. Charles Baker was sent to Uawa in 1843, and recorded in his Journal on 26 August, 1844: ‘Bible class, 68 present, 44 read the scriptures’; on 20 October ‘Good congregations, schools as usual’.

Frederic Williams draws on the William Journal to show the progress of the mission in the Waiapu and East Coast District in 1849. He points out that in addition to conducting services, ‘he personally conducted some 200 classes for instruction and examination, at which the aggregate attendance numbered upwards of 8,300’. A few of these classes numbered from 5 to 10 and from 100 to 118 pupils, but the bulk of them were between the two extremes. He also conducted examinations of 54 various schools that were in charge of native teachers. This work covered the whole of the East Coast, but virtually all the settlements between Gisborne and Hicks Bay were included. However no further indication is given, again, as to whether these schools were conventional schools, mainly for young people on the European model, as had

---

50 Sanderson, p.15.  
51 W. Williams, in Porter, pp.103-105.  
52 Jane Williams to C. Heathcote, 17 March, in Sanderson, p.16.  
been developed by the missionary bodies in other parts of the country. A list of participants ‘at special services’ between 21 January and 23 December 23 1849, lists only ‘communicants’, baptisms’ and ‘wedding couples’, with no reference to the activities usually associated with European-style missionary schooling.\(^{55}\)

Sanderson suggests that although some reaction against missionary activity was becoming apparent by 1850, and Williams himself detected a decline in enthusiasm, nevertheless ‘by 1850 it seems that nearly the whole Maori population of the East Coast professed to be Christian’.\(^{56}\) But by the mid-1850s Williams was reporting that particularly the younger generation of East Coast Maori were increasingly unprepared to submit themselves under the discipline of the missionaries, with a failure to attend Bible classes and services reflecting an increasing indifference to Christianity. He wrote in 1856 that ‘This morning I had a class of eight instead of forty’, and gave examples of young people who were outside missionary influence, concluding that ‘This I am sorry to say is a general case’.\(^{57}\)

Increasing reluctance on the part of East Coast Maori to sell land which accompanied growing awareness of its commercial value, or to make it available for schools and churches, also appears to have been evident by the 1850s. In his report for the Hicks Bay and Rangitukia Stations in 1851, R Barker commented on the difficulty he had experienced in trying to get a school established.; ‘I have been truly astonished by the close-fistedness of the Natives; the promised timber, labour, and land, indeed to help all in their power to build our School, both timber and labour I have paid for, they have given us 1½ acres of land for a School garden’.\(^{58}\)

A decision was made to open a central school at Turanga (Gisborne), but the mission station proved an unsuitable site for an industrial school, and in 1856 a block of 593 acres of land at Waerenga-a -Hika was given by Maori for the school and it moved there. The CMS made a grant of £500 and the new school, which opened in the Autumn of 1857, initially developed well: ‘In the school there were then four

\(^{55}\) F. Williams, 1937, pp.111-112.
\(^{56}\) Sanderson, p.36.
\(^{58}\) R. Barker, Report for the Hicks Bay and Rangitukia Stations, 1851. C.N./022. (C.N. in Correspondence of the C.M.S., New Zealand).
departments, as besides the girls and boys there were a number of adult students to be taught, some of whom were married, and the wives needed training as well as the husbands. The school was carried on industrial lines, and nearly all the food was raised on the spot.\(^{59}\) By March 1860 the schools at Waerenga-a-Hika had 120 pupils of all ages.\(^{60}\)

According to the Rev. Williams the numbers under instruction at the Turanga School in 1858 had been limited due to ‘the transition state through which we are passing’. The male scholars in the Teachers’ School had varied in number from only 11 to 14, and included both youths and adults, but mainly the latter, some of whom had acted as assistants to the principal teachers. The general course of instruction for the male scholars included the Holy Scriptures, the English Language, Writing, Arithmetic, Singing and Geography. Sixteen women and girls received instruction in Reading, Writing, Arithmetic, Geography and English. Williams stated that the staff had been aiming at enlarging their operations to meet the needs of the district, but described the Teachers’ School as being of primary importance because they looked to it for a supply of effective Teachers and Ministers for the Maori. But a Boys’ Boarding School was also under consideration which, it was envisaged, could act as a feeder for the upper School, and it was also hoped to enlarge the Girls’ School ‘so as to provide for both sexes equally’.\(^{61}\)

Porter suggests that Ngati Porou, in particular, tried to get Williams to ‘shift his station to Rangitukia so that he could be more properly Bishop of Waiapu; but as Waerengahika with all its schools was well established, Williams continued to make it his headquarters’.\(^{62}\) However in 1865 the family had to abandon the mission, including the boys’ and girls’ schools, when fighting occurred between Pai Marire followers and government forces, and most of the buildings were burnt down. The school was not rebuilt until 1890, and was recognized by the Department of Education as a secondary school for boys in 1909.\(^{63}\)

---

\(^{59}\) Barrington and Beaglehole, p.57 and p.171.
\(^{60}\) Porter, p.588.
\(^{61}\) Ibid, p.7.
\(^{62}\) Ibid, p.587.
\(^{63}\) Barrington and Beaglehole, p.171.
2.9 The Crown and Mission Schools on the East Coast

As I demonstrated earlier, there was considerable mission activity of various kinds on the East Coast which included instruction of various kinds of both young and old, and I certainly found some references to ‘schools’ and ‘classes’ for instruction. However despite this I found few references, particularly from the late 1840s, indicating the existence of well-established, long-lasting mission schools north of Gisborne of the kind that from around that time were receiving financial and other forms of assistance from the Crown. If that is correct, it probably points to the reason for another finding; the apparent absence of any similar Crown grants to missionary bodies to assist with the running of schools north of Gisborne.

The Annual Report to Parliament on Native Schools in 1858 included the Report of the Church of England Board for Native Education in the Northern District.64 This noted that the Turanga School under the Ven. Archdeacon W Williams, had ‘laboured under serious difficulties’ for the previous two years, and was largely self-supporting, including growing all its own food. It had received a Government Grant of £400 for the period 1 April 1857 to 31 March 1858, as did the following other schools under the same Board; St. Stephens £311; Kohanga £489; Tukepoto £365; Otawhao £241; Tauranga £117. Crown grants were also made in the same year to 11 schools under the Wesleyan Board and several run by the Roman Catholics.65

Sanderson suggests that by the late 1850s, northern East Coast Maori had become even more deeply preoccupied ‘in discussion and argument about land sales, governmental authority, and the possible ways of resisting these things’, and ‘the work of the mission in the late 1850s bore little resemblance to that of 1840. Baptisms were ‘rare’ and he confirms that ‘only a small number of carefully selected pupils attended the mission school at Turanga’.66

As an example of the increasing attitude of suspicion towards missionaries accompanying these developments, Baker recounted how at Rangitukia in 1857 he

---

64 AJHR, 1858, E-1, p.6, p.8.
65 Ibid., p.13 and pp.24-32.
66 Sanderson, p.147.
was accused of acquiring land for his private use from Maori on the pretext of needing it for the school.\(^{67}\) However in 1862 Baker reported on the Waerenga-a-Hika (Turanga) School, which remained under the management of the Rev. Williams, and appears to have had a revival. He described the average attendance of the scholars as having been 104 in 1860, 77 in 1861 and 115 in February 1862, the latter including fifty-eight from ‘Ngatiporou (Waiapu District)’ and thirteen from ‘Titangakouti (Tokomaru District)’. The age of the scholars ranged from under ten to over twenty. They provided ‘their own books for Maori lessons’ and there was a plentiful supply of English books. In the subject described as ‘Maori Reading—all the men read fairly; of the boys eighteen read well, four indifferently, in the lowest class nine knew their letters, and four were beginners’.\(^{68}\)

In 1862 Robert Donaldson, the ‘Native Instructor’ based at Napier, reported to the Native Secretary that he had visited several pas in Hawke’s Bay, and ‘every one’ would ‘assist a master and give a piece of land for school purposes; each pa is eager for a master to teach them English’.\(^{69}\) He then refers to what I assume includes the northern East Coast by stating that ‘Some other pas up country and inland have also sent me messages…to come and see them, but time and distance prevented me; besides I could hold out no rational hopes of teachers’.\(^{70}\)

In 1862 Richard Parsons was appointed Clerk and Interpreter to the Resident Magistrate at the East Cape, W. B. Baker, based at Rangitukia, which involved him beginning to attempt to learn the Maori language, and ‘to assist with the organization of schools’.\(^{71}\) However in his accounts of his activities which follow it appears that the opening and organization of schools always remained an intention rather than an event that actually happened. He pointed out that Maori had:

> Offered at their own instance eight or nine hundred acres as a School Endowment, at Manutahi, fifteen miles up the valley, for which the deed is to be signed in a week or two, so anxious are the leading men

\(^{67}\) C. Baker, Journal, MS 22, p.91. ATL.
\(^{68}\) AJHR, 1862, E-4, p.28-29.
\(^{69}\) AJHR, 1862, E-4, p.23.
\(^{70}\) Ibid.
to have schools in which the children shall learn English... In the 
meantime I am trying my hand on one or two of the most intelligent 
boys about here...for this part of the district is and has been for some 
time without a Minister-European or Native. The teacher here, whose 
duty is to instruct the children in the Catechism, i.e. read prayers and 
preach, but he is but a poor ignorant Maori whom they look upon as 
one of themselves, and therefore destitute of authority and weight with 
them.\footnote{Ibid.}

In July 1862 Parsons commented on the difficulty he was having learning Maori, 
and pointed out that when he eventually went to Manutahi he would be ‘completely 
thrown on his own resources and teaching the Maori boys will oblige me to find out 
the proper way of expressing an idea somehow or another’.\footnote{Correspondence, 26 July 1862. Ibid. DB} At the end of August he wrote that while he needed to go to Manutahi to get supplies, he could not go until 
the authority came from the Government for him to do so, ‘for which, seeing that the 
deed for the school site has been signed, Mr Baker has applied’. However he added 
that there had been considerable excitement at Rangitukia resulting from ‘the doings 
of a small Maori King Party in connection with the rebels in Waikato:

Although only a handful of disreputable young fellows they have 
threatened Mr Baker and all his projects with annihilation if he 
Attempts to carry out the School and other Government schemes (but) 
the chiefs are extremely anxious that their sons should learn English, 
and English habits, and while the establishment of the school is 
hindered by a lot of mischievous fellows of no birth or standing it 
provokes them very much.\footnote{Correspondence, 20 December, 1862. Ibid. DB}

On 20 December he wrote that he had heard from the Government Inspector of 
Schools at Auckland that he would be coming about the middle of January and:

that I must wait for him to see what can be done about the Manutahi School...I do not however apprehend much good from his visit, 
because the matter is no longer opposed for political motives, but for petty personal reasons which no public Runangas will affect at all. The 
school land is wanted by one of the Chiefs for a private purpose, and 
he intends to stick to it, come what may. He is also a Minister, the Rev. 
Kawhia, and is backed by the Bishop on his opposition, for personal 
reasons, so I see no hope of the affair being extricated from the 
difficult position in which it now stands, as even if the site is given up

\footnote{Ibid.}
\footnote{Correspondence, 26 July 1862. Ibid. DB}
\footnote{Correspondence, 20 December, 1862. Ibid. DB}
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to the school, the jealousy and ill-will of the parties I have referred to would effectively prevent the school being at all prosperous.\textsuperscript{75}

But as mentioned above, I did not find evidence of any Crown grants to mission schools north of Gisborne. Another probable reason for this was identified by two recent writers. One, Evald Subasic, concluded that ‘the contact between East Coast hapu and the Crown in general was very limited prior to 1860’, with no official Crown presence on the East Coast until 1861 when William Baker arrived at Waiapu in the dual role of Resident Magistrate and Civil Commissioner. And even then, the Subasic concluded that ‘Baker’s and consequently the Crown’s presence was deeply resented by a number of East Coast hapu’.\textsuperscript{76}

And Richard Towers recently concluded that:

The development of local government and the rating of land on the East Coast developed much later than areas with longer histories of Pakeha settlement. For example, none of the early ordinances of Governor Hobson or even the laws of the Auckland Provincial Council had any effect on the East Coast. Not until the establishment of counties under the Counties Act 1876 did the East Coast experience any form of truly local government.\textsuperscript{77}

\subsection{2.10 Maori Pedagogical Education}

Professor Graham Hingaroa Smith has pointed out that when the first missionaries and settlers arrived Maori already had in place a system for educating their young:

Prior to the arrival of Pakeha people in Aotearoa, Maori had a sophisticated and functional system of education. This system consisted of a powerful knowledge base, a complex oral tradition and a dynamic ability to respond to new challenges and changing needs. The traditional system of education, while complex and diverse, was also fully integrated in that skills, teaching and learning were rationalised and sanctioned through a highly intricate knowledge base. The linking

\textsuperscript{76} Ibid, p.6.
of skills, rationale and knowledge was often mediated through the use of specific rituals.  

In theorising about *Kaupapa Maori*, Smith gave further examples, pointing to Maori application of ‘science’ in their everyday activities, including in relation to kumara cultivation, canoe building, navigation and the crafting of stone and wood. He also described how traditional knowledge belonged to the whole group rather than being the sole preserve of the individual, although sometimes an individual, such as a *tohunga*, could be the repository of certain knowledge for the whole group. And he described how particular areas of knowledge were separated into categories of learning, giving as examples *Te Matorohanga*, places of learning where more sacred or *tapu* knowledge was classified as the *kauae runga* (upper jaw) and the more profane, less *tapu* knowledge, that associated with ordinary daily human activity, was classified as the *kauae raro* (lower jaw).  

Kuni Jenkins takes Smith’s ideas about Kaupapa Maori as ‘the over-arching umbrella under which to develop the concept of *aitanga* as a traditional social practice and as a theoretical framework for understanding social encounters’.  

The distinguished Maori scholar Dr Peter Buck had also, nearly fifty years earlier, written a generalised account, one that does not attempt to accommodate all the nuances of different iwi and hapu cultural practice. Buck wrote that prior to the arrival of Europeans the children were taught all they needed to know to enable them to usefully fill their future places in the tribe. They lived in a balanced community; they learnt what was needed to maintain their own place in the community, and to keep the community stable. Education began at home, and as three generations usually lived together the first teachers were often the grandparents. They helped the children to learn their language and told them stories and myths and legends. When they grew older, the boys and girls learnt by helping their parents in manual tasks. As Buck  

---

explained, the boys assisted their fathers in various ways – ‘in obtaining material, 
house building, fishing, fowling, food cultivation, and other masculine activities. The 
girls were taught by their female relatives to plait mats and baskets, weave and 
prepare food’.\textsuperscript{81}

Buck continued that to become adept at skilled crafts, such as woodcarving, tattooing, 
or fine weaving, the adolescent had to be taught by an expert. Those children who had 
been dedicated to Tu, the war god, were given military instruction. ‘After initial 
teaching…they received graduated exercises according to their age and strength. They 
were first taught the strokes and guards with a dry flower stalk of the native flax, in 
lieu of the double-handed club. In adolescence they were taught with real clubs and, 
when they had developed enough skill to satisfy the community, were sent to a tribal 
expert (toa) for a finishing off course’ To be dedicated to Rongo, the god of peace and 
ariculture, led to practical instruction in ‘meteorology, the seasons, the soil, and the 
methods of preparing the cultivation, planting, protecting, harvesting, and storing the 
crops’. The sons of chiefs and priests were given a high standard of education in tribal 
lore by men famous for their learning.\textsuperscript{82}

Rangimarie Rose Pere has also written about Maori pedagogical education, and drawn 
some comparisons with the more typical Pakeha approach. She pointed out that:

The emphasis of those elders responsible for our early childhood 
learning was not on setting up a formal system of what may be termed 
“states of knowledge” appropriate to a given age or class. There was 
no idea of “content” appropriate to any given point within the system. 
Their emphasis was on appropriate ways of knowing according to the 
responsibilities it was collectively recognised a child should be 
carrying or experiencing. A corollary to this was an emphasis on how 
the ways of coming to know would work effectively into what a child 
already knew or was experiencing. In contrast to this inherent growth 
of dignity and mana among Maori children, a common Pakeha 
procedure is to expect everyone to recognise an inherent status and 
authority differential between children and teachers. Children are 
expected automatically to recognise the distinction between themselves 
and teachers. This may be a consequence of difficulties with 
disciplining a mass of children in a specialised learning situation or be

\textsuperscript{81} Peter Buck, \textit{The Coming of the Maori}, Wellington, 1949, p.361. 
\textsuperscript{82} Ibid, p.362.
derived perhaps from the hierarchical nature of the Department of Education itself.\textsuperscript{83}

She continues that both:

Maori and Pakeha modes of education recognise the importance to a child of learning through imitation of the actions and sounds made by people or by animate and inanimate objects to which the child is exposed. The differences between the two modes however is that the Pakeha child at school is provided with an artificial set of circumstances in the classroom while the Maori child was personally involved with real life situations, for example the child may join a gathering of people to celebrate a joyous or mournful occasion and in the process has the opportunity to explore the range of emotions this involves...

The traditional Maori teacher knows the cultural background and history of the pupil. She knows the innate tendencies or traits that her pupil may have, and is also familiar with the pupil’s strengths, interests and experiences. With this type of information the teacher can competently and confidently assist the child to learn at her own level of readiness and interest. For example, a 12 year old Maori boy had been failed by the state school he attended, as having a dull intellect and being a behaviour problem, such assessment was that of the principal and the teachers in this school setting. Fortunately for this boy and the school, a person traditionally acceptable to the boy came in as the boy’s Form Two classroom teacher, and made amazing changes in the attitude the boy had towards school as well as the attitude the school had towards him. This teacher got to know the boy and his family intimately, and took full advantage of the strengths and interests she identified in the boy. In return the boy came to enjoy sharing the tremendous knowledge he had about the sea and fishing in his tribal area, including the Maori calendar. The learning these two individuals had between them was reciprocal...

The individual learns that the quality of her own life and the survival of the whole are dependent on the contribution she makes to the group and on how well she adjusts to the demands that the group imposes. The author’s maternal grandparents taught her to learn things well, and to see how they related to other things in hr experience. Anything that she learnt well as an individual had to be valuated by her, in terms of how well she could put this knowledge into practice alongside other people and in the “collective interest”.\textsuperscript{84}

Belich, in another account, describes education as having taken place:

\textsuperscript{84} Ibid, pp.75-76.
in daily life and in various types of whare wananga (school, literally, house of knowledge), whose high tapu usually excluded women, except for the type devoted to weaving...Tradition suggests that some were inter-regionally famous before contact. Ngai Tahu of Otago are said to have sent chiefly sons to a famous East Coast Eton, ‘Te Rawheoro University’. There are said to have been various categories of whare wananga: for the heirs of priestly ariki; for the teaching of ritual and genealogy to chiefly boys; for carving, moko, everyday crafts such as housebuilding; and for maketu or witchcraft. There were also women’s schools where weaving was taught, and even some provision for adult education. Belich points out that ‘virtually all sources agree that children were well treated and seldom struck.’

2.10.1 Impact on Maori Pedagogical Education

In relation to the impact of the missionary and early Government schooling policies on Maori generally, it is relevant to refer to Alan Ward’s suggestion that:

The missions had no desire to preserve Maori institutions, which, in the light of a theology strongly influenced by Calvinism, were seen as pagan and debased, to be uprooted and replaced in the process of Christian regeneration. On the mission stations English food and clothing, English crafts, English etiquette and entertainments, and the gospel of work and individual responsibility, replaced the Polynesian institutions of the Maori village.

Yet while they attempted to Europeanize the Maori, in so far as they identified European social habits with Christianity, this did not extend to the language. The missionaries learnt the language, and a huge amount of missionary effort was put into developing a written form of Maori, followed by the translation of English services into Maori and books of the Bible from Hebrew and Greek into Maori. Many thousands of books written in Maori were circulating prior to 1840. The high literacy rate amongst many Maori by 1840 and the Treaty of Waitangi was literacy in the

86 Ward, pp., 33-34.
Maori language, and the medium of instruction in the mission schools was generally the Maori language.  

When the missionaries arrived the traditional Maori social order was already experiencing change in some respects under the influence of earlier European arrivals and the things they had brought with them. In time many Maori were ready to listen to the missionaries. The latter had come with one main purpose; to further the spread of Christianity and show Maori the way to salvation. Their concern was to establish a Christian community, be it Maori or European; but, perhaps naturally, the Christian society they looked forward to resembled in many ways the social order they had left at home. Schools were an integral part of the missionary programme. Because one learnt to read in order to read the bible, there was little difference between the congregation gathered together to worship and the community assembled in ‘school’. The Maori teachers listed in the missionaries’ reports assisted the missionaries both in their religious duties and in the schools.

Michael Jackson described how the new skills of literacy was also to introduce profound changes in Maori culture and social structure, with the effect of marginalising to some extent Maori knowledge and culture.

It is important to point out that the flood of religious conversions and baptisms which occurred amongst Maori in the 1830s and 1840s, while often accompanied by considerable Pakeha missionary criticism of Maori ‘superstitions’ and cultural practices, did not mean that becoming Christian necessarily led Maori to reject Maori pedagogy and cultural knowledge systems. Indeed, history showed that these had a remarkable capacity to be maintained within Christian communities. Nevertheless, the impact of the general evangelistic work of the missionaries, the way of life on the mission stations, and the work of the mission schools on Maori pedagogical methods,

---

87 Barrington and Beaglehole, p.3. For an account of the extensive printed publications in Maori by the missionaries from the 1830s and the large number of Maori who learnt to read and write the language during this period see the same authors, pp.26-29.
cultural knowledge systems and cultural practices after 1814, and particularly from 1835 to 1845, must have been considerable.

The education, training and forms of socialisation of the young generally were inevitably affected by the process of religious conversion sought by the various missionary bodies. This was, as William’s suggests, ‘necessarily and intentionally subversive of Maori knowledge systems and cultural practices, and assumptions of European cultural superiority shared by the British, French and German men and women who established their missions’. 89

What the policy of the missionaries and subsequently the Crown meant, as Smith and Smith suggest, was that ‘schools were expected to assimilate Maori children into Pakeha culture by actively discouraging Maori beliefs and practices and replacing them with Pakeha belief systems and “manners”.’ 90 Or as Waiairiki Grace puts it, ‘Successive colonial governments from the mid-1850s established, refined, and cemented in place a one-hat-fits–all educational model that ignores Maori philosophical, cultural, spiritual and linguistic differences with devastating results’. 91

Professor Sinclair could well have included Maori pedagogical education in his description of the aspects of Maori society which were impacted upon by the Resident Magistrates and others who followed the missionaries:

Unlike his counterparts in British territories in Asia and Africa, the Resident Magistrate was not an agent of indirect rule, but a key figure in displacing Maori law and custom by English criminal and civil law. The Resident Magistrate, the native Land Court Judge, the village School Teacher and the Native Medical Officer had succeeded the merchants and the missionaries as the prime agents of assimilation’. 92

CHAPTER 3: OUTCOMES OF THE CROWN’S ADMINISTRATIVE STRUCTURE FOR MAORI EDUCATION FROM 1867

‘I suppose the usual Inspector’s visit should take place before anything else is done’.
Inspector Pope advising the Education Secretary on a request by residents of Hiruharama for a school (author’s emphasis).93

3.1 Introduction

Most reports on schooling for Maori prior to 1867 contained directly or indirectly recommendations as to the form any new system of Maori schools should take following that of the mission schools. In 1865 Rolleston brought these recommendations together in the ‘Notes on Reports of Inspectors of Native Schools’, which included the suggestion that the most important key to success would be taking general education out of the hands of the denominational boards and giving more responsibility for it to Maori themselves.94

The Auckland School, Inspector Hugh Carleton, had recommended this course in 1862: ‘If we attempt to hunt them (Maori) into education as we have hunted them into selling their lands, a spirit of resistance will naturally be engendered. Make education a part of the Runanga; give the direction of it to themselves; let them feel it is their ...

93 Pope to Habens 12th August, 1891.
94 AJHR, 1865, E-3, pp.1-3.
own work’.\textsuperscript{95} He emphasized accordingly the importance of establishing numerous
day schools throughout the country, ‘scattering the seed broadcast over the country,
instead of confining it to a few hot-beds’, rather than the previous emphasis on
mission boarding schools.\textsuperscript{96}

This idea, incorporating a strong emphasis on ‘self-help’ in any future Crown
schooling policy for Maori, was repeated and further developed by William Rolleston,
the Under-Secretary of the Native Department in 1865:

Induce the Natives to take the initiative; make education a part of the
runanga; give the direction of it to themselves; let them feel that it is
their own work. Once conscious of being free agents they will take
European advice and assistance as readily as Native assessors accept
the opinion of the Resident Magistrate on a point of law …as a first
step towards inducing the spirit of self-reliance, equal contributions
either in money, land or labour, should be made an imperative
condition of receiving Government aid.\textsuperscript{97}

### 3.2 The Native Schools Act 1867

*An Act to Regulate and Provide Subsidies for Maori Schools.*\textsuperscript{98} It established a
national system of secular village primary schools, controlled by the Department of
Native Affairs, for the education of ‘children of the aboriginal race and of half-castes
being orphans or being the children of indigent persons’. This system would
continue to operate parallel with the schools operated by the provincial governments
until the end of the provincial system in 1876 and the creation of the new central
Department of Education in 1878, which created a second national system of
government primary schools parallel with that for Maori children.

The importance the Crown attached to giving Maori some sense of involvement in the
establishment, maintenance and governance of any new system of schooling was
evident. A Native school would only be established on condition that (1) a

\textsuperscript{95} AJHR, 1862, E-4, p.17.
\textsuperscript{96} ibid;
\textsuperscript{97} AJHR, 1865, E-3, pp.1-2.
\textsuperscript{98} Short title, *The Native Schools Act 1867* became law on 10 October 1867. *New Zealand Statutes, 1867*. DB.
‘considerable number’ of the male Maori inhabitants of a district wrote to the Colonial Secretary asking for a school; (2) a meeting of a majority of the local inhabitants declared that they were willing to provide a proportion of the costs towards the establishment and maintenance of a school, and, (3) that the meeting elected a committee and a chairman who would report the proceedings to the Colonial Secretary. Once these conditions had been met, the district could be declared an educational district, and the committee the district school committee responsible for the ‘general management’ of the school’.99

The Colonial Treasurer would be empowered to grant one half of the cost of the erection of the buildings, provided that Maori contributed an area of land of not less than one acre for the school site. The section stated that ‘such sites shall be held in trust for ever for the purpose of a native school under this Act’. Where land exceeding one acre was given, the Governor was empowered to grant a subsidy larger than one-half of the estimated cost in aid of the buildings. The land was to be vested in two or more trustees nominated by the Governor.100 The Colonial Treasurer was also authorized to pay up to three quarters of the teacher’s salary and building maintenance, with the school committee having to guarantee that they would provide the remainder.101

No government grant would be forthcoming ‘unless a proper well-ventilated schoolroom with teacher’s residence and other buildings according to the requirements and character of the school’ were provided, and ‘kept in repair.’ Ibid. The Colonial Secretary would also need to be satisfied that ‘The English language and the ordinary subjects of primary English education are taught by a competent teacher, and that the instruction is carried on in the English language as far as practicable’.102 The grant would be calculated on the daily average number of pupils attending, ‘their proficiency in the English language and in the knowledge of reading writing and arithmetic as shall from time to time be prescribed in regulations’.103

---

100 Section 8 (2) Native Schools Act 1867.
101 Section 9, p.469.
102 Section 21, p.470.
103 ibid;
3.3 Requests for Schools

Requests from Maori to the Colonial Secretary for schools were initially slow in coming, with the Native Minister, Donald McLean, attributing this to the unsettled period out of which the country was emerging. But there were other reasons. One was the inability of Maori in some districts to raise the financial contributions the Act required. Consequently it was amended in 1871 to enable the Governor to grant further aid if this would facilitate the establishment of a school.

My earlier research demonstrated that requests for schools were not made evenly. The marked enthusiasm for Native Schools in the north and east of the North Island was in striking contrast to the absence of enthusiasm for Pakeha institutions such as schools by hapu living in raupatu districts and war-affected regions where land confiscations had taken place. Many of them adhered to a policy of opposition or passive resistance to European institutions, including the Crown’s schools. In parts of the Waikato, King Country and Taranaki districts of Te Tai Hauauru, this opposition to the schools lasted in some instances for several decades. McLean appointed Colonel A. H. Russell as the first Inspector of Native Schools under the 1867 Act and he was to be assisted by the Resident Magistrates.

3.4 The Centralised System of Control

The system of central control with regard to the Native (and later Maori) schools was therefore established. As mentioned earlier, this was initially by the Native Department but in 1879 their control passed to the central Department of Education in Wellington. The system involved the Wellington-based Inspectors of Native Schools making their annual inspection visits on horseback, to the widely scattered Native schools from the North Cape to the Bluff. The sheer physical rigours involved were highlighted by Pope during an inspection of the Tokomaru Bay School in 1880, when

---

104 McLean to Russell, 17 November 1871, AJHR, 1872, F-5, p.3.
105 Native Schools Amendment Act, 1871. Preamble and section 3. DB.
107 McLean to Russell, 17 November 1871, AJHR, 1872, F-5, p.3.
he advised the Education Secretary that ‘the roads were in a frightful condition. I had to walk a great part of the way; nevertheless, my horse was quite knocked up when I arrived at Tokomaru. This journey ought not to be undertaken in the wintertime’. The Secretary wrote alongside ‘I agree.’  

My research found several negative outcomes for the schooling of East Coast Maori children stemming from the control from Wellington that I will be discussing in this chapter. One of these was that the arduous nature of the inspector’s role and infrequent inspections affected the timing of inspection and examination visits to schools. Maori school committee members often complained that the timing of a visit was inappropriate, particularly if it came shortly after the beginning of the school year when some children were starting school for the first time, and others had barely resumed their class-work after the vacation and were therefore hardly in a position to be examined. This was one of several noticeable differences with the decentralised Hawke’s Bay Education Board, whose Inspectors normally made the first of their twice-annual visits to the schools in the district no earlier than April. When Pope arrived to inspect the Tokomaru Bay Native School on the 10th of February, 1890, very few children were present to inspect, one reason for this being the lateness of grass-seeding.

However much more serious as I shall demonstrate was that the final on-site approval of a Native School Inspector from Wellington was generally required for most of the vital matters connected with a developing school system. These included decisions about whether the establishment of a school was justified, negotiations regarding gifting of land for school sites and the location of sites, arrangements for school inspection and the maintenance of buildings. The system of central control involved, including the distance from Wellington, also had implications usually of a negative kind for such essential matters as ensuring that good teachers were appointed, vacancies for teachers were not left unfilled, incompetent teachers were dismissed, and when disputes arose between a school committee and a teacher they were resolved quickly.

---

108 Inspection Report, 1st September, 1880. BAAA 1001,652a, ANZ-A. DB.
109 Inspection Report, 10th February, 1890. BAAA 1001, 652b. ANZ-A. DB.
It was a system in which delays frequently lasting for months and sometimes for years were a built-in characteristic. A standard phrase used by Departmental officials which was repeated constantly when replying to Maori who had written requesting action on such matters of vital importance to them as having a school established, or a teacher appointed, or to teachers desperate about urgently needed maintenance, was that it would need to ‘await the next visit of the Inspector’ from Wellington. When an Inspector found that a matter could not be concluded on one visit, he would generally recommend that the matter be held over until his next, often at least a year later.

The delay was systemic, not just an occasional matter affecting individual communities or schools. The Crown’s own requirement that Maori wanting a school must gift the land for the site was one of the factors which frequently contributed to delay, through decisions needing to be made about site selection and approval and land ownership. But it cannot by any means be regarded as the main contributing factor. Where I have come across land being gifted for a school site I have noted it, but it is not an aspect I have examined in detail as this is being done in a separate report.  

3.5 Resident Magistrates

Resident Magistrates assisted the Inspectors of Maori Schools after 1867, and it needs to be acknowledged that to some extent, at least for the following two decades they were able to play an intermediary role of a kind first between the Native Department and committees and schools, and from 1879 between the Education Department and schools, adding the title of ‘District Superintendent’ of Native Schools to their own. For example in 1882 Captain Preece, in 1883 John Brooking, and in 1884 James Booth acted for the East Coast in this way. They sometimes assisted with school inspections, negotiations over sites for schools, and the appointment of teachers.

But this was combined with their many other duties, they were not educationists, frequent changes in personnel were not uncommon as the example examples

---

110 See David Alexander, *East Coast Public Works Issues*.  
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illustrate, and their role as intermediaries sometimes further slowed down rather than facilitated progress. Moreover as pointed out earlier most really important decisions still needed to be signed off by a school inspector on one of their infrequent visits. The growing professionalism of the Native School system after the schools were transferred to the Education Department in 1879 was paralleled by a continuing decline in the influence of the Resident Magistrates who by the end of the 1880s, as Ward suggests, ‘had more to do with settlers than Maori and their salaries were paid by the Justice Department’.  

### 3.6 School Committees

The Native/Maori School Committees might have acted as an effective middle level of administration and intermediary between the central Department of Education in Wellington and the schools. But from their creation in 1867 and for nearly the next 100 years they were not given sufficient authority or autonomy to accomplish this, their authority in this respect being considerably less than their education board counterparts. In his 1907 Annual Report, written 39 years after the 1867 Native Schools Act established them, Inspector William Bird wrote that:

> The duties of native School Committees are not very extensive, consisting chiefly of making arrangements for a supply of fuel, and for the cleaning of the school, and, in addition, seeing that the attendance of the children is regular. No capitation is payable to the Committee for any purpose, though the Department, in recognition of their keeping up the supply of fuel, makes a grant towards providing recreation for the children.  

This is certainly not to minimize the important role played by many of the Native/Maori committees, an aspect which is discussed later in this Report. But the point of most relevance here is that the Committees were not given the powers and responsibilities in the administrative structure that might have helped them (and the Department) overcome the void left by the distance of the schools from Wellington.

---

111 Ward, p.300.
The 1880 Native School Code asserted the authority of the Native School teacher even more strongly than previously, stating that ‘It is no part of the duty of the committee to interfere with the teacher personally in any way. That officer has the whole charge of the schoolhouse, the residence, and the grounds, and is responsible to the Department alone for the general management of the school’. The appointment of teachers continued to rest wholly with the Department, which was guided by the advice of the Inspector.113

The inferior status of Native school committees compared with their education board counterparts was often evident in the history of Native/Maori schools on the East Coast. One example of this, and its effects, was highlighted by the Minister of Education when responding in 1936 to a letter from A. G. Hulquist M.P. regarding the Whakaangi Native School, and sanitary arrangements in Native Schools generally. The Minister stated that these were ‘on a different basis from those applying’ to Board Schools; the Committees in the latter being ‘provided with public funds for this purpose, but in Native Schools the Committees are purely advisory bodies whose funds are derived only from entertainments etc’ He added that the sanitary arrangements in Native Schools was, therefore, the responsibility of the Committees, but the work was usually carried out by the senior boys, the pupils receiving free textbooks for this and other duties undertaken including the cleaning of the schools.114

In 1933, Inspector DG Ball advised new teachers at Mangatuna to ‘hold regular Committee Meetings. You will see that the Committee has little real power, but your first duty will be to create not only duties, but some definite powers for the Committee and thus win their willing cooperation’.115

113 1880 Code, Clause xvi. DB.
114 Minister to A. Hulquist, M.P., 6 August 1936. The sanitary arrangements referred to usually involved the emptying of the latrines by the boys. BAAA 1001, 104d 44/1/32 Pt.5. ANZ-A. DB.
115 D. G. Ball to Mr and Mrs S.Kelly, 30 January, 1933. BAAA 1000 951a. ANZ-A. DB.
3.7 The Crown’s Administrative Structure and East Coast Schools

Earlier I described the need for one of the Wellington-based Inspectors on one of their infrequent visits to approve in person many of the most important matters affecting the schooling of Maori children as one of the major impediments in the system. In the section below I have brought together a few examples from the many available to illustrate this point with particular reference to the East Coast.

3.7.1 Whakawhitira

One of the reasons it took five years from a request by Maori at Whakawhitira, situated below Ruatoki, for a school, and one opening, was that at an important stage ‘some considerable time had elapsed since the Inspector’s visit to the settlement and the Department needed to make sure before committing itself to expenditure on buildings that nothing negative relating to its prospects had occurred in the interval’ (author emphasis).\(^\text{116}\)

3.7.2 Reporua and Tuparoa

Residents at Reporua, east of Ruatoria, wrote to the Education Secretary requesting a school on the 13\(^{th}\) February 1880, and those at Tuparoa did likewise on 8th April 1880. The official response was that when Inspector Pope ‘returned from the south’ he should visit and investigate the respective claims before any decision could be made. This did not occur until the 19 August, and it was not until 24 August that he reported back to the Education Secretary.\(^\text{117}\)

3.7.3 Tokomaru Bay

\(^\text{116}\) Education Secretary (Secretary) to H. White, 22 December, 1914. BAAA 1001, 739d. ANZ-A.

\(^\text{117}\) Pope to Secretary 24 September, 1880. BAAA 1001, 663b. ANZ-A.
In 1884, after a significant number of residents had been requesting a new school for a considerable period, the Education Secretary, John Hislop, recommended that ‘Better delay consideration till Mr Pope again visits and reports’.118

### 3.7.4 Hiruharama

Residents of Hiruharama, 10k southwest of Ruatoria, requested a school in April 1890, and it took Pope until 12th August 1891 to inform the Secretary that he knew the area well and thought the number of children would justify a school. But he then added ‘I suppose the usual Inspector’s visit should take place before anything else is done’. However he then did not visit until 1892.119

In 1912 the Hiruharama School Committee asked the Head to inform the Education Secretary of the necessity for some means to be provided for getting the children across the Makatote Stream, because during winter it became ‘a swift and dangerous torrent’, lying between the School and three small pas from which 13 children attending the School came. The Head recommended that a ‘chair’ similar to those in use in other places would be the cheapest and most suitable means of conveyance.120

When the Secretary replied, six weeks later, he informed the Head that the Inspector would go into the matter with you ‘at his forthcoming annual visit’.121

### 3.7.5 Whangara

Protracted discussions extending over three years took place as to whether the Whangara School, located between Gisborne and Tolaga Bay, should be moved to a more central position to facilitate better attendance. A major factor
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121 Secretary to Head, 18 June, 1912. Ibid
contributing to the delay was the advice given regularly to parents and others when particular matters arose that they would need to wait for the next visit of the Inspector of Native Schools from Wellington to make a decision. The Minister replied to this effect in December 1923, at the time of the initial request from residents, again in August 1924, in July 1926 and twice in August, 1926.122

3.7.6 Whakawhitira

Complaints extending over three years were made by the School Committee and Head Teacher about overcrowding at Whakawhitira, and the Director finally advised the Head Teacher that if the additional accommodation was approved the position chosen would *receive consideration upon the return of the Senior Inspector to Wellington at the end of the present month*.123

3.7.7 Anaura Bay

In August 1938 the Inspector was not able to visit the Anaura Bay School, situatud between Tolaga and Tokomaru Bays, owing to the condition of the roads, despite the Head having made arrangements ‘for the supply of a horse’ which would be ‘sent over the hill to the turn-off on future occasions’.124

The Director replied that there was *every possibility of the visit taking place before the end of the term and I have notified the Inspectors of the steps you have taken to have a horse available for the occasion*.125

3.7.8 Whangara

122 Correspondence 1923-1926. BAAA 1001, 748a. ANZ-A.
123 Director to Head, 16 March, 1938. BAAA 1001 741c 44/4. ANZ-A.
124 Head to Director, 6 August 1938. BAAA 1001/231a. ANZ-A. DB.
125 Director to Head, 7 September, 1938. Ibid. DB.
On 10 June 1942, the Whangara School was completely destroyed by fire, and an offer by the people to have classes held temporarily in marae buildings was agreed to by the Department. On 5 August the Senior Inspector of Native Schools, T.A. Fletcher, advised that the Inspectors would be ‘going up the East Coast first trip in the third term’ when they would investigate the conditions in the meeting house and hold a meeting with the parents. Mr Fletcher himself arrived in Whangara on 8 September.126

3.7.9 Whareponga

Delays caused by the need for a Wellington-based Inspector of Native Schools to visit before important final decisions could be made was one of the factors in the 21 years between the residents of Whareponga, near Ruatoria, requesting a school and one being opened.127

3.7.10 Mangatuna

When residents at Mangatuna, 8kms northwest of Tolaga Bay, requested a school in 1908, the Education Secretary replied that arrangements would be made for a Departmental officer to visit Mangatuna ‘when a convenient opportunity of doing so presents itself’ to investigate and report on the schooling requirements of the district’.128

Nearly sixteen months after the Department had advised that an Inspector would visit the people were informed that the ‘Inspector of Native Schools expects to be in the district next month’ and would report on the application.129

126 Inspector to Director, 10 June, 1942 and; note on file Fletcher to A. Lake, 5 August 1942. BAAA 1001, 748b. ANZ-A. DB.
127 Pope to Inspector General, 14 May, 1900. BAAA 1001, 763a. ANZ-A. DB
128 Secretary to Rev. Tautau, 3rd September, 1908. BAAA 1001, 348a, ANZ-A. DB.
129 Minister to Macdonald, 4 May 1910. Ibid. DB
3.1.11 Te Araroa

In 1936 a new teacher at Te Araroa, East Cape, wanted to start a woodwork class for the boys of the upper standards, and wrote to the Director for approval. He replied that it would be necessary to defer consideration of the question ‘until your school is next visited by the Inspector’.  

3.8 Crown Response to Requests by East Coast Maori for Schools

Below I present more detailed case studies to illustrate some of the negative effects of the administrative arrangements described, with particular reference to what can only be regarded as excessive delays over decisions regarding the establishment and maintenance of schools for some East Coast Maori. But first, two telling comments by Pope demonstrated his own acknowledgment of the delay built into the system. In his report on the East Coast schools in 1884 he wrote that ‘There is little doubt if the opportunity can be seized just now (before the natives get tired out with delay and so give the thing up as hopeless) that schools may be successfully established all along the coast’.  

And his comments about the situation at Whakatane and Tauranga in 1890 could equally well have applied to that affecting many East Coast districts. School buildings were ‘very urgently needed’ he wrote and:

Meanwhile the people at both places are becoming disgusted at what seems to them to be never-ending procrastination. They are unable to understand why the Government should allow itself to be hampered by its own technical rules with regard to the acquisition of Native-school sites, when as far as they can see, the public advantage and convenience could manifestly be better secured by special treatment of such cases.  

---
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3.8.1 Hiruharama

In June 1887 Maori residents of Hiruharama provided the Education Secretary with a list of the names of 53 children who were available for a school, and re-affirmed the promise they had already made to gift 10 acres of their land for the school site. But nothing further appears on the file for another four years, until, in July 1891, the Resident Magistrate at Gisborne, J. Booth, reported that ‘Tuta Nihoniho and his tribe offer five acres for a school site. There are over 60 children so I am informed of school age at this place’.

This appears to reflect an incredibly laid back approach by Departmental officials, including the absence of any on-site visit by an Inspector from Wellington, particularly this late in time, and when such a significant number of Maori children remained without schooling. It then took until September for Booth to advise the Education Secretary of the circumstances surrounding the site offered, including the Block it was attached to, and the measures required for it to be made available for a school site.

Two years later the teacher at the Aku Aku Native School, W. A. Leach, reported to the Education Secretary that he had been visited by Tuta Nihoniho who had requested him to let the Secretary know that he was ‘most anxious to have a school opened immediately at Hiruharama’. He had given him a letter to forward to the Department with a promise of giving five acres of land which had been through the Court and for which he would give the title to the Department, and there was ‘a very large number of children in his Pa’ of school age. At the same time Nihoniho himself wrote to the Secretary, ‘In pity for the native children of Hiruharama who number more than one hundred I apply to you to establish a school at Hiruharama, the land that I and the Committee will give is five acres in extent’.

---
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It was another reflection of the effect of the distance from Wellington, the Department’s slow response, and the absence of any local Departmental education officials, that late in November a Native School Inspector, Harry Kirk, recommended to the Secretary that the Teacher at Aku Aku, Mr Leech, should be delegated to visit Hiruharama, give his opinion on the site and, if he thought it suitable, the Department ‘should acquire it and build at once’. Leech subsequently advised the Secretary that the site offered at Hiruharama was a very suitable one on higher land above the road.

Nihoniho then wrote to the Secretary again on 12 December, acknowledging his agreement ‘to the application that I have made for many years past for the establishment of a school at Hiruharama’, and his own obligation to provide six acres for the site. But he also asked that three acres given for a school at Whareponga should be given back to the people because there were no children for that school as all the parents and children had come together at Hiruharama.

The delays continued. On 8 April 1894 Nihoniho advised the Secretary that he had applied to the court to have seven acres partitioned for the school site, and he was ‘ready to hand same over to Education Department for school purposes’. On 9 April Leech advised the Secretary that:

Tuta and his people are keenly alive to the necessity of education and most anxious to have a school, and willing if Mr Pope be not satisfied with the site already offered to select another where he thinks fit. They seem disappointed that the site has not been surveyed, an application having been made to the survey department some time since, to have it done, not knowing that the site should first be approved by the Inspector.

Inspector Pope finally visited Hiruharama from Wellington in April 1894. Tuta Nihoniho estimated to him that there were now 100 children who would attend a school if one was established in the district, and Pope thought such a school might
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take the place of Aku Aku which had difficult access, and some of the children from Waipiro might also attend. Nihoniho had advised him that he would go to Tuparoa immediately when notice was received from the Judge that the question of the title to the site was to be called on, and he would be glad to have the site surveyed at once.143

Pope concluded his report with what had been obvious since 1887, namely that:

Tuta Nihoniho and his people seem very anxious to have the school established. I have no hesitation in recommending that the business be proceeded with without delay. Tuta appears to be actuated by the best kind of motives in this matter. He tells me that although childless himself, he wishes to leave his people a really noble reminder of his love for them in the shape of a school for the education of their children.144

Nihoniho’s understandable impatience with the continuing delays now led him to write to the Native Minister, James Carroll, complaining that he had been waiting two months for a reply to an earlier letter regarding the need for the Court to expedite the matter of the site.145

On 8 August the Education Secretary advised the Surveyor-General that an order in favour of Tuta Nihoniho had been made by the Court with regard to seven acres of land for a school site, and as soon as a survey was made he would be in a position to proceed with the erection of a school ‘for which the Natives are very pressing’, and he requested that the survey be completed as soon as possible.146 Receiving no response he wrote again on 11 September asking the Surveyor-General ‘to expedite the matter’.147

From this point on matters appear to have proceeded, if still slowly, at least relatively smoothly with the school open and a Teacher, John Lee, appointed and in residence in June 1895.
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3.8.2 Tokomaru Bay

In 1883 a combination of factors led to the Department’s decision to terminate the teacher’s employment and close the school temporarily. The prolonged absence of the Teacher, Mr Warner, through ill-health, had led to a decline in attendance, and the people had a long-standing wish to have the school moved to another site because part of it intruded on a burial ground and they wished to build a church on the site. But there were difficulties over deciding on an alternative site for a school. James Booth, the Resident Magistrate at Gisborne, was not sympathetic regarding the question of the location of the burial ground this being quite sufficient to create a prejudice against the School in the minds of a half-civilized and superstitious race, and I am afraid that the School will not be a success until the Building is removed to another site.\(^{148}\)

Three months later, on 18 March 1884, residents wrote to the Department agreeing to gift land for a new school site under the Native Schools Act and, if the Government agreed to establish a school, ‘let them select a good man to teach our children’.\(^{149}\) On 19 April the Secretary was informed that Maori were ‘most anxious to have a school’, and he attached a memorandum signed by the 41 residents given to him at a meeting advising that they were now willing to convey the land as soon as it was surveyed.\(^{150}\)

Despite this, extraordinarily, the Secretary of Education, John Hislop, wrote that ‘From the indifference formerly shown by the natives I do not think they should have another school just now. Better delay consideration till Mr Pope again visits and reports’.\(^{151}\)

It was not until five months later, in October, that Pope finally visited, and suggested to Henara Potae that if the proposed new school site at Tokomaru was put through the Land Court at Tolaga in the ordinary way a very long delay would occur, as would an application through the Waiomatatini Court; it seemed to him that the best
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course would be to let the Government manage the matter by putting the *Native Schools Sites Act* into operation, and he would endeavour to put all the necessary steps in place as soon as possible.152

On 22 November Potae and 5 others wrote to the Minister of Education asking him to speak to the Head of the Education Department with regard to sending a Teacher for the school, the site for which had been surveyed. It would be for the Department and Government to provide a residence for the Teacher and he advised him that ‘There are one hundred children old enough to attend the school’.153

However complications arose when some residents wanted the site and school to be on the opposite side of the river, and when the Resident Magistrate visited he confirmed that the site originally approved by Pope was not the one Henare Potae had subsequently selected, leading the Education Secretary to recommend that a new survey would have to be made.154 Five months later, on 4 July 1885, Hone Paputene, obviously frustrated, wrote enquiring: ‘Why are the school-houses for Tokomaru being so long delayed?. I have waited a long time, without effect. I have given a site for the school…and the land has been surveyed. Let the old school-house be removed to the site…If it is not done quickly in August or September I shall not consent to give the land for the school because my children have been too late for school.155

Four months later, on 2 November, which was over 12 months after the previous visit by Inspector Pope, the Assistant Inspector of Native Schools, H. Kirk, reported visiting the proposed site and he commented on it reasonably favourably, while pointing out that the old school building needed re-roofing, painting, placed on new blocks and the windows puttied.156 Five months later, on 31 March 1886, tenders were called for ‘a Residence and repairs to school’ at Tokomaru.157 Over four months later residents wrote again, this time to the Minister for Native Affairs, asking that ‘immediate steps be taken for building the school teacher’s residence at Tokomaru as

---
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the children are not working now’. Over three months later they wrote again to the
Minister, urging him to ask the Department to send a ‘humane and religious person’
to be the Master for the Tokomaru School ‘so that he may instruct the children and
lead them in the way of God as well as give them a knowledge of playing the piano’.
The house for the school master was being erected and he would be informed of its
completion. On 7 January 1887 the Secretary for Education wrote to a Mr J. H.
Broughton at Auckland advising him that he had been appointed.

However even with the school now opened, other defects resulting from the distance
and control from Wellington, administrative inertia, incompetence, or a combination
of these factors, continued to impede progress. Here it was reflected in the absence of
some of the books and materials essential for the operation of a school. (Another
aspect which is discussed more fully, with other examples, later in this chapter.)

Broughton advised the Inspector General that he had opened the school on Monday, 7
February, but was:

working at a great disadvantage being without the following requisites: table, chair, clock, blackboard, easel, Royal Reader Wall Cards, Slates, Vere Foster’s Copy Books, plain ruled exercise books, Petrie’s Table Books, prepared chalk, sewing materials, pen holder, lead pencils, slate pencil holders (he named eleven other items)…Piping is very much required around the school as there is no water near… a gate was required for the school to avoid the need for children having to climb through the fence.

Simultaneously Wi Pewhairangi and others wrote giving the names of those elected to
the Committee for the School, with Hare Mauhata as Chairman, and expressed their
wish to have Peti Pakewa appointed Assistant to the Teacher, which they claimed the
Teacher himself ‘very much’ wanted.
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Four weeks later Broughton advised that due to the illness of his wife and several of the children with a fever he was closing the school for a fortnight, with the consent of the Committee. On 4 April, Broughton wrote again to the Department, advising that the classroom was far too small for the number of children enrolled, he had only 20 desks for 70 pupils, and he repeated his earlier requests regarding the water supply and gate, the need for a table and chair for himself, and sewing materials, and also requested cleaning materials and an attendance register.

Pope finally arrived for an inspection visit on 30 May 1887, and after seeing for himself the conditions at the school recommended action on many of the important matters in terms of satisfactory teaching and learning that the Teacher himself had been requesting action on since his appointment. With a school roll of 77 he recommended that Mrs Broughton be appointed Mistress ‘at once’; she had not received even a sewing mistress’s salary or received any communication on the subject. If the enrolment continued to be as large more accommodation would be required. The desk accommodation was:

quite insufficient. This defect mars the efficiency of the school and should be got rid of at once. A gate leading in to the school grounds is needed, the children currently getting through the wire fence which was dangerous. The supply of water often runs short and the best way of dealing with this would be to put a tank near the school with suitable spouting. A table and chairs are required. Neither the Teacher or the Chairman had a copy of the 1880 Native School Code. There is a great need of slates; I think three dozen and six boxes of pencils should be sent at once with three dozen copies of the Native School Primer and two dozen of the Native School Reader.

Pope pointed out that the Teacher was currently paying Miss Bessie Pahewa, who had been a pupil at Hukarere, a small salary for assisting him, and if the high enrolments continued consideration might be given to appointing her officially as she ‘speaks English quite well and has much aptitude for teaching’.

---
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3.8.3 Tuparoa

At Tuparoa it took seven years from the initial request for a school for one to be opened. On 13 February 1880, Hotene Porourangi and others residing at Tuparoa wrote to the Native Minister requesting the establishment of a school at Reporua, where five acres had been set aside for a school site.167

On 10 April 1880, Tuparoa residents petitioned the Education Secretary for a school, advising him that they had selected a site ‘perhaps in excess of two acres in area’, and urging him to ‘hasten the erection of a school building’.168 The store and hotel-keeper at Tuparoa, Mr Milner, wrote to the Secretary supporting the request, pointing out that not fewer than 25 local children would attend a school if it was opened, and it was possible that those from other settlements would also attend. He knew the proposed site, which adjoined the Coast, and confirmed that it was not less than 2 acres. He recommended that a teacher be appointed with some medical and surgical skill to deal with the regular sickness amongst the children.169

In another appeal to the Secretary, on 27 April, Milner wrote that there were ‘many children at Tuparoa who are receiving no education from want of a school’, pointed out that there was a church that could be used for a school in the meantime, and ‘the natives are very earnest in the matter and would do everything they could to make the school a success’.170 He wrote again on 22 May, sending the Secretary a sketch of the site proposed by the petitioners, indicated the distance of Tuparoa from existing Native Schools, and reminded him of the areas in and around Tuparoa from which there were ‘many children that would attend the school’.171 The response of the Wellington officials was that there could not be a school at both Reporua and Tuparoa, and Mr Pope should investigate the best way to proceed on his next visit.172

---
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Pope finally visited on the 19\textsuperscript{th} of August, although his report was then not forwarded to the Education Secretary until the 24\textsuperscript{th} of September. He estimated there were 25 children of school age at Reporua, and the people had offered a suitable site of five acres. At Tuparoa and its immediate neighbourhood he estimated there were 15 children, but there were also many outlying settlements which might help keep up a good attendance; the people offered a site of about three acres which was also suitable, and would allow the Master to feed one horse and one cow. There were two other settlements not far off, with about ten and 20 children of school age respectively, who would probably go to a new school at either Reporua or Tuparoa, and ‘probably forty children would attend a new school at either place for a few months after the opening’.\textsuperscript{173}

However despite the significant number of children identified as needing a school, Pope was not willing to recommend one at either location because (1) opening a school at one would give it an educational advantage over the other; (2) although the distances were long, it was possible for the children from both places to attend other schools at Waiomatatini and Aku Aku, if they had horses; (3) a new school at Tuparoa would injuriously affect the attendance at Aku Aku.\textsuperscript{174} Given the number of Maori children who were reported to be available for enrolment in a school, this strikes me as an attitude of indifference and negligence on the part of the Crown’s senior official responsible for Maori education.

The Education’s Secretary’s response to Pope’s advice was to recommend to the Minister that he write to Maori at both Reporua and Tuparoa, informing them that ‘what money is available before next session of Parliament is required for places where the people are not so sparsely settled; but that when more money is available further consideration will be given to this matter’.\textsuperscript{175}

The apparent indifference of Crown officials continued, with no further initiative appearing to have been taken by the Department, and a significant number of the
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children at Tuparoa continuing to receive no schooling. Three years later, on 6 October 1883, the Rev. R Kawhai and others wrote again requesting a school for their children at Tuparoa, pointing out that the distance of ten miles or more from their homes to Waiomatatini, and the considerable distance also to Akuaku, was too great for their children to attend, that they had set aside land for a school in 1880-81, would appoint a committee to attend to all school matters, and attached a list of the names and address of the children available.176

A European resident of Tuparoa, Sir G. Whitmore, now also wrote to the Minister of Education on behalf of Tuparoa Maori who had been requesting him to do so for two years. He urged that a school be established, confirmed that the distance to other schools was too great and somewhat dangerous, that land had been put aside for the site, an estimated 60 children were available besides those at Reporua, and reminded the Minister that the last time Maori had applied they had been told they would have had a school but there was no money available in the estimates.177

Pope next visited Tuparoa on 5 November and he reported that the circumstances had changed, with ‘now about sixty children of school age at Tuparoa and surrounding settlements’, none of whom attended Waiomatatini or Aku Aku, and it appeared that arrangements could now be made for them to attend a school at Tuparoa. The block of land offered for a school site formed part of a block which had been through the Court. He concluded that if the money was available ‘the buildings might be among the first to be erected next year’.178

However during 1884 several factors continued to impede further progress. One of these was the need to further clarify matters regarding title to the land proposed for the school site. Another was renewed doubts by Pope. When he visited Tuparoa again in October 1884, nearly 12 months later, residents had met him to ‘impress upon the Government the importance of hurrying on the work of building the school there as
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much as possible’. But he now questioned whether Tuparoa was the best location for a new school, although one was certainly needed in the district.¹⁷⁹

But eventually, realising that the weight of local opinion remained in favour of Tuparoa, and apparently finally aware of the significant number of children not receiving schooling, Pope gave way. However it was then not until 23 March 1887, seven years after Tuparoa Maori had initially asked for a school, that one was ready for the Department to advise a Teacher that he was appointed, although he did not then take up his position until 24 May. When Pope made his first inspection on 1 June, 45 children, all of whom were Maori, were present.¹⁸⁰

Several hundred Maori children at Tuparoa and surrounding districts would have missed out on schooling altogether as a result of the seven and a half years of this sorry official saga.

3.8.4 Whangara

At Whangara it took sixteen years from the initial request by the people for a school and one to be opened. In August 1886 H. R. Tamararu and 40 other residents wrote to the Native Minister asking for a school to be built at Whangara, advising him that they had selected a site and set aside three acres for the school.¹⁸¹

Given that it was now 1886, Pope’s initial response reflected, once again, an extraordinarily laid-back attitude on the part of the Crown’s chief official responsible for Maori education, his advice on this occasion being that he had ‘often thought there should be a native school here, and proposed to instruct Inspector H. Kirk to visit the district and make enquiries.’¹⁸²

It took another two months before Kirk did visit, on 28 October, and then another two months before he reported that he regarded the site as suitable, although further
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enquiries were needed by the Resident Magistrate at Gisborne, James Booth, to confirm the number of pupils available. 183 Seven months later Pope wrote to Booth asking him whether ‘anything has been done with regard to the proposed school at Whangara?’ 184

Extraordinarily, nothing further appears on the file until nearly three years later, in May 1900, when Pope, having passed through Whangara, expressed the view that a Native School should succeed there; many applications had been sent to the Department by the residents for a school, and ‘for one reason or another they had all been declined, but there is now, quite plainly, much better reason for not refusing than there has been before’. 185 He had found that 48 children were currently available to be enrolled, and that some 15 “under age” children would be ready for school very shortly. The people at Whangara were willing to lend their church for school purposes if it was considered desirable to have an experimental school for a time, and a good site would be provided should the Department decide to build. 186

On 16 June Whangara residents again wrote to the Minister of Education, requesting ‘that a government school may be established at Whangara’. The reasons they gave were that: (1) ‘more than 25 children are debarred from the benefits of education by reason of the fact that there is no school at which they could attend nearer than Gisborne 16 miles distant’; (2) the owners of the Maori Church had consented for the building to be used as a school house until such time as a permanent school could be erected; (3) a guarantee would be given to pay a proportion of the teacher’s salary; (4) that the owners of the Whangara no.2 B Block had consented to set apart five acres of the block for a school reserve ‘which could be had as soon as requested for that purpose’. 187

On 11 August the Assistant Education Secretary requested the Surveyor- General to have the site surveyed. 188 Having received no response 16 weeks later, he sent a
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further letter, asking ‘what has been done in the matter of the survey of a site for a
Native School near Whangara, referred to in my memorandum of 11 August last. The
people of Whangara are complaining because nothing has yet been done’. 189 This
produced a response that the site had now been surveyed. 190

Understandably impatient at the continuing delay, Whangara residents continued to
ask for action, with Hapi Hinaki requesting the Native Minister on the 14th of
February 1901 to ‘please urge the Minister (of Education) to erect Maori school at
Whangara’. 191 Acting on a request from the Education Secretary regarding the
proposed site for the Whangara School, the Registrar of the Native Land Court
advised him that he had sent an application for petition to Hapi Hinaki asking him to
sign it and return it to his office. The application would be notified in the Gazette as
soon after as possible, and the Court would ‘award the parcel to whomsoever it
considers proper’. 192

On 20 June the Registrar advised that Judge Latham had requested to know whether
the title for the school should be ‘vested in His Majesty and not in Education
Department’, the Education Secretary responding that it should be in His Majesty.193

Four months later, having heard nothing further, a deputation from Whangara
comprising Rawiri Karaha and Hapi Hinaki, personally waited on the Minister of
Education, W.C. Walker, ‘to urge the necessity for a school at Whangara. They
informed me that there were now 40 children that could attend the school if erected –
The Natives have set aside a piece of land for the school’. The visit resulted in a
hand-written note on the file by the Education Secretary asking, ‘Can you tell me if
the title in this case has been obtained?’ and a response: ‘I cannot. Ask Mr
Brooking’. 194

Rawiri Karaha and Hapi Hinaki, who had remained in Wellington, wrote again to the
Minister on 30 October. They reminded him of their earlier visit when he had
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informed them enquiries would be made and they should attend upon him again when a definite reply would be given, expressed their anxiety to have the school built so the children could attend it during the coming summer, and also reminded him the site for the school had already been set apart and conveyed to the Crown by an order of the Native Land Court. They therefore wished to have a definite answer as to what steps would be taken regarding the erection of the school, and as they would be returning to Whangara within a few days, hoped an answer would come at his earliest convenience.195

On 6 November 1901, the Education Secretary advised them that on the direction of the Minister he was able to inform them that ‘the Whangara School will be established with as little delay as possible. The title to the site is not yet completed, but it is the intention to have plans of the buildings prepared at once’.196

The partition order of the Native Land Court relating to the Whangara School site was finally delivered to the Education Secretary on 29 November 1901.197 But then there was another period without any further activity, leading Haapi Hinaki and Rawiri Karaha to write again to the Minister asking that the work in relation to the school be ‘hastened’ because ‘There is much disappointment because of the great delay of the work in connection with the school here at Whangara’.198 Building of the school eventually commenced during 1902, but when the first teacher appointed, W. Frazer, arrived on 8 October 1902, he found that ‘the cases of school requisites had not arrived from Gisborne’; if they did, he proposed to open the school on 13 October.199

An aspect of the experience of the Tuparoa residents which also happened frequently in other districts, was the way in which East Coast Maori wishing to have a school but not able to rely on necessary first-hand meetings with an Inspector because of the infrequency of their visits from Wellington, turned to letter writing and petitions to a wide range of individuals who they thought might be able to expedite matters for them. This often included not just letters to the Secretary or other officials within the
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Department of Education, and the Minister of Education, but also to the Minister of Native Affairs and other members of Parliament. In some districts, as was the case here, individual Pakeha sympathetic to Maori aspirations for a school were encouraged to write supportive letters on behalf of the people. These approaches were sometimes also backed up, as here, by personal deputations to the Minister of Education in Wellington.

3.8.5 Anaura Bay

In April 1882, 19 Maori resident at Anaura Bay petitioned the Minister of Education to send a teacher for their children; four acres of land had been set aside for a site ‘to be vested absolutely in her Majesty’, and 50 children were available ‘and many others’. But was not until over two years later, in October 1884, that Pope finally visited and inspected the site offered, which he described as ‘thoroughly suitable in every respect’. He reported having a long conversation with ‘Te Hatiwira Houkamou, the influential chief of the whole district’, who had ‘promised great things, amongst others a school roll of 100 children, and I am inclined to think he would do his best to keep these promises’. He had appeared ‘very impatient under the long delay and asks that the necessary proceedings be pushed on as fast as possible so that the children of his settlements may not fall hopelessly behind those belonging to more favoured districts’.

On 7 May 1885, with apparently no further action by the Department, a further request to have a school established was made. However no further action appears to have been taken by the Crown. Five years later, in April 1890, Rutene Porotiti and others again requested the Government to ‘erect a school here at Anaura, there being 30 children ready for it’.
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It took another sixteen months, until August 1891, for Pope to advise the Education Secretary that he knew the district well ‘and had often thought there should be a school there. If there are 35 children in the two kaingas the case is a very good one. I suppose that the usual inspector’s visit should take place before anything more is done and that the natives should be so informed’.204

Pope’s comment here, that he had ‘often thought there should be a school’ at Anaura Bay deserves discussion. He had made exactly the same comment when the people at Tuparoa had requested a school. The question that should be asked, in my view, is how is it that the Crown official in charge of schooling for Maori is taking such a laid-back attitude to the obvious need of Maori children for schooling this late in time, 24 years after the passing of the 1867 Native School Act?

In September 1891, Poroti responded to a request to provide the number of children available and the land to be offered. He gave the number as ‘more than 30’ but was not currently able to provide their ages; the site offered was three acres.205

When Pope visited again in 1892, having sent a message ahead that he was coming, he found most of the people away at a tangi and was therefore not able to complete his enquiries. The Local Station Manager had informed him that some parents currently sent their children to the Tolaga Bay School and others to Tokomaru, and he concluded that “The needs of Anaura are not so urgent as those of other places on our list; the Anaura people might fairly be told to wait until next year. Nevertheless, if it were thought desirable that the site should be acquired soon, I have no doubt that Mr Clemence would be glad to inspect it on our behalf”.206 But Pope had obviously been put out by the people being at a tangi because the advice he gave the Inspector General was that ‘I think the proposed policy of taihoa is the more desirable in this case as the natives showed their lack of real interest by ignoring the presence of the Departmental Officer’.207
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Extraordinarily, nothing further appears on the file until 43 years later, when residents again requested a school, and one was finally opened on 13 September, 1937.208

3.8.6 Mangatuna

At Mangatuna a request for a school was first made in 1908 and one was finally opened in 1913. Here, as sometimes also happened elsewhere, issues surrounding the selection of the site and ownership of the land for it combined with the others matters already referred to such as distance from Wellington and only occasional visits from an Inspector, contributed to slow progress.

The Reverend Nikora Tautau wrote to the Education Secretary in August 1908 requesting that a school be established at Mangatuna, pointing out that the locality was seven miles from the Uawa School which was too far for the children to travel particularly in winter. A list with ‘the names of forty children aged from four months to ten years living 2 chains to four miles distant from the proposed school’ was attached.209

It is now 1908, but Maori continued to be required to gift land for the site if they wanted a school, with the Education Secretary asking the Reverend Tautau whether the people were willing to give a ‘suitable site of at least three acres in extent for school purposes as required by the provisions of the Native Schools Code’, and requesting completion of a form provided with particulars of the children available. If the information was considered satisfactory, arrangements would be made for a Departmental officer to visit Mangatuna ‘*when a convenient opportunity of doing so presents itself*’, to investigate and report on the schooling requirements of the district.210

By now, 1908, it is very late for any Maori child still not to be enrolled in a primary school, particularly when it is recalled that the School Attendance Act of 1894
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required Maori children from seven to fourteen years of age to attend Maori schools if they were available, and in 1903 the Minister of Education published regulations compelling Maori children to enrol at a Board school if there was no Maori school close at hand.\footnote{UNESCO, \textit{Compulsory Education in New Zealand}, Wellington, 1952, p.61.}

Over 18 months later W. McDonald M.P. wrote to the Minister of Education on behalf of the people, pointing out that if the Department provided a Teacher a Mrs Hale had offered to provide both a room to carry on the school work until the buildings could be completed and board for the teacher.\footnote{W. Macdonald, M.P. to Minister, 26 April 1910. BAAA, 1001/348a. ANZ-A. DB.}

Nearly sixteen months after the Department had advised that an Inspector would visit, the residents were informed that the ‘Inspector of Native Schools expects to be in the district next month’ and would report on the application. Minister to Macdonald, 4\textsuperscript{th} May 1910. Ibid. DB. Bird finally arrived in June, and his report to the Education Secretary reflected, again, an incredibly laid-back attitude on the part of an education official, in 1910, to a significant number of Maori children not being in school. He wrote that he had \textit{‘known Mangatuna as a settlement for some years and have always wondered what arrangements if any were being made for the education of the children there’}. The people were ‘all Maoris and ask definitely for a Maori or Native School. They stated that there are forty children available…The Head Teacher of Tolaga Bay informed me that there are 12 children attending his school from Mangatuna’.\footnote{Bird to Secretary, 7 June 1910. Ibid. DB}

Bird’s acknowledgment (my emphasis) above should also be noted for the attitude it again demonstrates on the part of a leading Crown official responsible for the schooling of Maori children. But it is now 1910, and the requirement of compulsory attendance by Maori children had now been in place since 1903, making the comment even more significant and serious.

Bird added that the people had reached:

\footnotesize
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no definite agreement regarding a site but one of four acres should be insisted on and might be easily available...I advised them to have the land ready to offer to Mr Porteous who would probably be coming down the coast in August and would then be able to respond definitely on the land and at the same time verify the number of children...I informed the people that no action of any kind could be taken until the Department was definitely assured of their willingness to place four acres at its disposal.214

Following Bird’s visit the Education Secretary wrote to Mrs Hale in June informing her that ‘no further action can be taken until the Department has definite assurance of the willingness of the people to give four acres as a site for a school, and until the number of children has been verified’.215 Porteous eventually arrived on the 24th of August and reported to the Secretary on 10 September. He advised him that the site selected was ‘in almost every respect a very suitable one’, he had ‘every reason to believe that there was a sufficient number of children to establish the school’, the number being ‘between 30 and 40’, and the application should receive the Department’s favourable consideration.216 On 19 September, Apiata Tawai and 6 others sought the assistance of the Member for Eastern Maori, A.T. Ngata, requesting him to take steps to have four acres of land taken under the Public Works Act for a school site, for which they would not request payment.217

However further delay resulted when a survey of the proposed site by the Lands Department led it to conclude that its shape, including absence of road access, made it unsuitable and further consideration was required, resulting in a request to the people to reconsider the site.218

Correspondence followed for the next 12 months with a school no closer to being opened. One reason for delay was a perceived difficulty raised by the Secretary for Education, that if the land was taken under the Public Works Act ‘compensation will no doubt be claimed’ by the lessee, a Mr C.W. Ferriss. For this reason he requested ‘that your people (Mangatuna Maori) should give the Government an undertaking to
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meet any liability that may arise in this direction’ and asked for agreement to this in writing.219

In January 1912 Nikora Tutau. and 39 others wrote to the Department that ‘We the undersigned hereby apply to the Government under the provisions of the Public Works Act to resume the Kopuatarakihi No. 2 and those subdivisions of the same which are included in the portion surveyed off as a site for a Maori school?’220 The Secretary for Education then wrote to the Under-Secretary for Crown Lands, pointing out that acquisition of a site for a Native School at Mangatuna remained obstructed by the land being part of a lease held by Mr C. W. Ferris, who refused his consent to the proposed transfer. The land:

would be taken under the Public Works Act but it is desirable that all questions of compensation should be settled in advance. For Native Schools the Natives interested are expected to make a free gift of the land required, and I have asked the natives concerned in this case to accept liability if any compensation may be involved. They do not seem to understand the position and it is not desirable to waste more time over the question. The amount involved must be small.221

He requested the Under-Secretary to get the matter settled with Mr Ferris and the Mortgagee, adding that ‘any reasonable arrangement he sees his way to make in regard to compensation will be accepted by the Department’.222 On 18 April 1912 the Secretary advised the Under-Secretary for Public Works that they had agreed to settle and that ‘the way is now closer to proceed under the Public Works Act’.223

But seven months then passed without any apparent further action, leading Mrs Hale to write to the Minister on 25 November, on behalf of the people appealing for a school to be opened during the coming summer. The land had been surveyed and set aside for a site for the past two years, the children able to ride had to go seven miles to the nearest school, and during winter when the roads were impassable they had to either be boarded or, if that could not be afforded, kept at home.224
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The effect of the distance from Wellington is again apparent when on 16 December 1912 the Secretary had to request a local resident, Mr W. Fraser, to visit Mangatuna over the summer to ascertain the definite number of children available for a school. On 5 February 1913, the Department was informed that the site for a school at Mangatuna had been passed by the Native Land Court and the parents were ‘anxious to have the school pushed on’. On 15 March 1913, the builder reported that despite some difficulties in getting materials to the site he was making good progress and the foundations for the school building were in place. Reporting again two weeks later he advised that the people were ‘very anxious to know who the teacher is and if he has a family, and has he taught native children before, and will he be here when school is finished in 5 or 6 weeks time. They are confident of 42 children coming to school at the start and very likely more after the winter’.

The Secretary advised Simmonds that he could inform the people that a Teacher, Mr W. H. Scammell, currently in charge of the Native School at Te Whaiti in the Urewera Country and previously with the Taranaki Education Board, had been appointed. Writing on 23 May 1913, at the end of the first week of the school’s opening, Scammell reported that 28 children had been enrolled and 25 were attending, although three were under five, but ‘there are still some others to come’. By 23 February 1914, 45 children were enrolled ‘with others still to come’. Again, as in so many of the examples I am discussing, it seems to me extraordinary that such a significant number of Maori children should have remained outside school for so long, particularly, in this instance, as late as 1913.

---
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It took five years from the initial request in 1912 by the people at Whakawhitira for a school and one to be opened, with here also a significant number of Maori children remaining outside school, again very late in time.

In June 1912, Nepia Mahuika, Paki Ohuka and others wrote to the Department with an application for a school at Whakawhitira, pointing out that the other schools in the district were too far away for their children to attend, over thirty children were available, and they were prepared to give a suitable site.232

On an inspection visit in July, Bird reported that the children were prevented from going to Waiomatatini by both the river and distance, he had seen thirty-two children at the settlement, of whom some 22 were of school age and ‘with a few exceptions had never been to school’, and concluded that ‘the number of children was quite sufficient to warrant the attention of the Department’. Five acres of land of the Paraanui Block which took in one acre of the Wharau had been offered as a site which he considered suitable. He concluded that ‘I think the case for a school is a good one and recommend that steps be taken to acquire the site. Had suitable buildings been available I would have recommended the opening of a school at once. I attach a memo of agreement signed by Nepia.’233

Nearly 18 months later, with no Inspector’s visit imminent, the Department again had to call on the services of a Teacher, this time at Tuparoa, and ask him to assist it by visiting the community and reporting on the proposal for a school. He provided the names of 25 children above and 20 children below school age, and estimated there were another eight children attending other schools who would return to Whakawhitira when a school opened. The people remained ‘very keen about the school, all the parents, in fact practically the whole settlement met me’. He confirmed that the owners of the land proposed for the school site were prepared to ‘hand over

232 Nepia Mahuika, Paki Ohuka and others to W. Bird, 12 June 1911. BAAA 1001/739d. ANZ-A. DB.
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the deeds of the property to the Department immediately’, and had been requested to ask the Department if it would get on with the school building at once as some time might elapse before the next sitting of the Land Court.234

The Secretary thanked him for his report, advised him that a title had been secured under the Public Works Act, but as some considerable time had elapsed since the Inspector’s visit, the Department had wished to make sure nothing had occurred in the interval to interfere with the prospects of the school before committing itself to expenditure on buildings. The Public Works Department would now be asked to prepare plans and call for tenders for the erection of the buildings.235

Another year passed with no evidence that any further progress was made. When the Department received another letter from White on 16 November 1915, advising that the people again wanted to know the position with regard to the establishment of a school for their children, the Education Secretary replied that restrictions on public expenditure as a result of the War now made it necessary to ‘postpone for the present the question of erecting any school buildings at Kaitaha’.236

No further sign of activity appears for another 10 months until September 1916, when Bird reported to the Director of Education, now W.J. Anderson, that he had visited the settlement and there were ‘about 30 children probably 36 available’, and the meeting place would be available for a ‘beginning’; ‘Hamana Mahuika would accommodate the teacher’ and the Department would need to supply furniture and requisites. He regarded this as a good suggestion and recommended it receive favourable consideration, adding that he thought ‘a Maori girl’ would be preferable under the circumstances and Miss Kaua might want the position or Joanne Hill.237

In providing the Director with his own summary of Bird’s report, the Senior Inspector of Native Schools, J. N. Porteous, also summarised the prior history of the application for a school:
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(a) Favourable report by Mr Bird in July, 1913.
(b) Acquisition of title recommended August, 1913.
(c) Site of five acres surveyed towards end 1913.
(d) Notice of intention to take site August, 1914.
(e) Expenditure of £1000 for erection of buildings authorised by Cabinet, October 1914.
(f) Proclamation under Public Works Act taking site November, 1914.
(g) Further favourable report from teacher Tuparoa Native School, December 1914.
(h) P. W. Department asked to have plans and specifications prepared and tenders invited, December 1914.
(i) P. W. Department instructed to suspend action beyond preparation of plans and specifications, September 1915.238

The Director then advised the Minister that ‘This is a case in which definite steps taken for the establishment of a school (including a Cabinet authorization of £1000) have been stayed by war conditions. There appears to be no change in the requirements of the place and probably building should not be long delayed. As a temporary measure, however, I recommend that you approve of the establishment of the school under the provisional arrangements outlined in Mr Bird’s minute’.239

The Director then wrote to Hamana Mahuika advising him that a recommendation had been approved for opening a temporary school along the lines discussed with him earlier, and that Miss Joanna Hill, currently an Assistant Teacher at the Te Matai Native School, be appointed.240 The school was finally opened in 1917, Miss Hill reporting on 17 April 1917, that there were 24 children on the roll.241 By the 25th of May enrolment had risen to 30 ‘with more to come. The children are very good attenders’.242

The delay involved here in providing a school, again so late in time, and even allowing for war-time constraints, seems again to me to be extraordinary. I cannot believe that an education board, such as the Hawke’s Bay Education Board, or the Pakeha parents whose children were the main clients of its schools, would have
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tolerated such a delay, 39 years after the passing of the 1877 Education Act. Again, as with so many of the other examples I am discussing, the delay meant that it was large numbers of East Coast Maori children who were denied the opportunity for schooling, with all the negative implications of this for their future life chances.

3.8.8 Rangitukia and Tikitiki

In June 1882 the Resident Magistrate at Napier, Captain Preece, advised the Department that he had inspected on its behalf two locations Maori residents at Rangitukia and Tikitiki wished to offer for school sites.\(^{243}\) However it took another seven months for Pope to suggest that two old buildings at Te Hatepe, a former school house and teacher’s residence, might be put into working order and then cut up for transporting to Tikitiki as a school building.\(^{244}\) In July 1884 James Booth R.M. requested the Education Secretary to provide the boundaries of a potential school site at Rangitukia ‘as given in Mohi Turei’s letter’.\(^{245}\) It then took until November 1884 for these to be recorded in an internal Education Department memorandum.\(^{246}\) Booth reported to the Education Secretary in February 1885 that he had gone with the Rev. Turei to inspect the site at Rangitukia. It covered seven acres, was well situated, the number of children available was estimated to be 40, and the owners were ‘anxious to convey it at once’.\(^{247}\)

He had then gone to Tikitiki, where some of the children had been attending the school at Waiomatatini, but it was impossible to attend in wet weather because the river was dangerous. A ‘very excellent site was pointed out to me containing I should say 8 or 9 acres. The Native owners are anxious that a survey be made at once; the number of children who will be able to attend the school is about 30’. He suggested that a side-school might be established at Tikitiki with one married master who ‘could ride over from Rangitukia and take the school on alternate days’.\(^{248}\) Pope

\(^{243}\) Preece to Under-Secretary, 9 June, 1882. BAAA 1001/508b. Rangitukia Building Sites. DB.
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recommended that steps be taken to survey the Tikitiki site as soon as possible and that Mr Booth should try to put it and the Rangitukia site through the necessary procurement steps by the following month.²⁴⁹

However it took over another year for tenders to finally be called for by the Education Department, in March 1886, for work on a school and residence at Rangitukia and a school at Tikitiki.²⁵⁰

It took another year, until March 1887, for Pope to recommend that the two schools to be established at Rangitukia and Tikitiki should be full-time and worked by a married couple, who would alternate morning and afternoon duties or alternate days at each school.²⁵¹ In April 1887, Habens advised a Mr and Mrs Stewart of Kirikiri that they had been appointed to take charge of the two schools.²⁵² In May 1887, Habens informed the Stewarts that the buildings at Rangitukia and Tikitiki were now ready for occupation and asked them when they could start; adding ‘the sooner you go the better’.²⁵³

However, when Pope inspected the recently finished school buildings at Rangitukia and Tikitiki in June he reported that the teachers ‘were daily expected but they had not arrived when I visited the settlement’; at Tikitiki the people had been ‘somewhat disappointed’ that there was no residence for a teacher ‘and appeared to think that their school would certainly be neglected by the teachers’.²⁵⁴

The Stewarts began teaching in the two schools later in June, travelling daily between them at alternate times, and 12 months later were requesting the Department to provide financial assistance for the upkeep of the two horses that their dual appointments required them to maintain.²⁵⁵
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3.8.9 Potaka

It took the residents of Potaka nine years from their initial request for a Native School in 1927 to one being opened in 1939. The case of Potaka illustrates several factors. They included the continued expectation by the Crown that Maori gift land for a school site, despite the year being 1927. A characteristically extremely slow response by Departmental officials to agree to a school, in part because they felt the number of pupils was too few; a disregard for a Maori preference for a Native rather than Education Board school. Preferential treatment for Pakeha parents in the district when a Board school was established with no more pupils than the number Departmental officials claimed was insufficient for establishing a Native School. The Hawke’s Bay Education Board permitting the schooling of mainly Maori pupils to continue in a temporary building (a cow-shed containing 17 pupils) under intolerable conditions which would, in my view, not have been tolerated if most of the pupils had been Pakeha.

In 1927 Potaka residents were advised by the Minister of Education, R. A. Wright, that if they wanted a Native school they must be prepared to give a site of not less than four acres, larger if possible, and should be ready to point out the proposed site to the Inspector when he was next in the district. Porteous reported after a visit in September that ‘The Maoris are prepared to give 4 or 5 acres, as required, free of cost to the Department’. But he was pessimistic and not prepared to recommend the establishment of one at this stage, because he did not consider the number of children sufficient to warrant a school, commenting that ‘It is possible that a dozen or so children might be available’. Moreover there was ‘no building suitable for a schoolroom’, so it would be necessary to erect one and a teacher’s residence, and at ‘this place the expense would be very great’. However ‘with the growth of settlement I have no doubt that in the near future the need for a school will be established’.

A year later Wi-Repa wrote to Sir Apirana Ngata at Parliament seeking his assistance, advising him that ‘the Potaka Maoris’ were ‘constantly worrying me about
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it...I think they have made out a good case’, and attaching the names of 15 children who were available.258 Ngata forwarded the application to the Minister of Education.259 In October Wright informed Ngata that his most recent information was that there were only four children at the proposed site, and the number was not sufficient to ‘justify the expense in establishing and maintaining a school’.260

In April 1930 Taha Wanoa wrote to the Minister of Education pointing out that the people had asked for a school in July 1927, in August they had advised the Senior Inspector of Native schools that that they were prepared to give five acres for a school site, and had pointed out that the nearest schools were 12 miles away at Hick’s Bay and 10 miles at Cape Runaway.261

Wi-Repa wrote again to Ngata in June 1930, again making the case for a school; ‘I have a lot of sympathy for these people. Some of them have left the place and gone to live at Wharekahika so as to be near a school. Some of the children are at Cape Runaway. It is a pity that these peoples lives should be so seriously disorganised owing to their great desire to have their children educated.’262 Ngata again referred the matter to the Minister of Education.

In August the people submitted the required official form indicating that eight children lived within one mile of Potaka but were currently travelling long distances to the schools at Hicks Bay, Cape Runaway, Horoera and Raukokore.263 The number of children was certainly small, but it is very significant that at this same time the Hawke’s Bay Education Board was already conducting a ‘household school’ in the vicinity, held at the station at Potirau of a European, J. M. Downey ‘and it is his children who attend the school.’264

A newly appointed Senior Inspector of Native Schools, D. G. Ball, visited Potaka in August 1930, and described the situation Porteous had outlined in his 1927 report as
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unchanged, the number of Maori children was not more than 12 and most were attending distant schools. But although he had been unable to visit ‘the European settlers’, he believed there were enough children in the district to warrant the establishment of a Board school, the best site for which would probably be one mile out of Potaka on the Hick’s Bay side. He suggested that such a school, ‘catering for all the children of the district, could be established at a much lower cost, as no residence would be necessary. The Maoris at Potaka would agree to this, as their main anxiety is to get a school established in the neighbourhood’.266

Dr Wi-Repa now wrote yet again to Ngata, acknowledging that the people had ‘exhausted the usual channels for getting a school’, and under the circumstances the Department’s attitude seemed ‘insurmountable’. To Europeans ‘the erection of a school naturally follows certain condition and when these exist, the school then falls into place in the scheme of things’. But he:

could not conceal my disappointment that something has not been done for these people. They are very anxious to have the school, and none of Euclid’s logic will convince them that they cannot or should not have it. It is, I believe, this feeling of keen disappointment that forced them to consult someone else who evidently suggested applying for a Board School. I suppose half a loaf is better than no bread. But I am of the opinion that a Board School …is a breeding ground for the colour question. I suggest that you further explain the matter to your colleague, for if it is possible to have a Board School why not a Native School; both are paid out of the one. I confess that I am not in favour of handing over five acres of land to the Pakeha Board. But of course, if these people cannot get a school except through the Board.267

Nothing further appears on the file for another three years, when in 1934 the Secretary of the Hawke’s Bay Education Board wrote to the Director of Education that there had been correspondence with the Department on a number of occasions regarding a school at Potaka; ‘The children are practically all Native, but the Board established a public school there in a temporary building.’268

265 Ball to Director, 21 August 1930. Ibid;
266 Ibid;
267 Wi-Repa to Ngata, n.d. A hand written note on the letter when it was forwarded to the Minister of Education read ‘An extract from Dr Wirepa’s letter re the Potaka School. The Natives would really prefer a Native School’, 23 September 1930. Ibid. DB.
268 Secretary to Director, 28 March 1934. Ibid. DB.
The Secretary to the Hawke’s Bay Board advised the Director in 1935 that the Board had received applications for several new schools, one of these being Potirau, the original building for which having been sold was ‘now being conducted in a cowshed’. And the enrolment having increased to 15, it appeared certain that some expenditure on a permanent building would be required.\textsuperscript{269}

The Board now advised the Department that with the roll having grown, with ‘all but four’ being Maori, it wished to apply for the building of a new school. The Board Secretary had observed on a visit that the existing accommodation was in a cowshed with 17 children present. The condition he described was appalling:

\begin{quote}
The desks are placed amongst the bails, two desks facing the back wall, four facing the end wall, and two facing the end of the bails (divided off by two rails) which are still used for milking morning and afternoon. The shed has an iron roof and low stud, and is of course open on the cow yard side. The lighting is bad. There are no conveniences of any kind…A school in such a building has to be condemned from every viewpoint except the desire of the parents to have no interruption in the education of their children no matter what are the conditions…The conditions are bad enough now, but in wet weather they can hardly be imagined.\textsuperscript{270}
\end{quote}

These are intolerable conditions for schooling to take place in, and one can only speculate that it seems highly unlikely that the Board would have tolerated them this long if the pupils had been mainly Pakeha.

Land for a new school was eventually acquired from the Maori owners, with their agreement under the Public Works Act, and the school’s name was changed from Potirau to Potaka in June 1935.

It was not only the condition of the accommodation for the children which was intolerable. The Board Secretary wrote to the Director in April 1936, referring to the Board’s application for a residence to be built for the teacher, citing extracts from a letter by the teacher; ‘In order that school might be held at all I have found it
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necessary to vacate the cottage where I have been living. On at least five occasions during the past few weeks I have had to walk across more than five miles of rough country to avoid the river crossings through which I could not take a horse. I cannot teach efficiently under such conditions, and have accordingly occupied the school tool-shed until something more suitable is available’.271

Three years later, in March 1939, the Department was advised that parents and householders had petitioned the Board for the school to become a Native School.272 The petitioners pointed out that this was not a new idea, a meeting having been convened in July 1937 for the same purpose, but ‘we allowed ourselves to be talked out of it by the only white parent who attended’. Since then, they had been sorry they had not proceeded because their children were passing through the school without receiving the instruction they deserved as Maori children. Since the petition was signed, four more Maori children were attending taking the roll to 24 and a family of four would attend if the school became a Native one.273 The Board Secretary advised the Director that the Board had no objection and the Minister approved the change.

### 3.8.10 Whakaangiangi

In 1918, and the lateness of the year should again be noted, the Secretary of the Hawke’s Bay Education Board wrote to the Director of Education informing him that because of the Department’s delay in providing educational facilities for the children of the Tihomanono District, the Board was applying for grants of £622 and £760 for the erection of a Board School and residence.274

The Board’s intention appears to have finally prompted some action within the Department, because the Director replied almost immediately that the Department was ‘now definitely committed to the establishment of a Native School at

---
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Tihiomanono, subject only to the condition that a title to the site offered is obtained without any further delay. Under the circumstances the Board’s application cannot at present be entertained.275

However Pakeha parents objected because they wanted a Board School for their children. Faced with possible racial tension, with the Hawke’s Bay Board having established a school on private land within a comparatively short distance of the site acquired for a Native School, and Departmental policy that there should not be separate Board and Native Schools close together in the same locality, the Department decided to back down on its decision to establish a Native School, and require all the pupils in the district, Maori and Pakeha, to go to the Board School.276

The Minister of Education C. J. Parr then advised the Director that when he had visited Te Araroa:

Matauru Wanoa and a number of other Natives from Tihiomanono waited upon me and urged the erection of a Native School at that place. It was stated that an area of five acres had been given as a school site, a school had been approved, the tender let, and the material actually placed on the ground, but the Department had subsequently cancelled the erection of a school. Wanoa stated that 43 children of school age would be available for the school and 19 others under school age were in the district. This had probably happened because of the erection of a European School, at a distance of 1½ miles, but it must be remembered that there were two river crossings in between over which it was not safe for young children to travel. A few of the children were attending the latter school, but the majority were going without any schooling at all.277

After making recommendations regarding the Board School, the Minister also now requested the Director to re-examine the matter of a Native School at Tihiomanono, as requested by Maori, and let him have his report and recommendation.278 However the outcome was that the Director recommended that the status quo be maintained and the matter of a Native School not be revisited, with the Board School to be named Whakaangiangi.
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3.8.11 Whareponga

Twenty one years elapsed between the first request by the residents for a school at Whareponga and the Department making a decision, in 1900, to open one. During this period hundreds of Maori children in the district remained without schooling, despite repeated requests from the people to Education Department officials to provide them with a school. The reasons for delay included the familiar ones of administrative inertia on the part of officials in Wellington when it came to schooling matters affecting East Coast Maori, including difficulty in resolving what they saw as the competing claims for schools at Akuaku, Waipiro Bay and Whareponga; delays caused, again, by the need for a Wellington-based Inspector to visit before important final decisions could be made, and the need to resolve issues around the gifting of the land for a school site. 279

3.9 School buildings

Many of the Native school-buildings were:

not well suited for school purposes. Some of them seem to have been built on the principle that any kind of structure that would keep out the rain and give partial shelter from the wind and sun would do for a native school. 280

---
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3.9.1 Introduction

Slow progress in responding to requests by Maori for schools to be built was the most serious outcome stemming from the remoteness of the centralized Wellington-based administrative structure which controlled the Native Schools. But it was certainly not the only one. It also contributed to many of the buildings in which Maori children were schooled and the residences their teachers lived in being badly sited, poorly built and inadequately maintained.

This frequently negatively affected both the effectiveness with which learning could take place and even, at times the health of pupils and teachers. What my research identified, and what can only be described as deplorable, is the extent to which this problem persisted in some instances well into the twentieth century, and well beyond the time when, in my view, most Education Boards would have tolerated it.

This section began with Pope’s comment about the state of many Native School buildings in the 1881 Annual Report of the Department of Education, and he wrote of the school furniture in the same report that:

All sorts of desks have been in use in Native school; double desks, which are objectionable, because they give children very undesirable facilities for carrying on conversation while in school; wall desks which almost seem to have been contrived to make the master see as little of his pupils as possible; and long desks that do not allow the teacher to have access to his pupils without disturbing, more or less, the order and work of the class.281

Considering the conditions of many of the buildings, and the sickness that the condition of some of them would undoubtedly have contributed to amongst the pupils, it is somewhat ironic that as part of the drive for assimilation Native School Inspectors, and James Pope particularly, constantly drew attention to what they claimed to be the unsatisfactory living conditions of Maori, and the contribution this made to illness and even racial decline. They emphasized, by contrast, the superiority
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of the ‘healthy’ European family environment. Pope wrote a well intentioned but rather paternalistic textbook on health for senior pupils of the schools and Maori adults along these lines, and the teachers were viewed as having an important role to play in combating illness amongst pupils and adults in their communities.282

Many teachers did do valuable work in the health field. But my research revealed that many Maori objected to the unsatisfactory conditions of many of the Crown’s own schools, which they themselves sometimes saw, correctly, as endangering the health of their children.

### 3.9.2 School Buildings: East Coast

After visiting the Native Schools on the East Coast Bay of Plenty in 1929, the Director of Education, T. B. Strong, wrote that:

> The impression I soon formed was that these schools have been managed too economically. Many of the buildings have been allowed to get in to disrepair, and the latrine accommodation was anything but satisfactory. I think it will be necessary to spend more money on the native schools in order to bring the buildings into satisfactory condition...Arising out of my visit will be a number of recommendations to you for expenditure on Native School buildings and equipment. We cannot at once make good the shortcomings resulting from the parsimonious policy of the past, but I trust we shall soon have the Native Schools as well found as any of the Board Schools.283

Strong’s comments are particularly revealing in the context of this discussion as a striking acknowledgment by the Crown’s highest education official that an inadequate maintenance building programme had been maintained with regard to the East Coast Native Schools, by comparison with that for Education Board schools. He also made another comment relating to inequality between the two systems when he noted that the Native school teachers were undoubtedly:
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Under very much better control and are subject to firmer discipline than is the case with board teachers. For example, not a single native school I visited had received any of the new textbooks which are supplied free by the Department, yet not a teacher complained. All were using the old books in a quite effective way, thus filling the gap for the time being.\textsuperscript{284}

The examples and case studies which I discuss below demonstrate how justified Strong’s comments were in relation to East Coast schools.

In 1875 an Auckland School Inspector, Richard O’Sullivan, inspected the East Coast Native Schools which were under the control of the Native Department at the time. The Teacher at Tokomaru Bay, Robert Warner, had drawn his attention to ‘the absence of water closets both for ourselves and for the school, and the necessity for a stove’, and asked that the Government give this its earliest consideration ‘as the winter is approaching and it is bitterly cold for the children in the school without any means of warming themselves’.\textsuperscript{285}

In 1879 the Teacher complained again about the state of the buildings. They had been built six years previously and required painting. The rain had penetrated the roof of the residence as a result of the shingles becoming rotten, meaning that his own children had not been able to sleep and in the last rain they had had to take the children out ‘in the middle of the night, and also to bore a large hole in the floor of the sleeping room to allow the water (which came down the chimney) to escape’.\textsuperscript{286} The Teacher complained again on 24 May 1880 but again received no response.

As was mentioned earlier, it took seven and a half years from the initial request from Tuparoa Maori for a school for one to be opened in late May 1887. But when Pope made his first inspection visit in June 1887 he reported on the new buildings that:

(a) The front door does not fit the aperture; the wind has therefore very free entrance into the passage;
(b) The rain comes in below the two front windows and has already spoilt the parlour paper;

\textsuperscript{284} Ibid;
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(c) The cupboard in the front room is so badly finished that it allows a very strong draught to come into the parlour;
(d) The windows all fit the apertures badly;
(e) A pane of glass was broken before the tenant arrived…the fencing is a failure as the following diagram will show.287

Two years later the Teacher advised the Education Secretary that ‘This school has grown beyond expectations. There are desks for 30 and the attendance is 60. I propose to add a class-room’.288

In 1891, Inspector, H. Kirk, wrote of a new Native School recently built at Tiki Tiki that ‘The residence and fences ought never to have been passed by any Inspector of works’.289

In his report on Akuaku in 1893, Pope wrote that the buildings were ‘in a very bad condition’ and it would be ‘unfair to the pupils, the teachers and the Department if the present deplorable state of affairs were allowed to continue’.290

In 1906, the Head Teacher at Tuparoa, H. Broderick, had a burgeoning enrolment and wrote to the Secretary that lack of room in the school was hampering the work; in ‘one room three children having to sit in each desk which is not conducive to good discipline or good work’. He also described the ventilation of the rooms as very bad as only a small portion of the upper parts of windows opened and there was no other way for the entry of fresh air. He asked that consideration be given to enlarging the porch.291 He wrote again 11 months later, with enrolment now nearing 80 pupils and more arriving all the time, asking ‘cannot something be done to relieve the crowded state of the school’, pointing out that the teachers and children suffered from the bad ventilation, with the small room becoming unbearable by 2pm leading to him having to permit several children to lie on the grass for a while.292
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It took until July 1907 for the Secretary to write advising that the Department had decided to comply with the request from the people at Reporua for a school, and it appeared from the list of potential pupils they had submitted that twenty or so would move from Tuparoa, thereby making the need for any contemplated additions to Tuparoa not necessary.293

One might have expected problems of the kind described to become less prominent with the passage of time, but this was not the case. Below several significant and often long-lasting case studies of some of the difficulties which continued to characterise the system are discussed.

3.9.3 Tokomaru Bay

The District Health Officer reported visiting the Tokomaru Bay Native School in May 1908 after the female teacher had contracted enteric fever and was now in the Waiapu Hospital. He had found that ‘The urinal is badly constructed, having no drainage, and as a consequence the urine from the scholars soaks into the ground rendering it foul smelling and unsanitary’. The windows in the schoolroom were unhung and would not open, the school porch was 6ft by 10ft and there was ‘only one lavatory basin for the eighty scholars attending the school’. He recommended that ‘the urinal enclosure be enlarged, the urine being conveyed away by open pipes, the closets be placed in a more convenient position in the school grounds, their number be increased from two to four, the closets for the girls be properly enclosed from those for the boys, ten lavatory basins be supplied for the scholars on an enlarged porch, and the windows hung to allow ventilation’.294

Inspector Bird then advised the Education Secretary that he understood that several cases of typhoid fever had been contracted by Europeans in Tokomaru Bay who did not frequent the school, but the other matters certainly needed attending to.295 Over a year later the Maori Medical Officer of Health, Dr Pomare, reported visiting the
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Tokomaru District in connection with a recurring outbreak of typhoid, and in the course of his visit inspecting the Tokomaru Native School where he found that ‘thirty six foot of drain pipes and one gully trap are urgently required’. 296

It was to take 15 years from an initial request by the Tokomaru Bay Native School Committee in 1909 for a new classroom to be built because the conditions in the existing one were so bad, for the request to be met. The Committee regarded the old room, which was 40 years old, as draughty and so decayed that ‘it is not right to have little children sitting for hours in such a room during winter months’. A new tank was also needed because ‘during the dry months the children use and drink creek water which is very unwholesome.’ 297 One month later the Teacher submitted his own list of repairs needed to buildings and fences, and Inspector Bird advised the Education Secretary that there was a ‘real need’ for these as ‘a few chains away stands the “European School” of 20 or 30 children and ours-an important Native School of 85 children suffers very much by comparison as to appearance’. 298 Over three months later the Teacher informed the Secretary that he was ‘much disappointed at the delay in carrying out the needed repairs, not only because I spent many unpaid hours at night drawing up elaborate specifications in vain, but because this Native School, with its rusting roofs, unpainted appearance, decayed shelter-shed and tumble-down fences, stands in most marked and unfavourable contrast with the local Board School’. 299 Three and a half years later William Bird, now the Chief Inspector of Native Schools, reported on the condition of the building at the Tokomaru Bay Native School, it being the same one that had been built in 1872:

the ground plates and joints have sunk or decayed and the place is in generally bad condition. Birds have free access through the walls and make the place filthy. The Assistant tells me that in hot weather the stench is very bad. The skirting board on the other hand has parted with the floor and draughts come up through the gap all round. If the school is to be maintained at all the infant room certainly should be replaced …The matter is one that deserves the serious consideration of the Department. The Assistant (a very good teacher and ladylike
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person) informed me that she could not remain in such a room in summer.\footnote{300}

However in another example of the interminable delays characteristic of the system, it was not until three years after that that the Acting Secretary for Education requested the Under-Secretary for Public Works to ask his local district officer, when he was next in Tokomaru, to furnish a report on the state of a classroom at the Tokomaru Native School which was ‘in a very bad condition and should be replaced by a new room’, and another which ‘needs over-hauling and renovating’.\footnote{301} In a subsequent report on the condition of the buildings later in the same month Bird wrote: Foundation: ‘sunk’; Painting: ‘wretched’; Spouting: ‘poor’, and added that he had ‘previously ‘personally reported on the condition of these buildings. Several items were so bad that they had to be put in hand at once’.\footnote{302}

Yet incredibly, nearly three years later, nothing still appears to have been done, with Bird writing in a report on the state of the buildings that ‘The old building and the furniture gives me the impression that the Department itself considers that anything is good enough for a Maori school’.\footnote{303}

Three years after that the Chairman of the School Committee, Rawhiti Paerata, wrote to the Secretary requesting renovation of ‘a portion of the Native School which is in a very dilapidated condition’.\footnote{304} The Secretary informed him that the matter would be ‘looked into by the Inspector at his approaching visit which in all probability will take place within the course of a month or so’.\footnote{305}

In April 1923, the following year, the Head wrote to the Director pointing out that the ‘buildings were in such a bad state’ that he had himself got a builder to look over them and provide an estimate of the repairs needed.\footnote{306} In July 1923, the District Engineer advised that the Building Overseer had reported on the ‘considerable
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renovations’ required at Tokomaru: the veranda floor, joists and blocks were ‘beyond repair from the effects of water overflowing, the spouting through sagging of the veranda beam, caused by the decay of timbers in the foundation’. There were ‘no copper tubs or drainage attached to the wash-house’; windows required repairs and ‘the whole of the spouting around the main building will require to be taken down’. In the Infants classroom ‘the foundation under the floors have partly given way’, one of the main walls had ‘bulged out’, the flooring of the class-room ‘has shrunk in a large number of places, sufficient to see between the joints, which makes the class-room very draughty’ The infant building had ‘reached a stage that any repairs carried out would be of a temporary nature, as I consider the life of the building of a short duration’.307

In August the Director advised the Under–Secretary that a sum of £147 14s. had been approved for repairs to the school and asked him to have the work started as soon as possible.308 At his next visit the Inspector reported that the Committee was disappointed that the old room was not yet to be replaced by a modern building.309 It was not until January the following year that the Director was advised that a quotation for the work had been received and approval sought for it to begin.310

On 24 January 1924, both rooms of the school were burnt to the ground.311 When the school re-opened it was conducted in a temporary building.312 The police report on the fire included the comment that several residents had been ‘agitating for a new building for some time past, and were agitated that the building was to be repaired in lieu of a new school’. But it concluded after an investigation that included interviews with local people that it had not been possible to ‘gather any information as to how the fire really started’. However what the interview did reveal was the frustrations felt by residents over the 15 years during which they had requested that the buildings be improved, and the feelings of some of them that their children were not safe in them. The Chairman of the School Committee, Rawhiti Paerata, stated in
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evidence that ‘The school had been in a bad state of repair for years past. The roof was bent, and the wood eaten with wood bore…I am satisfied that the school was unsafe for the children. The Health Inspector from Waipiro Bay also inspected the school and told us that is was not safe or healthy owing to its decayed condition’. These comments were corroborated by other School Committee members, including Arero Pewhairangi and Whare Gerrard, and other residents such as Pea Collier and Richard Perter.\(^{313}\)

However the same pattern of delay now occurred in getting a new school built. This was despite a gift of £500 by East Coast Maori themselves towards its construction, which was accepted by the Government and is discussed more fully in the Chapter \textit{Maori Contribution to Education}. On 31 March 1924, the School Committee Secretary, Tamati Poata, wrote to the Director of Public Works asking, ‘when can we expect to have the school built?’\(^{314}\) On 1 May, he wrote again, this time to the Minister of Education, C. J. Parr, drawing to his attention ‘the predicament our children are placed in not having the school erected before the mid winter, and requesting that it be erected ‘at the earliest opportunity.’\(^{315}\) However it took until 19 June for the Director of Education to request the Public Works Department to proceed with the working plans and specifications in connection with the erection of a new school, when he also pointed out that ‘the local donation of £500 has now been paid into the Public Account’.\(^{316}\) A tender for the work was finally accepted in late August.\(^{317}\)

However by 1937 the overcrowding at Tokomaru Bay had become so serious that new entrants who were ready to be enrolled were being turned away with the Director, in recommending to the Minister that a new classroom be built, advising him that ‘the teachers have had to refuse to admit five-year-old pupils on account of the overcrowded conditions’, and the second assistant had been ‘teaching classes in a
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nearby Maori dining hall which is not a suitable environment but is justifiable only on account of the congestion at the school.\textsuperscript{318}

Other conditions at the school were also unsatisfactory. The toilets were described by an architect in November 1937 as ‘in a very dilapidated condition’, having earlier been condemned by the Medical Office of Health. In April 1938 a grant of £208 was approved ‘for new outhouses on the Fijian pit system’. But a suggestion was subsequently made that a permanent water supply and a septic tank system of drainage should be provided, with the Committee having expressed its willingness to contribute £40 towards this amenity. However nothing happened, and in June 1940 the Director described the toilets as ‘seriously inadequate (only four compartments in all)’ for the 170 pupils enrolled. A plan had now been submitted for new toilets, a permanent water supply and septic tanks, with the Committee’s offer of £40 included in the costings. With reference to the toilets, the Director accepted the Head’s recommendation that separate compartments should also be provided for the staff which now totalled 4 women and two men.\textsuperscript{319}

In December 1940 the School’s Secretary, the Rev. W. Puha, wrote to the Minister advising him that the Committee had passed a resolution requesting action in relation to the outhouses and water supply and also the new craft building, tenders for which had closed weeks ago. He pointed out that the Committee had been waiting for the completion of the jobs ‘for a considerable time and also that our share of the cash had been paid in over two years ago’.\textsuperscript{320}

Over six years later, on 12 February 1947, the Rev. Puha, wrote to the Hon. E. T. Tirikatene, following up an earlier telegram, about ‘our urgent need for school buildings’, and invited the Prime Minister and Minister of Education to accompany him and Mr Omana MP to Tokomaru Bay ‘to investigate our claims’. He first outlined the existing buildings, which consisted of two open-air and two older type classrooms plus a former board school building of two classrooms and one corridor which was situated approximately four hundred yards from the Native School. Its
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location so far away from the rest of the school had been a source of complaint by successive Head Teachers for a number of years. He then outlined the defects, some of which the Committee had been complaining about for years. These included:

- Defects in main building block classrooms used to accommodate 145 children and five teachers;
- Two older type classrooms: lighting poor; interior conditions poor; leakage during rain rendering dampness for some days; hand-basins insufficient;
- Two open-air classrooms: blackboard space poor; cupboards inadequate; cloakroom space poor; hand-basins insufficient; no shelter sheds; no facilities for washing of towels; no craft buildings for teaching of cookery and woodwork; insufficient storage space; no permanent water supply for the whole school;
- Defects in old board school buildings accommodating one hundred children and three teachers;
- Flooding during wet weather (the reason why the Hawke’s Bay Education Board had abandoned the buildings about eight years previously); sanitation primitive; water supply insufficient; drainage defective; buildings and grounds ‘present a sorry and dilapidated spectacle, not good enough for the Pakeha so why should our Maori children be subjected to such conditions’, and;
- Hand-basins nil; washing facilities for towels etc nil; insufficient blackboard; ‘from a health point of view the conditions are deplorable’.  

After making the argument for consolidation of all the buildings on one site the Rev. Puha concluded that ‘Surely our school is one of the largest in the native service and for that reason we should have something of which we could feel justly proud’.  

The Chairman and Secretary of the School Committee reinforced these points and added others when the Minister of Education visited Tokomaru Bay in March 1947. The Chairman, W.K. Ryland, pointed out that the parents were fearful of losing the Headmaster and his assistants due to the conditions at the school. The Rev. Puha told
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the Minister he was sorry it was not raining because then he would have ‘seen for himself the conditions under which the children and teachers existed. Some of them had to sit in the corridors with wet clothes hanging all around. Rooms leaked badly and the children sat huddled together’. The old school building down the road was ‘beyond repair and had been abandoned by the pakeha children some eight years ago. At present the Maori children were marched up the road each day to classes there and he considered that if it was not good enough for the pakeha children then it was not good enough for the Maori children.’ The war had previously been given as the reason for not building earlier, and this was the reason why the old Education Board building had continued to be used, but the war had now been over for two years and it was not fair to the children that they should remain any longer than was absolutely necessary in that building. He had learned that ‘only nine children from the school went onto secondary education’, and considered that the school should be included in a scheme for higher secondary and technical education.

The Minister of Education subsequently advised Tirikatene that ‘the poor conditions are admitted’, and plans were being made for resolving the difficulties, although the ‘works at Tokomaru Bay have also to be considered in relation to others in that area, and some are even more urgent. The needs of Tokomaru Bay, however, will be fully considered at the earliest possible moment’.

An Inspector of Native Schools, A. E. Golding, reported to the Director in May 1947 on an inspection visit he had made to the school on 26 March. Two hundred and forty pupils were now enrolled at the school, 105 of them being accommodated in the old building, and there was ‘an urgent need for new classrooms’. The buildings on the old site ‘were condemned some years ago. The site of about one acre is subject to flooding, and after rain the environs are under water and, although the grounds are not used as a playing area, the dirty condition of the grounds after a heavy rain is most unhygienic’. The ‘lavatory accommodation is hopelessly inadequate and the site being near the main road is used by the general public. One pan only is available for 52 boys and two pans for 54 girls’. He concluded by making recommendations for
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development, including the need to acquire some further land adjacent to the school to consolidate all buildings on the one site.\footnote{325 Inspector to Director, 12 May 1947. Ibid. DB.}

However overcrowding persisted through 1948 when the roll had reached 250, making the school the sixth largest Maori School.\footnote{326 Inspection Report, Tokomaru Bay, 28th May 1948. BAAA 1001/1061a. ANZ-A. DB.} By 1949 two new classrooms had been built to ease the overcrowding, but the old school building was still separate from the main school and remained in use.

### 3.9.4 Whareponga

It took 32 years from the initial request by the School Committee of the Whareponga Native School for the re-building of a suspension bridge which was needed across a creek which the children had to cross to attend the school, but which regularly flooded, impeding their attendance and risking their safety. Many hundreds if not thousands of school hours would have been lost by the Maori children of this district over this period as a result of the delay in dealing with the problem.

The original bridge had been paid for and built solely by the local residents of Whangara They had already rebuilt the bridge once after flooding, but it had come down again in another flood, and this time they appealed to the Department for a small grant for the materials, while they would again provide the labour. The matter dragged on for over a year, during which time the Maori children continued to lose many school days.

The Chairman of the Whareponga School Committee, Anaru Ngamu, wrote to the Department on 5 February 1916, advising that the timber on the bridge which the children crossed to attend the school had rotted and was no longer serviceable for the purpose of crossing. If the Government agreed to pay for the necessary timber and nails to repair it, which he estimated would cost £1, the committee would undertake to
do the work. In a hand written note on the file the Inspector, J. Porteous, had written, ‘I recommend that the amount asked for be authorized’.  

However on 21 March, the Teacher, F. Woodley, advised that as the result of a flood the bridge had ‘been entirely washed away’, and an official advised him to report on the ‘lowest sum for which repairs can be affected and what assistance the Committee was prepared to give in replacing bridge’. On 5 April the Teacher confirmed that the committee would re-erect the bridge if the department would refund the cost of the material. One month later the Secretary raised with the Teacher his attendance returns, which showed that the school had been closed on 20 and 21 March due to floods. He presumed that meant that no children had put in an appearance on those days, and reminded the Teacher that a school must remain open if only one child attended. The Teacher responded that on the days referred to, owing to the floods, it was ‘quite impossible for the children to cross. On the Monday one could not get across on horseback and even on the Tuesday it was exceedingly dangerous. We were, practically speaking, an island. On the 11th and 12th inst. the creeks were again flooded to nearly the same extent… no children were able to cross… On the 15th inst. only the bigger children were able to attend—their parents however were very unwilling to let them attend… I am afraid the creeks will continue to be a source of inconvenience until the bridge is erected’.

It was not until five months later, on 25 October, that Inspector Porteous after visiting the school reported the background to the Education Secretary. He advised him that the bridge had originally been built by local effort, and when washed away had been rebuilt a second time by local effort. On the third occasion the Committee had requested the Department to pay the costs of the timber and nails, while it would still provide the labour. He reminded the Secretary that the bridge was the only means of access to the school grounds, and recommended that the Department should pay for the materials. The Director then advised the Minister that the residents had ‘twice
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erected a bridge at their own cost. The bridge is entirely for the use of the school’. He pointed out that ‘the residents have again given all the labour. It would be unfair to expect them to give material a third time. Recommended that the expenditure be authorised’.333

However there was then further delay, the Director writing to a newly appointed Teacher, M. McFarlane, four months later on 27 February 1917, requesting him to consult with the School Committee with a view to placing before the Department ‘some definite proposal for restoring the footbridge’, and whether a bridge could be built which would be less liable to damage through floods than those previously built.334 However by the end of March 1917 the Whareponga School Committee, frustrated by the delay, and the seriousness of not having a bridge for the children, now offered ‘to construct a new foot bridge at their own expense’ 335

But no further action appears to have been taken. Twenty one years later, in February 1938, the Head Teacher, now V. Pickens, advised the Director that flood waters had damaged the school property, resulting in the shelter-shed being in an unsafe position, and something needed to be done to direct the force of the water from any future floods from wearing away the portion of the school ground where the shed and gardens were situated.336 He wrote again on 27 March, two months later, pointing out that he had received no reply about his warning, and further damage caused in the past weekend by a new flood was therefore not the result of neglect of duty on his part. The result was that ‘half the school flower gardens, a row of pines, a row of lawsonianas, and all the ground between the shed and the creek has been removed’. It would require only one more flood to ‘completely undermine the shelter shed and send it toppling into the water’ as ‘the last flood removed 6 to 8ft of ground’ The work required urgent attention and he asked whether his earlier letter had been received and whether anything was going to be done to avoid further damage.337 Still receiving no reply, his frustration was reflected in him then taking the unusual step for a teacher of writing directly to the Minister of Education, pointing out that it was
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unfortunate he had not come to the school during a recent visit to the East Coast and seen the damage caused to the school property by floods. He added that ‘The Department of which you are in charge has failed badly to attend to many things in connection with this school and has been guilty of the gross discourtesy of not even replying to urgent correspondence’, and detailed the nature of the problem and the need for urgent action to be taken.338

It took another five months before the Director wrote to the Head of the Public Works Department requesting him to arrange for the District Engineer at Gisborne to draw up a report with estimates for carrying out the remedial work.339 In February 1939 the Director advised the Minister that measures to protect the property from further flood damage were estimated at £104.14.0 and recommended that he approve the expenditure.340

It was now almost twenty three years since the Head Teacher had first reported the seriousness of the situation, but no action still appears to have been taken. The need for the bridge was still being raised in 1940 and for the same reasons; the attendance and safety of the children. In October 1940 the Headmaster, now A.H. Norrie, wrote to the Director pointing out that during the last visit of the Inspector he had discussed with him the necessity of having a footbridge over the stream through which all the Maori children ‘must wade in order to reach the school’, which was ‘subject to rapid changes of depth even when only light rain has fallen. Frequently it is so dangerous that only the bigger children are able to cross in order to attend school’, and he had been advised by the Public Works Engineer that a suitable suspension bridge could be built for about £25.341 However the Director thought that before consideration was given to bridging the stream it might be advisable to await the result of erosion prevention work in order that the future course of the stream might be known, and he requested that the matter be referred to the District Engineer for comment.342 The District Engineer reported that although it might be possible to provide a foot-bridge
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across the stream, a definite decision should be deferred until such time as ‘the effect of the proposed groynes can be observed over the winter period’. 343

But still no action appears to have been taken. *Eight years later, in November 1948*, the District Engineer being advised that at Whareponga: ‘There is a stream just outside the above school which the children must ford in going to and coming from school. In wet weather the stream rises very rapidly and it has been necessary to station a pupil to watch it during rainstorms to prevent the children from being marooned at school. On numerous occasions when the stream has been rising, it was necessary to send all the children to their homes.* 344 The District Engineer was requested to investigate the feasibility and cost of erecting a swing foot bridge over the stream, and as it was assumed the crossing was on public property, to advise as to which body would normally bear the cost of erecting such a bridge. 345

The outcome was that a swing bridge was finally built by the Waiapu County Council and paid for by the Department of Education during 1949. *This was 33 years after the Whareponga Teacher had first raised the need for a bridge to facilitate the attendance and protect the safety of children at the school during the regular flooding of the stream. During that time many hundreds if not thousands of hours of schooling by the Maori children in the Whareponga district had been lost.*

This can therefore be viewed as yet another example of the delays characteristic of the centralised control of the Native Schools from Wellington, and the sort of ‘out of sight out of mind’ attitude that commonly seemed to prevail amongst officials, even when as here it came to dealing with a serious local problem affecting a school and its pupils. I find it inconceivable that a delay of this length of time in relation to such a serious matter would have been tolerated by the Hawke’s Bay Education Board, or the Pakeha parents whose children were its main clients.

343 District Engineer to Director, 31 December 1940. Ibid. DB.
344 District Administrative Officer to District Engineer, 22 November 1948. BAAA 1001/765a 44/4. ANZ-A. DB.
345 Ibid;
A second example, also involving Whareponga, is described below, this being the four years it took to provide an urgently needed permanent water supply to the School. On 4 October 1940, the Whareponga Head Teacher forwarded the Director a plan for a water scheme for the school which had been discussed with the architects and the Inspectors, and he requested that the necessary materials be sent before or during December to be ready for the start of the new teaching year. On 11 October, the Director forwarded the Head’s request to the Hawke’s Bay Education Board at Napier requesting the Board’s Architect to furnish him with an estimate of the cost of the items so they could be made available to the Head during December. The events which followed are listed below.

- 18 November 1940; Receiving no reply he wrote again.

- 10 December 1940; the Head wrote to the Director of Education highlighting reasons for the need for a permanent water supply to be installed: the school tank was now empty, and the pupils had to go to the teacher’s residence for drinking water. He requested that piping etc be provided as early as possible in the holidays so the installation could be completed before the start of the 1941 school year.

- 18 December 1940; the Director informed the Head that owing to pressure of work the Hawke’s Bay Education Board’s Architect had been unable to deal with the matter, and he had consequently communicated with the Native Department to see if it could make the materials available and possibly also assist with the work.

- 6 March 1941; with nothing having happened, the Head informed the Director that the school tanks were once again empty. And as the tanks at the residence were also nearly empty the children were ‘having to carry drinking water from

---

346 Head Teacher to Director, 4 October 1940. BAAA 1001/764b. ANZ.-A. DB.
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348 Director to Secretary, 18 November 1940. Ibid. DB.
349 Head, A. Norrie, to Director, 10 December 1940. Ibid. DB.
350 Director to Head Teacher, 18 December 1940. Ibid. DB.
a neighbouring stream’ which was ‘not a very satisfactory source of supply’.  

- 28 March 1941; the Director informed the Head that the Health Department had advised him the ‘bacterial examination made of the water from the spring, which it is proposed to use, resulted in it being found unsuitable for drinking purposes’, being ‘possibly subject to vegetable and animal pollution’; he asked the Head to arrange for the spring to be cleaned and temporarily fenced to keep out animals after which another sample would be taken.

- 7 August 1941; the Director advised the Director General of Health that the Head had completed the cleaning and fencing, and he would like to be informed of the results of further tests he understood had been carried out by the Medical Office of Health, Gisborne.

- 9 September 1941; the Director informed the Head that the tests had proved satisfactory; he would now communicate with the Native Department as to whether it was yet in a position to provide an estimate of the costs of the installation.

- 19 November 1941; the Director informed the Head that he is still waiting for advice from the Native Department on the matter.

- 2 March 1942; the Head asks the Director what progress has been made concerning the water supply. The matter was becoming urgent as the school tank now had a large hole about half way down and one of the house tanks was in a similar position.

351 Head to Director, 6 March 1941. Ibid. DB.
352 Director to Head, 28 March 1941. Ibid. DB.
353 Director to Director General, 7 August 1941. Ibid. DB.
354 Director to Head, 9 September 1941. Ibid. DB.
355 Director to Head, 19 November, 1941. Ibid. DB.
356 Head to Director, 2 March 1942. Ibid. DB.
• 19 March 1942; the Under Secretary of the Native Department advised the Director that ‘the most that we could do would be to get a subsidy and find labour to carry out the work’ with the Department supplying the materials.357

• 27 March 1942; the Head replied that it was impossible to obtain the supply of water-piping at the present time ‘and I am afraid it will be necessary therefore to hold over the question of installing a permanent supply at the above school. I am arranging for new tanks to be provided at the school to meet the immediate requirements’.358

• 27 March 1942; the Director informed the Head of this and requested him to secure a quotation for the supply of the new tanks.359

• 24 September 1942; the Head advises that he has been unable to secure a local quote but if the tanks could be sent he could arrange for local installation.360

• 6 November 1944; the Director advised the Board Secretary that the matter of the water supply has been revived by a new Head Teacher who asked whether the Department would be agreeable, if pipes could be procured and the Department provided the other materials, for her husband to undertake the work of installation.361

• 28 February 1945; the Director advised the Head that the Hawke’s Bay Board had been authorised to arrange for the supply to the school of the materials needed for installation of the proposed permanent water supply and he had no doubt that her husband would still wish to proceed with the installation with the help and advice of the local Health Officer.362

357 Under Secretary to Director, 19 March 1942. Ibid. DB.
358 Director to Under-Secretary, 27 March 1942. Ibid. DB.
359 Director to Head, 27 March 1942. Ibid. DB.
360 Head to Director, 24 September 1942. Ibid. DB.
361 Director to Secretary, 6 November 1944. Ibid. DB.
362 Director to Head, 28 February 1945. Ibid. DB.
But sixteen years after this a report on the school concluded that it was ‘very old having been built about 1890 and is in very poor order: It has poor Fiji pit toilets; Poor spring water supply; No concrete area and no paths; Poor fencing; Access to garage is through school grounds. May I suggest you consider the desirability of trying to close the school and take the children by bus to Hiruharama’.363

This poor physical condition of the school was one of the factors in it subsequently being closed and consolidated on Hiruharama in 1962.364

363 Secretary Manager, Hawke’s Bay Board, to Education Department, 16 June 1961. Ibid. DB.
364 BAAA 1001/764a. ANZ-A. DB.
3.9.5 Mangatuna

At the Mangatuna Native School Inspector Porteous reported in 1915 that:

The schoolroom measures as far as I could judge 24 x 20; accommodation for 40 pupils. Today it was overcrowded there being 52 present. The conditions under which teaching is carried on are very trying. I am afraid there are 6 or 8 more children ready for school, but there is no room. I see no other alternative to adding another room to accommodate 25-30 children. The whole matter might however be allowed to stand over until the examination is over. Mr Bird will be at Mangatuna in six or eight week’s time.365

When Bird visited the addition was approved, with him asking the School Committee Chairman what the possibility was of getting the timber locally. However no progress was made, and on 6 September the Head, W. Scammell, wrote to the Secretary regarding enquiries he himself had made locally.366 On 27 October 1915, the Secretary advised that the plans for the additions appeared quite satisfactory ‘except that there appeared to be no provision for outbuildings and for school furniture’.367

On 17 January Scammell wrote to the Secretary again advising that he understood from the builder that he would begin work on the new building the following week, pointing out that conducting school while the work was going on would be impossible, and requesting permission to delay opening the school until the work was finished. Officials were not sympathetic, a file note suggesting that suitable subjects could be held in the open-air if no building was available.368 Although a telegram from Scammell on 29 January suggested it was impossible to open the school under the conditions, the Department remained adamant that he do so, repeating the suggestion for holding outside classes outside.369

---

365 Inspector Porteous to Secretary, 1 June 1915. BAAA 1001/348a. ANZ-A. DB.
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368 Scammell to Secretary, 17 January 1916. Ibid. DB.
369 Secretary to Scammell, 8 February 1916. Ibid. DB.
Despite Scammell’s continued objections, including the effects the previous year’s overcrowding had had on the health of both he and his wife, and the intolerable conditions which would be created in the existing classroom when the builder worked in it to put in a new roof, he advised the Secretary that he had opened the school at the usual time.\footnote{Scammell to Secretary, 3 February 1916. Ibid. DB.}

\subsection*{3.9.6 Hiruharama}

In August 1925 the Head of the Hiruharama Native School reminded the Director that ‘the matter of an additional school-room has been under review since March 1923, since when the attendance has steadily increased’. But for the provision of temporary accommodation for 27 Standard pupils ‘in the new workshop, the most objectionable over-crowding of three in a seat, as before, would have been inevitable’. There were ‘strong reasons’ for another large classroom for the Infant Department, ‘fitted up on modern lines’, and for the small room to be utilised as a cloak room, the existing porch being quite inadequate.\footnote{Head, E. Miller, to Director, 1 August 1925. BAAA 1001/247a. ANZ-A. DB.}

When he visited soon after Inspector J. Porteous confirmed that the school was ‘uncomfortably overcrowded and additional accommodation is necessary’. The parents, who had contributed the workshop themselves, were unhappy at it being used as a temporary classroom, and the Chairman, ‘who takes an enthusiastic interest in the school made a request for more accommodation as a good many children are ready for admission. The matter is urgent’.\footnote{Inspector to Director, 31 August 1925. Ibid. DB.}

Porteous sent a lengthy memorandum to the Director one month later outlining the seriousness of the situation:

\begin{quote}
The accommodation at this school has been overtaxed during the past two years...Repeated requests for increased accommodation were made, but it was considered that careful inquiry was necessary and that time was necessary to establish the stability of the attendance. There is
\end{quote}
ample evidence now that an overall number of between 90 and 100 is likely to be maintained. A large number of children are coming on and it has been found necessary on account of the lack of space to refuse admission to children between 5 and 6 years of age. For some time past some relief has been obtained from the use of the workshop which the people erected, but the arrangement is a very unsatisfactory one. The workshop has in a large measure been diverted from its intended use, and the people are naturally protesting against the commandeering of the workshop for use as a permanent schoolroom.373

The need to refuse admission to children between five and six years of age should be noted.

Although a second classroom was built and in operation by May 1926, increasing enrolments meant that by early 1929 a further classroom was required and this was recommended.374 But in the meantime the workshop was again being used as a classroom because of overcrowding, there was no possibility of it being heated, and during a gale a loose roof had meant ‘rain pours through it in many places making it very damp, cold, and exceedingly uncomfortable. Both teacher and children get chilled through’.375

By July there were 68 children in the Infant Department and seating accommodation for 52. Standards 1 and 2 were being taught in the workshop and were three desks short, and ‘In addition there are roughly fifteen infants of school age in the pa. Twelve dual desks would relieve the present position’.376

The Chairman of the School Committee, Pakanui Nihoniho, also wrote to the Minister in July, pointing out that 123 children were now enrolled and the two classrooms were overcrowded. He had been collecting the names of the children who were five and the total had reached 14, but the children from Te Pahou were not included and if they did come there would not be any room for them. Therefore ‘I appeal to you in the hope that the Government will be awakened from its sleep since we have been

373 Inspector to Director, 29 September 1925. Ibid. DB.
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375 Teacher to Director, 28 May 1929. Ibid. DB.
376 Head to Director, 29 July 1929. Ibid. DB.
waiting for such a long time. *I am very anxious that these matters be attended to as soon as possible, as these children are entitled to be educated at this school*. 377

In August the Cabinet approved finance for an additional classroom, at which point this particular file closes. 378 However overcrowding persisted at Hiruharama because nearly ten years later, in March 1938, there were 76 children in the Infant Department, leading to a proposal to provide two new classrooms. 379

3.9.7 Anaura Bay

Wartime conditions were sometimes given as a factor contributing to delay, as happened at the Anaura Bay Native School in 1944. In April of that year the Anaura Bay School Committee requested the Department to increase the school’s accommodation. The sole classroom was currently occupied by 25 Standard pupils, leaving no room for the 18 Primers, with a further 16 children approaching school age. The teachers were:

> doing their best by teaching the primers in the play-shed when the weather is suitable, and in the corridor of the school at other times. This is not always a very satisfactory arrangement owing to the lack of appliances such as desks, chairs, blackboards etc. With the approach of winter, it is deemed a matter of urgency that something should be done, and the Committee hopes that the Department will be able to provide an Infant room at the school. 380

The Director acknowledged the overcrowding and promised that if the roll was maintained consideration would be given to the erection of a new classroom as soon as circumstances permitted, but with existing difficulties with regard to labour and materials it would be impossible for this to be done before the winter. 381

377 Chairman to Minister, 23 July 1929. Ibid. DB.
378 Minister to the Hon. Sir Apirana Ngata, 7 August 1929. Ibid. DB.
379 Director to Minister, 11 March 1938. BAAA 1001/247b. ANZ-A. DB.
380 Secretary, H.Gordon, to Director, 20th April, 1944. BAAA 1001/231a. ANZ-A. DB.
381 Director to Head, 27 April 1944. Ibid. DB.
In his reply the Head presented the result of a survey showing the number of potential pupils, highlighted again the unsatisfactory conditions where ‘Mrs Armstrong has to teach 19 infants amongst the coats and towels in the porch with the standard pupils interrupting the work every time they go outside’, and presented a lengthy list of necessary materials the school was deficient in.382

In March 1945 the Director advised the Minister of Education that the overcrowding justified an additional classroom and he recommended accordingly.383 A tender was received in October 1945 and was accepted, but seven months later, in May 1946, with the war now well over, no further action occurred, and with the overcrowding still existing the Head advised the Director that:

The Maori people of this district, concerned at the prevalence of sickness among their children, request that official action be taken to hasten the erection of the new classroom at this school. With the approach of winter teaching conditions have become intolerable: 15 primers and their teacher are confined to a damp and draughty porch where the only source of warmth is an evil smelling and totally ineffective kerosene stove; the 26 standard pupils are obliged to work in a room where none of the outsider windows function, the window cords having long broken since. It is no wonder that under these conditions the health of both children and teachers has suffered during the past weeks.384

He added that he realised that the responsibility now lay with the contractor, but the reason originally given of shortage of materials as the reason for the delay was now ‘wearing very thin’.385

Eight months later a further reason for the continuing delay was given; regulations made it necessary for the builder to use Oregon for scantling and a substitute for weatherboard, which escalated the original tender price by £192.386 In February a recommendation went to Cabinet for this extra sum to be approved.387
Seven months later, in September 1947, advice was received that the Contractor had delivered several loads of timber to the school ‘in readiness for making a start with the additions’, and an assurance had been given that ‘the carpenters will be on the job shortly and the work completed before the end of the year’.  

However the School Committee now petitioned the Department, expressing ‘extreme dissatisfaction with the lack of progress made with the erection of the new classroom at the school’, noted that the contract for the work had been signed in December 1945, there had been an understanding that the work would be completed within ten weeks of the acceptance of the contract, and again drew attention to the effect of the lack of progress on the health of the younger children.

The file closed at this point.

3.9.8 Mangatuna

In May 1916 a flash flood led to five feet of water going through the Mangatuna Native School which forced the teachers to live elsewhere due to severe damage to their residence. The damage was so bad and the clean-up required so extensive that the school remained closed for the next six weeks, it not being until 17 June 1916, that the Head advised the Department that he would ‘reopen the school on Monday next for standards and primer three others as soon as possible’. But it was not until 3 July that Primer 2 resumed and P1 would do so ‘in a few days’.  

Fixing the situation had required a visit by the Public Works Officer and he recommended that the teacher’s residence be moved to a site away from the school. But the Teacher was informed that this would require the visit of an Inspector from Wellington ‘and the only course open was to wait until Mr Bird had an opportunity of seeing into the matter personally and of advising what should be done You may rest

---
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assured that there will be no unnecessary delay in dealing with Mr Bird’s report when it comes to hand’. (Author emphasis). 392

However the poor choice of site for the school and residence meant both were subject to further flooding resulting in lengthy further closings, meaning children spent lengthy other periods out of school. The Department finally decided, in 1918, to move the buildings to a better site, the Senior Native School Inspector, John Porteous, recommending in July 1918 that ‘having regard to the time lost by the children (2½ months lately) the second term holidays of one week of September should be foregone’. 393

Conditions at the Mangatuna (now Maori) School in 1955 reflected the long-term persistence of the difficulties described, despite the administration of the Maori Schools having been moved from the central office of the Department in Wellington to its regional office in Newmarket Auckland, in 1948. The Medical Officer of Health reported visiting the school in 1955 and finding it to be ‘a very old school and the conditions of the buildings is becoming very unsatisfactory….I should recommend that this school be visited by your Departmental building experts in the near future’. His report noted:


At a meeting of the School Committee and Householders on 29 May a proposal was carried unanimously ‘that a strong complaint be lodged with the Department about the conditions of the school buildings’, with a list attached of the most serious complaints. 395

392 Director to Scammell, 5 July 1916. Ibid. DB.
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One year later an Inspector of Maori Schools, H. B. Holst, reported after a visit to the school that he had found in both class-rooms:

the light extremely dull-too dull in my opinion for children to work without undue strain to their eyesight. In spite of large open fires in both rooms the temperature at the back of the rooms was extremely cold. Both chimneys smoked badly when the wind blew. The blackboard space in the senior room was inadequate. The assistant teacher Mrs Macpherson is compelled to store most of her valuable teaching material at the residence owing to lack of storage space in the school buildings. The infant room is very badly placed for the sun. I understand that some remodelling is contemplated. The building is extremely old, and in my opinion is not worth remodelling on an extensive scale to bring it up to standard. Conditions have not changed at Mangatuna since I left there in 1948 after spending 4½ years as Head Teacher. They were the worst teaching conditions I experienced during my career and resulted in almost continuous colds in the winter for pupils and teachers alike. I would urge that the decision not to replace these buildings this year be reconsidered.396

Various proposals were made for re-building the school and relocating it to a site closer to the main population. But a further 15 months elapsed before the Head was informed that it would not be possible to proceed with any replacement of the school because of very heavy commitments for extra classrooms elsewhere, especially for post-primary education, but the claims for a new school would be considered when the 1958/9 building programme was being prepared.397

One year later, in September 1958, the Senior Inspector of Maori Schools and Maori Schools Officer met parents at Mangatuna to discuss their request for the school to be moved to a new site by the meeting house. However, Departmental officials remained adamant that it should be rebuilt on its existing site, and according to their account of the meeting, the people, ‘rather than delay building operations…accepted unanimously’.398

396 Holst Report to Department, 1 June 1956. Ibid. DB.
397 District Administrative Officer to Head, 24 September 1957. Ibid. DB.
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3.9.9 Waiomatatini

At the Waiomatatini Native School intolerable conditions for teaching and learning persisted for over three years in the period 1908-1911 because of the apparent inability of the Department and its Inspectors to resolve matters.

In August 1908 the Inspector reported that nothing had been done with respect to repairs ‘which are urgently needed and were recommended many months ago’, the Contractor having undertaken other work at Reporua. The repairs included those to a classroom and blackboards, the latter being ‘quite unfit for use’. On another visit ten months later the Inspector described the small classroom as being ‘about 19 x 8½ feet’ with ‘congestion in the room there being present in it 27 children in it’ with the crowded desks ‘too high for the small children’.

Twelve months later the Inspector wrote that: ‘It seems to me that the Department cannot wait longer for the alterations to the desks in the infant room’. Nine months after that A. T. Ngata wrote to the Minister of Education with an accompanying letter from his father, Chairman of the Waiomatatini School Committee, asking for an extension to the school building to improve the accommodation for the younger children because the existing room was too small and very uncomfortable both in the hot weather and winter and was crowded.

On his next visit two months later the Inspector described the infant teacher as ‘working under conditions that must be harmful both to the teacher and the pupils’. It appears as though the necessary alterations had taken place before the start of the 1912 teaching year.

---
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3.9.10 Whakawhitira

It took over three years for serious overcrowding at the Whakawhitira Native School during the 1930s to be remedied. In November 1935 the Chairman of the School Committee, Wetini Haerewa wrote to the Hon A. Ngata that overcrowding of the single classroom had led to children having to be taught in a small corridor in which ‘it is almost impossible for the teacher to walk or turn when it is occupied by the scholars’. The Inspectors had been informed and had advised that they had requested the Department to provide an additional classroom.\(^{404}\)

Seven months later the Head Teacher appealed directly to the Director for extra accommodation, pointing out that 22 out of the 44 children enrolled were in the infants ‘and sit in a porch measuring approx 5’ x 20’. There is barely move to move and in some cases there are three in a seat. This room receives no sunshine and has no blackboard or room for activities’.\(^{405}\)

The Head continued to press the Department for action, and in March 1938 the Director advised him that the position for a new classroom would be considered by the Senior Inspector when he returned to Wellington at the end of the month. But he reminded him that no grant had yet been approved for its building (author’s emphasis).\(^{406}\) Three months later when the Minister of Education Peter Fraser visited the School, he was informed that overcrowding had existed for 18 months, with some of the children being taught in a cloakroom, and of the history of attempts to get action by Departmental officials, and he said he would look into the matter.\(^{407}\) The Chairman of the School Committee wrote to the Minister on 28 July pointing out that 50 children were attending the school, and 14 of them sat in the porch which ‘has no sunshine or fire. This winter is very cold and wet, and we think it is very unfair that the teachers should have to teach under such conditions’.\(^{408}\)

\(^{404}\) Chairman to Ngata, 16 November 1935. BAAA 1001/740a, 44/4. ANZ-A. DB.
\(^{405}\) Head to Director, 24 June 1936. Ibid. DB.
\(^{406}\) Director to Head Teacher, 16 March 1938. Ibid. DB.
\(^{407}\) Report of visit by Minister of Education, 8 June 1938. Ibid.
\(^{408}\) Chairman to Minister, 28 July 1938. Ibid. DB.
Finally, in December 1938, the Director advised the Head that a tender for the provision of additional accommodation had been let.409

3.9.11 Anaura Bay

At the Anaura Bay Native School in 1936, after additional land was acquired for the school, the teacher asked the Director whether favourable consideration could be given to erecting a school residence. He described his current living quarters as:

rather unimpressive and dingy. The window of the room is 2ft by 2ft.6in. and the door posts are so warped that a long stream of water crosses the floor diagonally whenever the rain comes from the sea side.. Faded, torn and stained wall-paper complete the picture.

About a month ago, the veranda collapsed owing to rotting posts and a howling gale….There are no facilities in the way of obtaining hot water, a clean bath or a grimeless wash copper…Maori residents, five in number, are being newly erected by the Tairawhiti Land Board and I would not like to be less fortunately placed than other residents.410

3.9.12 Other Examples

In the section below I present shorter examples of some of the difficulties experienced:

In 1935 the Inspector reported that at Potaka Native School at the beginning of the year the instruction had been being given in part of a cow shed, but a fine new school had now been built in a good position.411

When a new Teacher arrived at the Waiomatatini Native School in 1936 he found a roll of 97 and conditions ‘very overcrowded. There are 59 in the Primer classes, 22 of whom have no seats and have to be accommodated on boxes in the porch, shelter-

409 Director to Head, 2 December 1938. Ibid. DB.
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411 Inspection Report, Potaka 11 September 1935. ABDJ Acc3568 33f, ANZ-W. DB.
shed or under the trees according to the state of the weather. There are practically no blackboards.412

At the Horoera Maori School in 1952 ‘Accommodation is totally inadequate, with the standard classes in the class-room and the primers in the porch’.413

In 1948, finally realizing that so many Maori schools were too far away to have local demands and problems met effectively from Wellington, the Department of Education established a regional office in Auckland. But the records show that the new administrative arrangement by no means ended delays in meeting urgent educational requirements on the East Coast, not least because Auckland was no closer to it than Wellington. Problems which continued at Tokomaru Bay from 1951 provide one example of this.

In 1951, by which time Tokomaru Bay had become a Maori District High School, the old building was still in use, now for woodwork instruction, and the Headmaster, desperate for space because the possibility seemed ‘remote’ for a permanent secondary block accommodating home-craft and woodwork facilities for pupils enrolled in these subjects for School Certificate, suggested to the Department that it might be converted for this purpose. But he was advised that funds were not available.414 A report on the school in November 1952 described the ‘lavatories and various outbuildings’ of the old school as ‘not only in a very advanced state of disrepair but are being used by all and sundry as public conveniences. In fact conditions are so bad that immediate action should be taken to have the building demolished’.415

Still no action was taken. On the 14th of January 1953 an Education Department official reported that ‘the lavatories of the old Tokomaru Bay School are completely dilapidated and at present are being used as public conveniences. Conditions are said to be so bad that a serious menace to the health of children using other buildings
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nearby exists. The single classroom building on the same site is apparently in the same condition’.416

3.9.13 Other Problems

In 1951 the Department of Education had to call on the Department of Maori Affairs in Wellington to assist with the serious backload of urgently needed development and repairs to a significant number of East Coast Maori schools. In March that year the Department’s District Administrative Officer, based in Auckland, set out for the Assistant Under-Secretary of Maori Affairs in Wellington, the ‘essential school building work’ he hoped Maori Affairs might be able to assist with. He then listed ‘the extent of the major works proposed for the next few years in relative urgency order as follows: (I have referred here only to Maori Schools in the East Coast Inquiry District):

Tokomaru Bay: New Secondary Block; the facilities to be provided consist of two classrooms, one laboratory, a general purpose room with library and subsidiary accommodation…It is considered that this work should be undertaken when the buildings at Manutahi, now nearing completion, are finished.

Horoera: New 2 classroom school and standard plan residence with usual outbuildings and septic tank drainage. This work is considered to be as urgent as the Tokomaru Bay additions.

Waiomatatini: An additional classroom is urgently required at this school.

Te Araroa: New Secondary Block-including two classrooms, library, manual and technical room, dental clinic and other subsidiary accommodation.417

Other major works of less urgency are as follows:

---

416 District Administrative Officer to Registrar, Tairawhiti Maori Land Court, 14 January 1953. Ibid. DB.
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Tikitiki: New Secondary Block. Details of the accommodation to be provided at this school have not yet been finally worked out, chiefly because of the precedence given to the Tokomaru Bay and Te Araroa projects. This job will be comparable in extent with the other two mentioned.

Potaka: New 2 room school and residence, usual outbuildings plus permanent water supply and septic tank.\textsuperscript{418}

He added that ‘You will note that the above listing shows only major works. There are various other schools in the district where comparatively minor works, such as manual and technical buildings, arts and crafts accommodation, dental clinics etc are required’. And he concluded by suggesting that ‘in view of the magnitude and probable duration of the Maori School building Programme, you might welcome the opportunity to enlarge your building organisation and so provide Maori youths with thorough training in skilled trades, building up a reservoir of competent workmen in a field where such services are badly needed. On present indications there is enough school work in this area to last from five to ten years if not longer’.\textsuperscript{419}

The outcome was that Maori Affairs offered to do one job at a time for the Department, and although the result of that was that it that would take ‘something like ten years before the above work is completed, without taking into account new requirements which might arise’, it was recommended that the offer be accepted and that work should begin on Horoera. It was also suggested that some ‘aluminium’ classrooms might cut down the building time as well as save materials and labour.\textsuperscript{420}

However the Under-Secretary for Maori Affairs wrote to the Department’s Administrative Officer in December pointing out that on a recent tour which included the East Coast the Minister of Maori Affairs had been ‘rather concerned that perhaps too great a proportion of the Department’s building potential was being used for school work, having regard to the very urgent housing needs of the Maori people’, but he also gave his assurance the Department would always be willing to consider applications for assistance from Education.\textsuperscript{421}

\textsuperscript{418} Ibid;
\textsuperscript{419} Ibid;
\textsuperscript{420} L. J. McCarthy to District Administrative Officer, 2 November 1951. Ibid. DB.
\textsuperscript{421} Under-Secretary to Administrative Officer, 4 December 1951. Ibid. DB.
As late as 1958 an inspection report on Mangatuna noted good work on the part of teachers and pupils, but then added:

It is a pity that so much of this splendid effort is offset by the school buildings themselves…Outwardly all the buildings present a sorry state. All buildings are in dire need of urgent repair and repainting. The school house, too, needs painting very badly. The classrooms are small and lack many of the amenities usual in schools today. Great difficulty is being experienced by the teachers in putting modern methods into practice.422

3.10 Teaching Supplies and Equipment: East Coast Schools

There seems to be no doubt that allowances for requisites are too small. I believe that if these were doubled, the efficiency of our schools would be greatly increased.

Pope, making a general comment about the Native Schools following inspection report on Tokomaru Bay in 1900.423

My research identified other problems associated with the Crown’s choice of an administrative structure for Maori schools, in addition to slowness in responding to requests for schools and dealing with building and maintenance requirements. One of these was the slow response which often occurred in providing teachers with essential teaching materials and equipment—the tools of the job—to enable them undertake their work properly, with often very negative consequences for learning and teaching. This problem is apparent throughout most of the history of the Native/Maori schools.

It is relevant here to recall again here the comments by the Director of Education, T. B. Strong, in his report to the Minister of Education in 1929 after visiting the East Coast and Bay of Plenty Native Schools. He described the schools as having been ‘managed too economically’ and gave as examples the fact that ‘not a single native school I visited had received any of the new textbooks which are supplied free by the Department… all were using the old books in a quite effective way, thus filling the

422 Inspection Report, Mangatuna, 5 May 1958. BAAA 1001/951b. ANZ-A. DB.
423 Inspection Report, 9 May 1900. BAAA 1001/653a. ANZ-A. DB.
gap for the time being’, as well criticising the extent to which the buildings had been allowed to get in to disrepair, and concluded that ‘We cannot at once make good the shortcomings resulting from the parsimonious of the past but I trust we shall soon have the Native Schools as well found as any of the Board Schools’.  

Examples of why the Crown’s most senior education official would make an acknowledgment of this kind this are given below with respect to East Coast schools.

In 1875 an Auckland School Inspector, Richard O’Sullivan, inspected the East Coast Native Schools when they were still under the control of the Native Department and after his visit to Tokomaru Bay reported that ‘the books in use are not at all suitable, most of them being far too advanced; also, the writing desks require lowering and the top used for writing made much flatter’.  

The Teacher at Tokomaru Bay complained in 1879 about a lack of any response to a request he had made four months earlier for suitable books for infants plus lead pencils and 2 school registers. (He wrote again on the 19th of July still having received no response). In September the Resident Magistrate inspected the school, described the teacher’s house as ‘almost uninhabitable’, and recommended repairs.

The Teacher at Kawakawa reported in 1879 that he been in the school for eight months but had ‘never received quarterly or half yearly return sheets, roll books, register or report forms. Books so essentially necessary for the keeping of the school’.  

In 1882 the Teacher at Tokomaru Bay advised the Education Secretary that he was returning the requisition form to the Department because ‘Only two dozen copy books were sent and the slates were omitted which I regret as I am very short’. In

---
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July the Teacher wrote again, informing the Secretary that the box of urgently needed teaching materials he had ordered had still not arrived, months after he had requested it, meaning, ‘I have no pens, or paper, or envelopes, and the swing is useless as there is no rope’. 430

Having earlier drawn the Education Secretary’s attention to an increase in his roll to 64 pupils the Teacher at Tiki Tiki, Captain Mitchell, wrote to the Education Secretary on 1 October 1895, pointing out the very limited school accommodation; ‘half the pupils are without desks, and more than a third have to be seated on anything that can be used for seats—such as empty boxes and cases, resting their slates on their knees or holding them in their arms the best way they can’.431 When Inspector H. B. Kirk finally visited seven months later, he acknowledged that ‘a class-room is urgently needed here. The school is seated for 40 children, and ten more can be accommodated on the front seats. There is a roll of 71, and an average attendance of 61.7. During the summer the health of the teachers suffered much from the crowded state of the class-room’.432

After an inspection report on Tokomaru Bay in 1900 Pope made the general comment about the Native Schools that ‘There seems to be no doubt that allowances for requisites are too small. I believe that if these were doubled, the efficiency of our schools would be greatly increased’.433

An inspection report on Tokomaru Bay in 1907 complained that that ‘School supplies were asked for during the year. This was rendered necessary by the increased attendance. They were not sent and the work has been somewhat hampered in consequence’.434 An inspection report twelve months later found ‘There was a great scarcity of reading books. Many were in a dilapidated condition’.435
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In 1916 the Teacher at Tokomaru had to remind the Department that ‘Some weeks ago I wrote asking that a copy of a text book on Swedish Drill might be sent to me as I am in pressing need of something more modern, but I have had no reply.’

At Whangara in 1914 the school had not yet been supplied with the readers which had been procured from England and had arrived some months ago, resulting in the children having to ‘still use the old fashioned Royal Crown series which it was intended to discard from the beginning of the year’.

When the Mangatuna Native School was finally opened in May 1913, approximately 5 years after the people had made the initial request for a school, the newly appointed teacher was immediately confronted by the difficulty that ‘We have so far received no slate pencils…also the Primer No 1 Reading Books, as there are a good class of children requiring these, and we are handicapped in not having them to go on with’.

Inspection reports on the teaching at Mangatuna by both Bird and Porteous were that it was very good, despite the teacher not having the proper supplies to do the job and having to engage in a constant battle with the Department in Wellington to obtain them, Bird adding a note with the inspection report in 1915 ‘New books have not yet been supplied’.

3.11 Teachers: Appointment and Dismissal

We are still waiting for the new teacher…Our children are going backward.

Comment by the Rev. P. Kohere long-serving member of the Rangitukia Maori School Committee in 1953, referring to what he had found to be a long-standing problem affecting the East Coast Maori schools; the length of time teacher vacancies went unfilled.

---
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Remoteness from supervision makes it all the more necessary for a Native School teacher to maintain a proper sense of responsibility.\textsuperscript{441}

Another problem arising from the long-distance administration from Wellington was the lengthy time it sometimes took to appoint teachers to the East Coast Native/Maori Schools. This led to schools not-infrequently remaining non-staffed or short-staffed and the pupils out of school, sometimes for quite lengthy periods. Moreover the close and regular supervision of the work of teachers once they were appointed, that would have been more characteristic in the decentralised Education Board Schools, was frequently absent, also with negative outcomes for teaching methods, and there was a frequent failure to deal adequately with teachers who were unsatisfactory.

The following examples illustrate these matters with particular reference to East Coast Native/Maori schools. My own view is that no Education Board would have allowed, or been permitted to allow by the Pakeha parents of the children who were the main client of its schools, schools remaining closed for the very long periods that some of the East Coast Maori schools discussed below remained closed, with all the negative consequences for learning, future education and life chances generally that would have resulted.

In his report on Tikitiki in 1892 Pope wrote that ‘considering that the school had been closed for three months’ prior to the arrival of a new teacher who had started just six months before the examination, there was reason to be generally satisfied with the results.\textsuperscript{442}

Of Waiomatatini in the same year, Pope wrote that because of a change of teachers ‘many of the children have for a long time been absent from the school’.\textsuperscript{443}

The Teacher at Tokomaru Bay, Robert Warner, informed the Minister by letter on 7 October 1882, that as a result of rheumatic fever he was unable to fulfil his duties.\textsuperscript{444}

\textsuperscript{441} Education Secretary to Teacher, H. C. Sigley, Tokomaru Bay, 12 June 1902. BAAA 1001/653b. ANZ-A. DB.
\textsuperscript{442} AJHR 1892, Vol.2 E-2, p.10.
\textsuperscript{443} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{444} Teacher to Minister, October 7 1882. BAAA 1001/652a. ANZ-A. DB.
It then took until 26 November for Pope to report that, owing to his continued absence, resulting in the absence also of most of the children, he had been unable to either inspect or examine the school. In June 1883, six months later, Pope informed the Secretary that he understood that Mr Warner was still very unwell and unable to attend to his duties, and that a former Hukarere pupil had not returned to the school because she was undertaking his duties. While he ‘could not vouch for the correctness of these rumours’, he thought it desirable to ascertain what the real state of affairs was, and in the event of a vacancy occurring at Tokomaru suggested a suitable man to fill it.

In 1902 the Education Secretary wrote to the Teacher at Tokomaru Bay that the Inspector’s recent report had not been one the Department was accustomed to receive ‘nor one calculated to inspire confidence in your management of the school’. He referred to laxity in the keeping of admission and attendance registers, unsatisfactory maintenance of discipline, and unpunctual attendance by pupils, concluding that ‘Remoteness from supervision makes it all the more necessary for a Native School teacher to maintain a proper sense of responsibility’ (author’s emphasis).

On occasions Inspectors reported negatively on poor teaching of Maori pupils, yet did nothing about it. In the following example, at Waiomatatini in 1907, Inspector Bird suggested that the Department needed to insist upon a more competent assistant than the existing one, yet it had allowed the situation described to continue for a significant period of time:

For several years past I have remarked upon the unsatisfactory work in the preparatory classes. Indeed there is more harm done (from a school management point of view) than good and the head teacher has in the upper classes to make up for all the defects which have been instilled into the children in the first two or three years of their school course. I have no doubt that it is the evident want of success that causes the people to show such lack of interest in their school and that leads the children away to Port Awanui Public School.

---
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When the well-regarded Teacher at Tikitiki, David Bone, died in May 1901, the school remained closed for six months, from 22 May until 13 November, when a new teacher, H. W. Geissler, was finally appointed. (Author emphasis). This was despite letters from Hoani Huriwai expressing concern on behalf of parents at the failure to appoint a teacher and asking when one would be appointed. ‘The children are rather slow in coming back and some of the older ones will no doubt stay away altogether’, Geissler wrote to the Education Secretary on 23 November, when advising him that he had reopened the school. Pope subsequently reported that the effect of the lengthy closure meant that even when the school re-opened, in the four weeks from its opening until the Christmas vacation, ‘less than half the children attended’.  

Fifty six pupils were enrolled when Bone died. It is inconceivable to me that such a lengthy subsequent period without a teacher would have been permitted to continue if the school had been an Education Board one. And the same comment applies in the following example, at Whareponga, where the school remained closed for eighteen months after the departure of a teacher.

The Teacher at Whareponga left the school at the beginning of the 1904 year and the school was closed until a replacement could be appointed. On 29 March A. T. Ngata advised the Education Secretary ‘Whareponga natives anxiously waiting appointment of teacher’. With no teacher still appointed by November the Chairman of the School Committee, Wiremu Pokiha, wrote to the Minister of Education that: ‘It is now eleven months that the children have been without schooling. It is because there is no teacher that there has been no school and the children are suffering now for want of a teacher….The number of the children at the kainga is 36, besides others’ (Author emphasis). The Chairman provided a list of the names of the 36 children. When the Secretary replied on 2 December he advised the Chairman that the Department ‘hopes that you will not now be much longer without a teacher for your school and expects to be able to advise you very shortly that an appointment has

---
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been made’.453 But it then took until 12 April 1905 for the Assistant Secretary to advise the Chairman that Miss Bertha Baigent had been appointed and ‘may be expected to take up her duties in the next four or five weeks…I here take the opportunity of expressing the Department’s regret that the school has been without a teacher’.454 However Miss Baigent did not take up her position until June 1905 when the school was finally re-opened.

When the teacher at Waiomatatini retired in June 1912 the Department had no replacement in place and the school was closed. Despite a plea from the School Committee asking ‘When will the School reopen’ it remained closed for six weeks.455 On 16 March 1923, the local M.P., K. S. Williams, wired the Minister of Education, C. J. Parr, that the vacancy caused by the appointment of the former Head Teacher of Whangara to Tokomaru Bay had not been filled, and the parents were getting anxious.456 He wired again on 2 April asking, ‘Have you got teacher for Whangara school parents anxious for the children to continue schooling’.457 The Minister replied three weeks after William’s initial request, stating that it was hoped to secure the services of a suitable teacher soon, but if a temporary teacher could be found meanwhile would suitable accommodation be available elsewhere than in the teacher’s residence which was unfurnished.458 On 19 April the Minister wrote to Williams again, stating that there was no possibility of the school being reopened that week, but the Department was making every effort to find a teacher and the school would not be kept closed longer than could possibly be avoided.459

On 29 April the Chairman of the Whangara School Committee appealed to the Director Education, reminding him that the school had been closed since February, and asked him if he could not help to forward the letter to someone who could, because it was ‘of the greatest importance that we should hear from those who hold
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the reigns of controlling and furthering education amongst the Maori immediately’.  

On 5 May the Director advised the Chairman that the Department had succeeded in finding a teacher, a returned soldier, Mr A. D. Macarthur, who previous to enlisting had been the teacher at the Tangoio School near Napier, he would ‘take up his duties as soon as circumstances permit’, and he expressed his regret that the school had been closed for so long a time.  

Not surprisingly, the Inspector commented in his next report that ‘the work of the pupils has suffered in consequence’ of the school having been closed for some time. Reflecting the long-term negative effect on learning of interruptions of this kind an inspection report two years later noted that ‘The general work of the school has evidently been affected by the short year, and by the very bad roads.  

The effects of the distance from Wellington and absence of close supervision of teachers is also seen in the following example which involved the Waiomatatini Maori School in 1951. I find it hard to imagine, again, that the situation described would have been tolerated by Hawke’s Bay Education Board officials in one of their schools. But here also it is the effect that the situation would have had on the Maori children enrolled which needs to be noted.

9 April 1951: Mr Powell absent today. According to his landlady whom I contacted at 8.30 he just didn’t feel well.
17 April: Mr Powell absent on leave today for medical examination.
24 May: Mr Powell absent-sick according to his landlady.
28 May: Mr Powell absent. It is now 3pm and no word has been forthcoming about him.
29 May: Mr Powell still absent.
31 May: Mr Powell absent today-no reason notified
1 June: Mr Powell still absent-no reason notified as yet.
5 June: Mr Powell resumed duty armed with Dr’s certificate for flu.
6 June: Mr Powell absent-no word from him.
7 June: Mr Powell still absent. Mr Powell arrived at school at 11.27 a.m. today.
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11 June: Mr Powell absent.
26 June: Mr Powell absent. As I was suspicious of his absence I rang the District Nurse in Ruatoria. During the morning Dr Carter went to see him at the teachers’ bach where, according to their later report, he was simply sleeping off the effects of the night before.
16 July: Mr Powell absent.
17 July: Mr Powell still absent.\footnote{Waiomatatini Maori School Log Book, 1951-1958. YCAK, 1366/1b. ANZ-A.}

In 1953 the Maori Schools Officer, A. Lake, congratulated the Rev. P. Kohere, who had recently retired from long service on the Rangitukia School Committee, on his having been made a life member of the Committee. In thanking him, Kohere explained that he had resigned mainly due to loss of hearing, but he had enjoyed his work for the school, adding that ‘we love our school, we do anything we can for our school’. But he also put on his Chairman’s hat one more time, by referring to what he said had been a long-standing problem for many schools on the Coast over time, and one with serious consequences for pupil learning; the gap between a teacher leaving and a new one being appointed, adding ‘We are still waiting for the new teacher…‘Our children are going backward’.\footnote{P. Kohere to A. Lake, 22 April 1953. BAAA 1001/1013a, 44/6. ANZ-A. DB.}
3.12 The transfer of Native/Maori Schools to Education Boards

3.12.1 Introduction

The Crown’s intention from the outset was that the system of Native Schools would be a temporary and fairly short-term solution to the need to have Maori learn the English language and other aspects of English culture and assimilate as speedily as possible. The schools were to be major agents in the assimilation process. The policy therefore was that as soon as the Organizing Inspector decided that the children in a Native School had mastered English sufficiently to be instructed in the ordinary primary school curriculum the Native School would be transferred to the Education Board in whose district it was located.466

Some Native/Maori schools did eventually transfer. But the most common reason for this was increasing numbers of the children of Pakeha settlers in a school to the point where they became the majority, rather than a preference to transfer expressed by Maori. As time progressed, most Maori communities generally favoured retaining the Native (and later Maori) Schools. Amongst the reasons for this was community attachment to the school, developed initially with having gifted the land for the school site, and a feeling that despite the often many limitations of the Native Schools, their children might well be better off in them than as a minority in a board school. With a modification of policy after 1930 some also came to feel that more consideration was given to aspects of Maori arts and crafts in a Maori School than would have been the case in the typical board school, and the growing number of trained Maori teachers who entered the schools after 1940 was also usually viewed positively.

But there were always those Pakeha, including some members of education boards and Pakeha settlers who wanted to hasten the transfer of schools to Education Board control. The situation was usually one involving whether a Native or Maori School

466 Native School Code, AJHR, 1880, H-1f, p.6.
should be transferred to a Board. But occasionally, where Maori pupils were the
majority in a Board School, their parents made efforts to have the school transferred
from the Board to the Department, as happened with examples on the East Coast
discussed below.

During the 1950s pressures began to build again for all Maori schools to be
transferred to Education Boards, with the New Zealand Education Boards Association
and the New Zealand Educational Institute leading the charge. The need to resolve the
transfer issue was one of the factors behind the creation of the Committee on Maori
Education in 1955, which was significant for being the first time that Maori including
representatives from major tribal districts had been represented on an important
national committee set up specifically to make decisions about Maori education.

However when the Committee made its investigations it found a strong wish
amongst Maori communities for retaining their Maori School, and it therefore agreed
with what it said had identified as the ‘general feeling of the Maori people’ that the
time was not yet opportune for any full-scale transfer of the Maori Schools from the
Department to education boards’. It also recommended that before the Director of
Education took any action to change the administrative control of a Maori School
from the Education Department to an education board, ‘full consultation must first be
held with the local people’. Nevertheless, one of its other recommendations was that
the long-term policy of the Government should be aimed at a single unified
system of administration of primary schools.

In a 1961 report the Acting Secretary of Maori Affairs, J. K. Hunn, took a much
harder line in advocating speeding up the transfer process, suggesting that it might
be too slow ‘without a measured policy of liquidation (of the Maori Schools) for the
good of race relations’.

\text{\footnotesize 468 Ibid.}
\text{\footnotesize 469 Ibid.}
\text{\footnotesize 470 Report of Department of Maori Affairs, Wellington, 1961, p.25. (Author emphasis).}]}
A Royal Commission on Education which reported in 1962 endorsed the policy of gradually transferring Maori Schools with the consent of parents, but it also suggested that it was desirable for the pace of change to be faster, and recommended that the transfer of all Maori Schools to Board control should be completed within a period of ten years.\footnote{Report of the Commission on Education, Wellington, 1960, p.420.}

3.12.2 Transfer and East Coast Maori Schools.

In 1928 the Hawke’s Bay Education Board proposed to takeover the Native Schools in its district, but a major reason for this not occurring at the time was resistance by teachers in the Native Schools, who made reverse proposal; Board Schools enrolling a majority of Maori pupils should be transferred to the Education Department.\footnote{Kay Mathews, Behind Every School: A History of the Hawke’s Bay Education Board, Napier, 1988, p.73.}

In 1938, although Waipiro Bay was a Board School under the Hawke’s Bay Education Board, only five of the 86 children attending were Pakeha, and a large number of Maori parents signed a petition to the Minister of Education asking that the school be made a Native School.\footnote{Mrs James McIlroy and others to Minister, 31 January 1938. BAAA 1001/710c. ANZ-A. DB.} The Board decided that it was not agreeable to a change, giving no reasons for its decision.\footnote{Secretary to Director, 27\textsuperscript{th} April, 1938. Ibid. DB.} The Director advised the Minister that although it was the ‘almost unanimous wish of the parents to have their children educated in a Native School’, as the law stood at present there was nothing that could be done.\footnote{Director to Minister, 4 May 1938. BAAA 1001/710c. ANZ-A. DB.}

Nine months later a further appeal was made, this time to the Acting Minister of Native Affairs, for the school to become a Native School, the reason given being that the people could not afford to send their children to a high school, and if the school was a native one it might increase their chances of attending Te Aute, Hukarere or one of the other Maori colleges on one of the scholarships that were available.\footnote{Mrs James McIlroy to Savage, 6 February 1939. Ibid;} The letter was referred to the Minister of Education who repeated that it was not possible...
to take any action because the Hawke’s Bay Education Board would not agree to the suggested change. However in April a large number of parents petitioned the Minister again for a change, on the grounds that there were 3 European and 80 Maori children at the school, the children were not obtaining the advantages of secondary education, the books and requisites were not available to the children as they were in the Native Schools, and they were not receiving the practical education common in the Native Schools.

In due course, the Hawke’s Bay Board reluctantly agreed not to stand in the way of the transfer to Departmental control in this instance, although it restated its earlier view that all Native Schools should be under its control.

In 1936 Whakaangiangi was a Board School with 73 pupils enrolled, 66 of whom were Maori. The Director of Education advised the Minister that the Board had applied to the Department for authority to appoint an additional assistant teacher to bring the staffing into line with Native Schools having a similar roll number. The Department replied that the school was ‘so predominantly Maori that it was highly desirable that it should cease to function as a Public School and should be transferred to the Department as a Native School’.

Advised that on this occasion the Board had agreed to the change, the Director praised:

The enthusiastic support shown by the Maori race in its native Schools, the curriculum of which can be planned to suit the peculiar needs of each school, and the supply of teachers and inspectors specialized in this type of work who the Department has at its command are all reasons in support of this contention. I am of the opinion that so long as these schools remain Public Schools so long will the pupils, in spite of the best intentions of the Board and the teachers continue to receive an education not so well fitted to their needs as would otherwise be the case.

---
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However two families with Pakeha children attending ‘were antagonistic to the change in status of Whakaangiangi’, and applied successfully to have their children enrolled in the Correspondence School, the Director suggesting to the Head that ‘I have no doubt, as their children grow older, you will be able by the exercise of tact to overcome their prejudices and to show them that their children can receive as good an education in a Native School as in any other’.482

However when it came to the recommendations of the 1955 Committee on Education with respect to the East Coast Maori Schools, both Education Department and Education Board officials immediately demonstrated in some instances an enthusiasm for bulldozing through their transfer to the Board, rather than the more long-term and consultative approach with parents the Committee had recommended. According to Alex Khouri, who had been a Maori School administrator from the 1940s to 1960s, this was not an unusual situation. He recalls that education boards generally welcomed the opportunity to expand their importance, influence and ‘empire’:

> When the Government said ‘We’re going to transfer all Maori Schools to administration of the boards’, the boards went all for this. They said it was a marvellous idea…The Auckland Board thought that was good, it gave them more mana. It gave them a bigger empire.483

After the Senior Inspector of Maori Schools, K. I. Robertson, met the Tokomaru Bay Maori District High School Committee in 1956, he reported that he had told the Committee that the situation of separate Board and Maori Schools in the Bay was ‘especially bad’, because many Maori went to the Board School. However the Chairman, Mr Elley, had spoken against amalgamation of the two schools unless it was under the Department rather than the Board, a development Robinson had pointed out was impossible. But he privately thought the Chairman ‘would agree to our proposals after token opposition’; one of the fears of the Committee, he wrote, had been that the Pakehas would take over a combined school, but he had pointed out to them that if that happened it would be their own fault as they could be at least 10 to one at any householders meeting. He felt that ‘even more definite opposition (to Transfer) would come from the Committee of the Board School’, but ‘this of course
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would be the Hawke’s Bay Board’s problem’. He concluded confidently that ‘these people can be persuaded to adopt the plan we have in mind so that there should be one school for all in Tokomaru Bay’.484

In June 1956 a meeting took place between officials from the Department of Education (District Superintendent, Officer for Maori Education, Maori Schools Officer), the Hawke’s Bay Education Board (Chairman and Acting Secretary), the Waiapu County (Chairman), Turi Carroll, a member of the Committee on Maori Education, an NZEI observer, and the members of the East Coast Maori and Board School Committees.

An analysis of the meeting shows that the first eight speakers were all Departmental and Board officials, and it was clear that all favoured transfer. The first member of the Maori School Committee to speak was Mr Te Ohaere, and first he, and then other members raised some of the reservations they had about transfer. He referred to efforts made by the Maori School Committee in the past, without success, to get together with the Board School Committee. At that time they had agreed to amalgamation, but not under the control of the Hawke’s Bay Board. Mr Elley the Chairman pointed out that the site for the Maori school had been given by the old people and that discussions had led him to believe that they would not pass the site onto the Board. However that was a matter for the people to decide. He also pointed out that they would ‘not be very happy’ with the Hawke’s Bay Board, as they had already had one matter of dissension over the transfer of children from Waima; the Board had declined the application with the result that sixty children were walking. The parents had finally provided their own bus. Mr Turi Carroll, who said he was ‘wholeheartedly behind amalgamation’, emphasized the importance of ‘bringing the two races together for their mutual benefit’, and declared that ‘prejudices should not get in the way of amalgamation’. Finally, the officials and Mr Carroll prevailed, and the outcome was the passing of a resolution that amalgamation be approved in principle, subject to the approval of a meeting of householders in the district.485

485 Notes on meeting with School Committees. 7th June 1956. BAAA 1001 1061b. ANZ-DB. DB.
However a Teacher at the Tokomaru Bay Maori School at the time recalls how difficult it was for many Maori present to communicate their real concerns regarding the transfer of their schools:

And then you had the awful extreme where it was getting close for the time when the Maori service was to be abolished and there was going to be this combining...It was a felt thing rather than a confrontational thing. The confrontation came with the doing away of the Maori Schools and going to Board control, the people at the Maori School couldn’t understand why they were being gobbled up...Plus the fact that historically they had given the land for the school and I can remember at a public meeting when this was to be discussed and the people came up from the Hawke’s Bay Board and conducted the meeting themselves. And particularly the older people in the audience were getting up and speaking in Maori and it was not accepted very well at all by the Hawke’s Bay officials, to the degree that after a while they said everyone must speak in English, and it was sad to see those people getting up, very much emotional, and just stumbling over these words. It was just awful and after a while they would give up and just sit down.486

Nevertheless the decision to amalgamate was subsequently confirmed at a large meeting of householders on 28 June 1956, and the Tokomaru Bay Maori District High School was transferred to the Hawke’s Bay Education Board on the 1st February 1957.

The Waiomatatini Maori School Committee Minutes reveal that on 7 November 1955, the Committee passed a resolution ‘That in the event of any discussion with the Departmental Officers that this Committee express its strong disapproval of any changes in Maori School administration. Reasons: 1. Loss of identity; 2. Possible enforced retardation through language difficulty’.487

The Secretary of the Whakaangi Maori School requested the Maori Schools Officer, J. C. Preston, to address the Parent--Teacher Association on the present administration system and the reasons why some Maori Schools had changed to Board control.488

486 Simon and Smith, p.269.
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The Head of the Potaka School was advised that the School Committee and parents would be visited by Maori School officials to discuss the question of change to Board control. The Maori Schools Officer had added in a handwritten note on a copy of the letter on file that in a phone conversation ‘Cmte has discussed. Not keen to change. Want to know what it is all about. Would not wish to take a decision but wants night meeting with Parent Teacher Association.’

At the meeting the Officer for Maori education explained that ‘no pressure was being exerted by the Department to make a change’, but if the parents were interested the area would be visited again. Requests for meetings had been received from other Committees on the Coast, and arrangements would be made for a visit later in the month. The meetings were being regarded as preliminary ones with parents if they wished to have them at this stage, but ‘if there is evidence of a desire to change (to Board control) a further meeting would be arranged at which the Hawke’s Bay Education Board would be invited to be present’.

In June 1966 the Waipiro Bay Maori School Committee advised the Department that after a meeting with local parents, and a thorough discussion of the transfer question, it had decided that ‘as the affairs of the school were very satisfactorily managed by the Department’, it saw no reason to transfer to the Hawke’s Bay Education Board. In an extremely positive report on the school in November 1967, the Inspectors described the classrooms as ‘among the most attractive and useful ones that we have seen’ providing ‘a stimulating environment for young children’; the ‘active support given to the school by a small community is a real feature of Waipiro Bay’ and the school was ‘providing a fine service to children in an isolated community’. However it was to be transferred to the Board anyhow.

---
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The Tuparoa Maori School Committee decided in 1967 that it wished the control of the school to move from the Department to the Board. While they had been ‘very happy with the service and help given by the Maori Schools officers and staff’, they felt the time had now come for the change. The school roll had fallen to 12.\textsuperscript{494}

In November 1965, H. M. Ngata wrote to J.C. Preston, the Maori Schools Officer, regarding any possible transfer of the Whangara Maori School to Education Board control. He emphasized that there was no school of significant size in its vicinity on which it could consolidate, or from which contributions could be made to its roll. And he drew attention to the history of Whangara and its special place within the Ngatiporou tribe. He raised several questions, including whether transfer was the ‘wish of the elders who realised the significance of their village to the tribe as a whole, or the younger generation who in their ignorance do not understand these things’?; ‘How would the Ngatiporou people, most of whom I think prefer Departmental control, react to the transfer’?; ‘Would the Whangara sub-tribe of Ngati Konohi lose mana over it?’ He concluded that only the Whangara people could give the answers, but his own opinion was that they could lose much, the most important possibility being their identity.\textsuperscript{495}

On 1 May 1967, the Whangara School Committee resolved that it remain under the Department’s Maori Service rather than transfer to the Hawke’s Bay Education Board, until such time as the Minister of Education acted.\textsuperscript{496}

In July 1962 the Maori Schools Officer wrote to the Chairman of the Rangitukia School Committee, M. Raroa, that advice had been received by the Department that the Committee was interested in discussing the possibility of a change to control by the Hawke’s Bay Education Board, and suggested a meeting between officials and the Committee.\textsuperscript{497}
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A meeting subsequently took place on 4 December. Present were the Chairman of the School Committee, 24 parents, the Head, L. Lyons, the Officer for Maori Education, J. Jillett and the Maori Schools Officer A. Preston. The Chairman extended a welcome and then immediately advised that while the question of a change of control had been discussed, no decision had been made. The officials then gave an overview of aspects which would change and not change if a transfer took place, but pointed out that the Commission on Education had recommended that all Maori Schools should change within 10 years, and that was the policy of the Government and the Department. This did not mean, however, that any particular school should make the change at any particular time, rather communities should choose what they considered most appropriate, and ‘the question was one for the people to decide’.

Mrs Reihana opened the general discussion by saying she would be reluctant to see any change. The parents and committee fully supported the school, if a change was made the school might not get teachers similar to those who had been appointed in the past. She felt she and the community wanted time to consider the matter and no change should be made in the immediate future, which ‘appeared to be the opinion of all present’. The meeting closed with an agreement that no further action would be taken unless the Committee proposed it, or the situation changed in some way where it became felt that the parents should be persuaded to change.  

At a meeting with the Senior Inspector and Maori Schools Officer on 10 November 1965, the Chairman advised that the parents had decided that they were not interested in a change of control to the Education Board. Maori Schools Officer. There was therefore a range of views amongst the Committee members and other parents of the school about whether or not they should be transferred to the Hawke’s Bay Education Board. But amongst them was a considerable body of opinion wanting the status quo maintained.

However the decision was to be taken out of their hands and those of all other East Coast Maori School Committees when the Government announced on Waitangi Day
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1867 that all of the remaining 114 Maori schools would come under the administration of Education Boards by 1 February 1969. The Maori District High Schools were also included in the change.

CHAPTER 4: THE CROWN’S LANGUAGE AND CULTURAL POLICIES FOR NATIVE/MAORI SCHOOLS

In the same way, the language itself must pass through the Maypole Soap process of mongrelism, as it is now doing in the more civilized parts, and finally disappear as a spoken language. Then, too, its interest will consist in the same fact as does that of specimens of old Maori work, viz., that it represents a lost art.\(^{501}\)

The Native is gradually losing knowledge of his own language, and the question has been raised whether there is not good reason to introduce the teaching of the Maori tongue. Sentiment would incline one to say yes; but sentiment alone is not sufficient justification. Language is a means of communicating thought and is a social necessity. By its measure not only meeting the needs of daily association with our fellows but having the advantage of being able to study the thought of the best thinkers of all ages. From both points of view a knowledge of the Maori language is unnecessary to Natives who know only English. The Maori language has no literature and consequently in this direction, too, the natural abandonment of the native tongue inflicts no loss on the Maori.\(^{502}\)

4.1 Introduction

One of the prerequisites for a Native School to be established under the Native Schools Act 1867 was that ‘the English language and the ordinary subjects of primary

\(^{501}\) Senior Inspector in charge of Native Schools, W. Bird, to Director of Education, 24 July 1918.

English education are taught by a competent teacher and that the instruction is carried on in the English language as far as practicable’.

Given the policy of ‘amalgamation’ or assimilation of Maori it was logical from the Crown’s perspective to emphasize English as a central feature of its schooling policy. From an East Coast Maori perspective however, the policy of excluding the Maori language from the Native/Maori primary schools for almost the next 100 years can be viewed as one of the most damaging aspects and legacies of the Crown’s schooling policies.

The Crown’s emphasis on English only had begun earlier, as was mentioned in Chapter 1. The Education Ordinance 1847 was one important measure for establishing and reinforcing its amalgamation policy, and one of its central features was that English would be the only official language. The Ordinance laid down that only those mission schools providing instruction in English would continue to receive Crown assistance, and this was reaffirmed in the Native Schools Act 1858.

A more strident English-only approach became evident in various reports and enactments during the early 1860s. When the school inspector Henry Taylor presented a report to Parliament in 1862 he claimed that several factors were impeding progress in ‘carrying out the work of civilization among the aboriginal Native race through the medium of the schools’, particularly:

"The Native language itself is another obstacle in the way of civilization. So long as it exists there is a barrier to the free and unrestrained intercourse which ought to exist between the two races. It shuts out the less civilised portion of the population which intercourse with the more enlightened would confer. The school-room alone has the power to break down the wall of partition between the two races. Too much cannot be devoted to this branch of Maori education."  

Taylor’s view was also that ‘Native habits of filth and laziness also impede the progress of civilization’ and strongly recommended health education in schools.

---
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Hugh Carleton, who had been appointed as the first full-time Inspector under the terms of the 1858 Native Schools expressed a similar view:

I consider that too much stress cannot be laid upon the acquirement of the English language… civilization cannot be advanced beyond a very short stage through means of the aboriginal tongue. The Maori tongue is sufficed for the requirements of a barbarous race, but apparently would serve for little more.\textsuperscript{506}

Speakers to the Bill which came before Parliament in 1867 to establish a Native Schools system emphasized that a policy of assimilating Maori through schooling in the English language was necessary to ‘civilise’ them. Carleton, in supporting the Bill, claimed the stage had now been reached when it was necessary ‘either to exterminate the natives or to civilize them’, adding that they would never be civilized through their own language, because it was ‘imperfect as a medium of thought’. Civilization would only be achieved by means of ‘a perfect language’, i.e. English.\textsuperscript{507}

John Hall, member for Heathcote, claimed that learning English would pave the way for the ‘civilizing of the remnants of a noble race’, while for Major Heaphy, member for Parnell, ‘the more the natives were educated, the less would be the future expense on police and goals’.\textsuperscript{508}

New instructions and guidance for teachers was set out in the \textit{Native Schools Code 1880} which James Pope, as the new Organizing Inspector, had played a significant part in drawing up. The Code instituted a greatly improved organization of the Native Schools over that of the 1870’s and the standards of attainment now introduced were a modified version of the curriculum outlined for Education Board primary schools in the 1877 Education Act.\textsuperscript{509} The Code laid down specific instructions regarding the use of Maori. Despite being appointed to communities in which Maori was the language of common usage, teachers were advised that it was:
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\textsuperscript{506} Ibid., p.77.  
\textsuperscript{507} NZPD, 1 1867, pp.862-3.  
\textsuperscript{508} Ibid., p.863.  
\textsuperscript{509} AJHR 1880, H-1f.  
\end{flushleft}
not necessary that teachers should, at the time of their appointment, be acquainted with the Maori tongue. In all cases English is to be used by the teacher when he is instructing the senior classes. In the junior classes the Maori language may be used for the purpose of making the children acquainted with the meanings of English words and sentences. The aim of the teacher, however, should be to dispense with the use of Maori as soon possible.510

Here the Maori language was limited entirely to being a pedagogical tool to assist with the more effective teaching of English, not as a language having intrinsic cultural or other value in its own right.

After 1900 and towards the end of Pope’s term as Inspector, official attitudes hardened even further against even this extremely limited use of the language, on the grounds that the most effective means of learning a second language was not to permit the first language to be spoken at all. Inspection reports reflected the more rigid anti-Maori language policy. Pope, referring to the modest use of Maori permitted in the junior classes after 1880 to facilitate the teaching of English, explained that ‘What was being done in 1880 was to teach English through and by means of Maori’, but now the ‘only way to teach English was through English’, and he described any use of Maori as ‘an anachronism’ in his reports on the schools.511

Pope’s successor as Senior Inspector in 1904, William Bird, not only maintained the rigid no-Maori policy but reinforced it. A memorandum to Native School teachers in 1906 emphasized the ‘necessity for encouraging the children to talk English on the playground and to see that this is done as much as possible’.512

A pamphlet issued in 1917 for the guidance of the teachers ordered them:

Do not speak to your pupils in Maori, and do not permit them to speak in Maori to you or to one another if you can help it. The less they hear of Maori the better it will be for their English. Do not, however well you may speak the language, give orders in Maori, or attempt explanations.513
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After 1867 some Maori who requested the Crown to provide a Native School also expressed approval for the emphasis on the English language in the schools. Secure in their own language and culture at the time they viewed the mastery of English as a necessary pre-requisite for holding their own with the Pakeha in the circumstances that now confronted them, and the Native school as the agency which would enable them to do this.

In 1877, Renata Kawepo, a senior leader of Hawke’s Bay Maori and 790 others, and Piriri Ropata and 200 others, petitioned Parliament that ‘the Government should use every endeavour to have schools established throughout the colony so that the Maori children may learn the English language, for by this they will be on the same footing as the Europeans, and will become acquainted with all the means by which the Europeans have become great’.514

Dr Pat Hohepa described how at the Waima Native School south of Hokianga Harbour in 1884 the minutes of the School Committee, ‘elegantly written in Maori by Hone Mohi Tawahai’, revealed the stern measures taken by the Maori parents on the Committee in an effort to enforce attendance and exclude the Maori language:

To supplement the law forbidding the speaking of Maori in class, or in the school grounds in school hours, no person or parent can engage a child in speaking Maori, and in such cases, any child can inform on that person or parent to the Committee, who shall be empowered to fine that person or parent the sum of five shillings.515

The Committee then moved that these two laws were to be written up as a proclamation and nailed to the schoolhouse door, and Dr Hohepa points out that there are no minutes showing its repeal, although he adds that ‘while the children were forbidden to speak Maori in school, it seems that the effects on parents were negligible because for the next 58 years (to 1942) the School Committee minutes and obviously the proceedings were in Maori’.516
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However some other Maori advocated a bi-lingual approach. In 1876 Wi Te Hakiro and 336 others from Tai Tokerau petitioned the Parliament that the Native Schools Act 1867 be amended to include schools for the teaching of Maori language and culture, and schools for teaching English:

Let there be two classes of schools. First, for all children knowing only their own Maori tongue, also having a knowledge of all Maori customs. These should be taught to read in Maori, to write in Maori, and arithmetic. Second all children of two years old when they are just able to speak, should be taught the English language and all the knowledge which you Europeans possess. If this plain and easy course be followed, our children will soon attain to the acquirements of the Europeans… (and in the schools emphasizing English) there should not be a word of Maori allowed to be spoken in the school, and the master his wife and children should be persons altogether ignorant of the Maori language.517

But there were some Maori, in areas of the Waikato, King Country and Taranaki who resisted sometimes for many decades after 1867 the Government’s efforts to introduce European-style schooling with its emphasis on English and assimilation, because of their experience of land confiscations, or fear that their own Maori culture would be threatened.518

There were other  Maori, as demonstrated earlier, who wanted the Maori language taught in the schools. A debate about the place of Maori in the education system took place at the national gathering of Maori council representatives and other persons interested in the welfare of Maori which was convened by the Government in 1908. The Member of Parliament for Northern Maori, Hone Heke:

Strongly urged that the Maori tongue should be systematically taught in the native schools, as at present the people were in great danger of losing their language altogether. This must be prevented at all costs, for if the language were not retained they would lose their nationhood and be neither one thing nor the other.519
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But William Bird as the Crown’s main educational official present disagreed, emphasizing the Government’s view that teaching English was of paramount importance. He again rejected entirely any idea that the Crown might have some responsibility for including Maori in schools:

Mr W.W. Bird, MA., Inspector of Native Schools, said that whatever might be the fault of the native school system; he believed that the one vital part of it had been the teaching of the English language. In such schools steps had to be taken to remove the principal bar between the two races, the bar of language. But in any case the children had plenty of time in which to practice their mother tongue, for the school day was only four hours long. He thought the proper place for instruction in the Maori language was at Te Aute, and he would be pleased to see it introduced into the syllabus there.520

While Hone Heke’s plea for Maori to be taught in primary schools was rejected, there was considerable support for it being included as an optional subject for matriculation and entry to the university. The Principal of St. Stephens, A. Wilson, moved and Hamiora Hei seconded:

That in view of the extra labour imposed upon Maori students through being instructed in a language not their mother tongue and with a view to help conserve the Maori language, this Congress considers that Maori should be made an optional subject for matriculation at least and that a committee consisting of Dr Buck, Messrs J. Thornton and G.A. Hansard and the mover be appointed to draw up a memorial on the subject to be submitted first to the Councils and Professorial Boards of the four University Colleges and finally to the Senate of the University of New Zealand.521

Support for the teaching of the Maori language and culture also came from Henare Kaihau, MP for Western Maori, who advocated a revived Maori Parliament in a new township between Ngaruawahia and Taupiri. In an interview he identified a major reason for it being needed was that ‘unless some such scheme is brought into operation the Maori language, Maori tradition, and Maori customs will be lost to an irreparable extent before many years have gone. The real Native language was fast passing away…and if it was to be preserved it must be systematically taught’.522
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The 1909 *Regulations Relating to Native Schools* included the Maori language as an optional subject in the syllabus for Maori Junior Scholarship holders at the denominational boarding schools, with a view to assisting them to pass the Junior Civil Service examination. Education Department officials acknowledging that there was value in educated Maori boys being taught their own tongue and being able to act as interpreters for bodies like the Land Court. Maori became a required subject for both boys and girls attending secondary schools on Junior Scholarships from 1931.

The comment has been made that while Ministers of the Crown responsible for Education and Crown officials within the Education Department continually emphasized the importance of English, and vigorously advocated the exclusion of the Maori language in the primary schools, in tertiary institutions and in the final years of secondary institutions –where Maori students were few and far between—Maori language could be optional and might be academically ‘interesting’.

As Inspector in charge of the Native schools and the Crown’s chief advisor on Maori education Bird continued his assault against any use of the Maori language in the schools, or any other aspect of Maori culture, well into the 1920s. In 1918 the Director of the Dominion Museum, J. Allan Thomson, acknowledging that Maori weaving and carving were in danger of dying out, supported the introduction of their teaching in the Native Schools.

When support also came from several teachers in Native Schools, the Director of Education asked Bird for his advice which was that:

> I do not see that there can be much educational benefit to be derived from including in the curriculum a scheme of instruction in the art of weaving.
>
> The purpose for which the Maoris in the old days engaged in weaving and carving no longer exists and while, from a sentimental point of

---
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view, the loss of the art is to be regretted, it has to be recognized that in
its place, Maoris have acquired the art of knitting, sewing, making
garments and carpentry, which their present day circumstances find of
far greater practical worth...except for the places where education has
not yet fully opened to them the way of civilization, Maori art as such
has died out.

In the same way, the language itself must pass through the Maypole
Soap process of mongrelism, as it is now doing in the more civilized
parts, and finally disappear as a spoken language. Then, too, its interest
will consist in the same fact as does that of specimens of old Maori
work, viz., that it represents a lost art.527

Armed with this advice the Director replied to the teacher of the Horohoro Native
School near Rotorua that although the Department would not place any obstacle in the
way of instruction in Maori arts and crafts being given outside of normal school
hours, ‘it cannot see that much educational benefit is to be derived from, nor is it
prepared to agree to the inclusion of such a course of instruction in the school
curriculum’.528

Bird still assisted with the inspection of the Native schools after he had formally
retired, and retained considerable influence within official education circles. He also
continued to take the hardest possible line against any use of Maori in the schools. In
a report on Horohoro in May 1930, he advised the Teacher that language lessons by
the direct methods should be given each day, ‘the Maori language being suppressed in
schools’.529

Following the official line, some teachers developed their own approach to enforce
the English-only policy and ensure that any use of Maori was eradicated. The writer
of an article published in Te Waka Maori, the journal of the Native School Teachers’
Association in 1918 informed readers that her own practice was to insist that ‘only
English should be used within the school boundaries’. She found it difficult at first to
get the rule obeyed:
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so to impress it upon their memories, ten stones had to be brought up from the river nearby, each time that a Maori word was used, and 20 stones for two words; while the penalty for a full sentence, or careless non-observance of the rule was a bucket half-full. The stones were put into muddy places about the yard...When the holes were all filled the same number of manuka sticks were cut down in the playground.  

Bird introduced other policy changes to ensure that Maori was excluded. He decided that the English examination sat by pupils in the Native Schools hoping to obtain a scholarship to one of the Maori denominational boarding schools should be in English only. This was on the grounds that ‘while a boy is forbidden to use Maori in a village school he is expected to translate Maori in his English examination for scholarship’.  

4.2 Punishment for Speaking Maori  

The distinguished linguist Dr Richard Benton has described how a hardened attitude against any Maori language in the schools after Bird replaced Pope in charge of the Native Schools was reflected in:

Negative sanctions, often involving harsh physical punishments directed against children who were heard speaking Maori in the school playground. Such practices, although never officially sanctioned by the Department of Education, affected several generations of Maori school children—in many rural areas, half or more of the adult informants interviewed in the NZCER linguistic survey reported having been punished at school for speaking Maori.  

When the New Zealand Department of Education presented evidence to the Waitangi Tribunal in 1985 it claimed that no official policy had existed that corporal punishment was used to enforce the English-only policy. But Sir James Henare, one of several respected kaumatua who had attended school in the first 25 years of the twentieth century, gave evidence to the Tribunal that:
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If there was no such policy there was an extremely effective
gentleman’s agreement…Then he went on to give his own experience
of the time and place and the names of teachers and school inspectors
concerned…Then he also told us of being sent into the bush to cut
down a piece of supple jack with which he was punished for breaking
the rule that te reo Maori must “be left at the school gate”.

From this and the evidence of other witnesses the Tribunal concluded that the use of
corporal punishment for speaking Maori was part of official policy in the first quarter
of the century, rather than ‘just a practice’.

Douglas Ball later claimed that after his appointment as Senior Inspector of Maori
Schools in 1930 no evidence of pupils being punished for speaking Maori would
have been found because ‘That all stopped with the new policy after 1930. I put a stop
to it’.

But the continued emphasis on the importance of teaching English, allied with the
persistence of the belief that the presence of Maori hindered rather than facilitated this
aim, undoubtedly meant that many teachers continued to take a hard line against any
use of the language in either playground or classroom. Typical of the time was the
advice from one inspector to a teacher that ‘a judicious discussion with the pupils
should enable them to see the advisability of speaking English only in the playground,
where at present a considerable amount of Maori is used’. And from another, in
1933, that ‘on no account should the children be permitted to talk Mori in the
classroom or in the playground’.

At Matapihi in 1933 the Head recorded: ‘We found when we opened school that the
children were in the habit of speaking Maori in the playground. We are trying to
change this, and have made a rule that English must be spoken.’ A pupil recalled
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that, ‘As soon as we saw the teacher, if the teacher was with us, we observed the school rules. When the teacher went away we’d babble away in Maori’. 539

Teachers in Native Schools were required to enter physical punishments in the log books, giving the reason for the punishment and the number of strokes, but most Native School log books did not record examples of punishment for speaking Maori. In a study of log books between 1930 and 1940 I came across only one example, at Rangiahua in 1933, during a period when the Head was using the strap almost on a daily basis for a wide range of offences. However it is still horrific: ‘After many warnings am punishing P. classes for talking Maori (lightly).’ 540 In a much more extensive study of Native School log books William’s also generally found an absence of punishments for speaking Maori being recorded. 541

However the absence of such punishment in log book entries does not, however, by any means prove that it did not happen, and needs to be placed alongside other evidence, such as that by Richard Benton and Sir James Henare, and interviews with former pupils in the schools, that it did. The logs record a whole range of reasons for punishment, including ‘talking in class’, ‘disobedience’, ‘cheekiness’, and ‘insolence’, some of which, given the official attitude of the time, some teachers are more than likely to have recorded when a pupil spoke Maori. 542

My own view, based on extensively reviewing the evidence, is that individuals given physical punishment at school for any reason do not forget the experience. If someone says they were struck at school for speaking Maori, or for any other reason for that matter, I accept that they were.
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4.3 Other Aspects of Assimilation

Another expression of the assimilation policy affecting schooling was the unsympathetic and disrespectful attitude education officials including school inspectors frequently demonstrated towards to other aspects of culture which Maori held dear, including tangi and hui.

A plan originated with James Pope at the turn of the century for using model villages and cottages to enable selected pupils who had passed through the native primary schools and denominational boarding schools to live as couples in a Pakeha fashion in a European-style settlement. Twenty cottages were to be built on land gifted by Maori near the Pamoana Native School on the Wanganui River. One reason given for the idea was that it would avoid some of the difficulties and ‘backsliding’ officials claimed school-trained Maori experienced when they returned to the kainga, and enable the couples to live the European life-style that their schooling had accustomed them to. An essential part of the plan was Pope’s intention to use such ‘respectable Maori elders as may be willing to learn the new way of life, and to do without the tangi and other kinds of hui, and generally and above all to give up indiscriminate hospitality and general communism’. 543

The scheme did not proceed. But it provides another example of the assimilation aim linked to schooling, of which an intention to restructure Maori family life into a Pakeha nuclear model was an important component.

In 1905 a teacher sought the advice of the Inspector General of Schools, George Hogben, regarding the position of teachers in, ‘the combating of Tohungaism or witch-craft among the Natives’; an elderly Tohunga has been ‘secretly practising’ and if he had not removed one patient from him she would have died:

I could, I suppose, have him shifted by giving a hint to the Police, but have so far refrained as he is being employed by the leading man in the

543 AJHR, 1901, E-2, p.11.
settlement and I have no wish to stir up strife with the Maoris without obtaining from your Department an assurance of my position in regard to the combating of this evil.544

Hogben’s reply, based on notes supplied to him by Pope, was cautious. It was:

not a very easy matter to give advice without in the first place having an accurate knowledge of the facts of the case…A teacher should be careful not to offend the prejudices of the Maoris unless he is reasonably sure that good will come from such action. In such a case as that referred to in your letter the teacher should continue to do all in his power to conserve the interests of the children; treating the Tohunga question with a very light hand, but endeavouring to show in a kindly manner that he considered the tohunga remedies foolish and probably dangerous. In no way should the teacher endeavour to bring force to bear in such a case; doing so could produce no result of a beneficial nature, and might arouse hostility that would lead to serious injury to the school.545

In 1909 all the teachers were sent a copy of the Tohunga Suppression Act 1908, and here also the Department proceeded somewhat warily, repeating Pope’s earlier comments about being careful not to ‘directly offend the prejudices of the Natives’ and to treat any matters which arose ‘with a very light hand’.546 But the memorandum added that the aim should be to overcome the difficulty ‘in time, by means of steady, patient, well-directed effort towards the general enlightenment of the people’. The teachers were also advised that ‘the professing or pretending to profess supernatural powers in the treatment or care of any disease’ was a matter which could prejudicially interfere with the role expected of them in contributing to the care of the sick in their district, and if any ‘flagrant cases’ of that kind came to their notice it should be reported to the Department, with as much detail as possible to help determine whether a prosecution should be laid.547
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4.4 School Texts, Assimilation, and Perceptions About Race and Patriotism

The reading material used in the schools continued to reflect and reinforce the English cultural emphasis, while also giving the Maori pupils messages about race and culture, and inculcating patriotism. The stories in the most commonly used history and geography texts in common usage in both Native and Board schools, and in The New Zealand School Journal which was distributed to all schools, presented a ‘pecking order’ approach to race which:

Automatically placed the white race first...there was general agreement, amongst both British New Zealand writers, that they (Maori) were members of a lesser race or racial sub-group but very worthy for all that (reflected in comments like); “Whites form by far the most important race, for they have the best laws, the greatest amount of learning, and the most excellent knowledge of farming and trade. There are five great races of men, and of these the white race is highest”; “The men of our race sometimes complain because the white people have taken away so much of their land; but I am sure that our teacher is right when he tells us that we have more land left than we can use. He says too that the white men have given us peace and order, and a thousand blessings that we could never have enjoyed but for their coming to settle amongst us” (Maori boy, speaking in a story in the Sixth Imperial Reader).  

An analysis of The Zealand School Journal identified how:

A selective phraseology made careful use of adjectives, intensifiers, and metaphors to heighten images of colonial ‘heroes’ and Maori ‘enemies’. In various situations Maoris were evaluated as ‘treacherous’, ‘cunning’, ‘troublesome’, ‘distrustful’, ‘cruel’, ‘savage’, ‘wild,’ and ‘fierce’. ‘Native’ was a term synonymous with ‘Maori’ and strongly implied images of inferiority and barbarism. Also, comparative and patronising adjectives such as ‘little’ and ‘brown’ portrayed Maoris in a discreditable light to be ranked in a scale of negative value alongside the ‘white’, ‘bold’, ‘fearless’ and ‘noble’ colonial settlers. Moreover, ‘white’ conveyed symbolic and emotive

---

connotations of cleanliness, purity, objectivity, rationality and normality, which ‘black’ and ‘brown’ did not share.\textsuperscript{549}

The author also points out that history was virtually non-existent outside the context of British imperialism; the Journal reinforced the notion that New Zealand’s history began with European arrival. Maori were portrayed as being completely unable to exist on their own in an orderly and peaceful manner.\textsuperscript{550} ‘Maori Fairy Tales’ were designed to keep readers amused, and portrayed in what was meant to be a humorous tone, ‘the quaintness and antiquity’ of Maori culture, in comparison to ‘serious and solemn accounts of the Empire’.\textsuperscript{551}

Another analysis of the \textit{New Zealand School Journal} from 1907 found that the attitudes expressed in it ‘were, of course, ethnocentric: the European New Zealanders saw themselves, their civilisation, technology and Christian religion as morally and socially above any other, and judged other societies on the basis of this alleged superiority.’\textsuperscript{552} The author quotes a not atypical story in 1916:

\begin{quote}
The white men came…the friendly tribes said “These new men are far more clever than we. Let us learn the ways of the white men! Then there was war, great war, with the sound of guns. But after this last great war was over, then all the Maoris grew wise.
\end{quote}

She then contrasts this with a story in a 1922 issue of the \textit{Journal}:

\begin{quote}
The long roll of honour that marks the greatness of our (British) race has engraved upon it the names of heroes, poets, explorers and historians: great men and women of action…who were not afraid to stand up for the rights of the people against tyrannical kings and nobles, and who were prepared to die rather than give up the ideas for which they strove.\textsuperscript{553}
\end{quote}

And on the basis of her analysis Beaglehole concludes that an ethnocentric attitude lasted in the \textit{School Journal} ‘for forty years or so’ and ‘took two basic forms: on the
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one hand, exalting British virtues and heroes, and, on the other, portraying the Maori
in terms of the past rather than the present or future. This undoubtedly influenced the
attitude of Maori and European children towards themselves and towards each
other’.554

In 1916 the Secretary for Education advised teachers in Native schools of the list of
books for distribution to the various classes as their course of reading for the year,
pointing out that any departure from the list was ‘not desirable’:

Standards 6 and 7: Southern’s Life of Nelson; Settlers Canada; Ivanhoe.
Standard 5: The Cricket on the Hearth; The Mill on the Floss; A Christmas Carol.
Standard 4: Feats on the Fiords; Coral Island; The Hawthorne Reader; Wallace and Bruce; Norse Legends.
Standard 3: The Swiss Family Robinson; Rambles by the Riverside; Popular Norse Tales; The Anderson Reader; Hiawatha.
Standards 1 and 2: Sinbad the Sailor; Alice in Wonderland; Norse Stories; The Moorhen and the Watervale; The Owl and the Fieldmouse; The Story of the Robins.555

Occasionally, individual teachers resisted the policy that this should be the only kind
of material available, as in the following example of a teacher commencing in her first
Native school in 1928:

When I went into this place I was shocked. I looked at the reading material and it was the old Blackie’s phonic readers…the material was so foreign from anything Maori …I wrote to the Department and said…I couldn’t possibly use them for reading…They wrote back and said, well, if the Department has piles of these books on the shelves you just have to keep on using them. So I burnt the lot and I just had to make my own materials.556

Considerable effort was put into instilling patriotism and loyalty to the Empire in the
schools. The Inspector-General of Education, in a memorandum to teachers in Native
schools in 1910, outlined the details for the observance of Empire day; the school was
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to assemble as usual in the morning, and lessons given to the children on the reign of the late King Edward VII and Queen Victoria, and the present King George V. It was suggested that the Committee and as many of the parents who wished to should also attend and, after the completion of morning school, the pupils would be dismissed for the day.\textsuperscript{557}

Therefore for most of the period under review, 1867-1930, the policy of Europeanisation and assimilation meant that the Maori pupils themselves, the Maori members of School Committees, and the extremely limited use of Maori in the beginning classes for a limited period under Pope, were virtually the only sign of anything Maori in the schools. Alan Ward’s description of the Crown’s ‘amalgamation’ policies that ‘The saving of the Maori race involved the extinction of Maori culture’, certainly applied to the Crown’s policies towards the Maori language for approximately at least the 100 years after 1867.\textsuperscript{558}

Moreover with the emphasis on the English language came other cultural forms; ‘the infiltration and observation’ by the Crown’s educational representatives leading to Maori children being ‘examined, inspected, supervised, counted, ordered, disciplined and cleaned’.\textsuperscript{559}

Professor Ranginui Walker describes the Native Schools as a potent weapon in the armoury of the Crown as coloniser. He suggests that the process of colonisation is:

\begin{quote}

total, in that it involves cultural invasion and colonisation of the minds of the invaded as well...Beginning with the missionaries, the founding fathers of the new nation state were therefore committed to the policy of assimilation. To this end the missionaries, and later the state, used education as an instrument of cultural invasion.\textsuperscript{560}

\end{quote}

Douglas Ball, who was appointed the Education Department’s Senior Inspector of Native schools in 1930, was scathing in his criticism of the official policies of his pre-1930 predecessors, writing in 1940 stated that:

\begin{flushright}
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To the earlier administrators and educationists, quick and complete assimilation appeared to be unavoidable and the natural end of educational endeavour....In desiring to change the mental and social patterns of a people assimilation is ruthless in its repudiation of the indigenous culture...It makes no attempt to adapt, and striving, by a major operation, to substitute one culture system for another, often destroys the people it hopes to benefit.  

And another Inspector, Tom Fletcher, recalled that:

When I first visited Maori Schools in 1931, there was practically nothing Maori in the schools except the Maori children. No Maori song was ever sung, there was no sign of Maori crafts or any interest in Maori history as part of the curriculum. The values in their own culture were ignored’.  

Yet while both Inspectors were to oversee a modification of the assimilation policy after 1930 which permitted selected aspects of Maori arts and crafts to be taught in the Native Schools, they maintained the rigid policy of their predecessors in continuing to justify the exclusion of the Maori language. While the need to change this policy had been raised at the time of the other changes in 1930, the Crown’s chief education official, TB Strong, the Director of Education, strongly disagreed. Writing in 1930 he stated:

The Native is gradually losing knowledge of his own language, and the question has been raised whether there is not good reason to introduce the teaching of the Maori tongue. Sentiment would incline one to say yes; but sentiment alone is not sufficient justification. Language is a means of communicating thought and is a social necessity. By its measure not only meeting the needs of daily association with our fellows but having the advantage of being able to study the thought of the best thinkers of all ages. From both points of view a knowledge of the Maori language is unnecessary to Natives who know only English. The Maori language has no literature and consequently in this direction, too, the natural abandonment of the native tongue inflicts no loss on the Maori.  
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A memo from Bird, now Chief Inspector of Primary Schools, would have reinforced Strong’s views. He advised Strong in April 1930 that his experience had been that ‘those teachers who use Maori in their teaching are the worst teachers of English, the use of Maori offering an easy way of avoiding the need for explanations in English’.  

Despite this, some teachers attempted to circumvent the sanctions against the use of Maori; ‘You were using Maori language to facilitate’, recalls one, but ‘we didn’t let on to the inspectors’.  

However the educational historian, A.G. Butchers, writing in 1930, summed up the prevailing official view:

A question of interest now beginning to be raised with some insistence is as to whether the time has come for some relaxation of the basic rule of the schools, namely, that English only may be spoken within the precepts, and that all instruction must be in that language. The suggestion is, however, grounded in sentiment rather than in its practical utility. Some of the older Maoris fear that their language is doomed to extinction unless direct steps are taken to preserve it in the schools. But natural languages cannot be made to obey artificial laws and the ultimate test will undoubtedly be—which language is of the greater practical utility to the Maori? One thing is certain. The prescription that English should be the sole language of the schools was a supreme stroke of genius as a means towards the civilization of the Maori people…Practical teachers for the most part regard the question (inclusion of Maori) as one having an academic interest only, and recommend not only that English should remain the sole medium of instruction in the schools, but that the Native school teachers themselves can do better if they refrain from trying to learn and use the Maori tongue in their social intercourse with the Natives.  

As the Senior Inspector of Native Schools Douglas Ball agreed with these views. Even in 1940 he was writing that ‘the language of a people living so long in isolation and in primitive conditions must be inadequate in vocabulary to meet the needs of a civilised community with all the modern inventions of science’. Ball added another obstacle or justification officials regularly put forward as a reason for not including  
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the Maori language in Native schools. This was that the schools were still almost completely staffed by European teachers, ‘not one percent of whom has facility in the Maori language. Even if it were considered desirable to introduce Maori…the lack of teachers would prohibit the venture’.\footnote{Ibid;}

Apirana Ngata’s views on whether the Maori language should be included in the schools changed over time. In 1930 he supported the emphasis on English and did not think the Maori language, or, for that matter, even Maori arts and crafts, should be taught in the schools. His attitude was summed up in the advice he gave to the Minister of Education in 1930:

I agree with your correspondent on the general principle of the Maori children knowing their own tongue and that it is desirable a knowledge of the Maori arts and crafts should be retained. It is another question whether these objects can best be accomplished through the schools. I do not think so as a matter of practical politics. Maori parents do not like their children being taught in Maori even in the Maori Schools, as they argue that the children are sent there to learn English and the ways of the English. The language should be the language of the home, and there other ways of achieving that end. The most important and the one in which we find we can do most good for ourselves is to inspire the Maori especially the educated Maori, to have pride in his race, and all that pertains to it-especially the language.\footnote{Ngata to Atmore, 19 September, 1930. AAZY W3901 44/1/2 Box 216, Native Schools. ANZ-W.}

Wiremu Parker suggested that while the parental attitude Ngata identified was by no means uncommon at the time (see discussion on East Coast schools below), he himself might not have been aware of the extent to which language loss was already occurring in some areas even in the 1930s, because the best orators always greeted him when he visited marae.\footnote{Interview with the author, 1985.}

However Ngata still held the same view in 1936. In a speech to a widely representative conference of some 60 Maori and Pakeha delegates convened by the new Prime Minister, M.J. Savage in 1936 to consider the educational, health and economic position of the Maori, he stated that if he were allowed to devise a
curriculum for the schools he would make ‘English first, second, third, fourth, and all the rest of the subjects fifth’. 571

But within three years Ngata had changed his mind about the Maori language. Speaking to the important conference of young Maori leaders at Auckland in 1939, he acknowledged that he had formerly opposed the teaching of Maori in Native schools because he had believed there was not sufficient time for pupils to learn both Maori and English. But now he believed ‘nothing was worse than for one to be with Maori features but without his own language’. 572

When Ngata visited the Poroporo Native School in 1938 the Head recorded in the log book that he had told the pupils ‘stick to the Maori language’ because ‘a Maori who couldn’t speak the language was neither a Maori or a Pakeha’. 573

In 1939 Ngata wrote to the Minister of Education, Peter Fraser, that:

The problem presented today is that education through the mothers of the men and women of the next generation of the Maori people is attacking the core of the Maori culture- the medium of mental communication, the language. The remedy in the circumstances is to develop deliberately through education a bilingual and bicultural people. The day when a Maori child, born of Maori parents, was assumed to know Maori as his native tongue is passing rapidly…There it seems to me is the outstanding problem for the Native education system. The alternative is to let things go with the inevitable result of rooting out all that makes the Maori a Maori. 574

And later in his life he wrote of the effect the policy of excluding the language and arts and crafts from schooling had had on him personally:

The chief and almost fatal obstruction was the course of education to which the policy of New Zealand committed the children of both races… The result in my case, my education in the music and singing of my own people, was short-circuited. The years that followed at Te
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Aute almost completed the suppression of any taste or desire for a prized accomplishment in the society to which my kin belonged.575

The loss of Maori culture, which Ngata believed the policy of assimilation and exclusion of all things Maori in schooling had contributed to, now led him to the view that it explained ‘the case of thousands of Maoris old and young, who entered the schools of this country and passed out with their minds closed to the culture, which is their inheritance and which lies wounded and slighted and neglected at their very door’.576

4.5 Crown Language Policy From 1946

Crown officials within the Department of Education responsible for Maori education, and Ministers of the Crown responsible for Education and Maori Affairs policy, maintained their implacable opposition to the introduction of the Maori language into schools for several further decades after 1945.

However in October 1945 the Maori Purposes Fund Board convened a conference at Rotorua ‘in connection with the teaching of Maori from the elementary stage to university’.577 The ‘Maori Education Committee’, whose members included the Very Rev. J. G. Laughton (Chair), Pei Te H. Jones, M. Winiata, and others, strongly recommended the teaching of Maori to retain Maori traditions, culture and the personality of the Maori, and preserve and foster racial pride and dignity. The Committee received correspondence from Ngata and Bird, both members of the Committee but unable to be present. This was illuminating in terms of representing their different viewpoints. Bird had now retired from the Education Department. But he still held views identical with those he had held when appointed Senior Inspector of Native schools in 1904; an English-only policy should be continued, and his approach generally to the use or retention of Maori remained unsympathetic.

from the very first the law required that the children should be taught English and that the school should be conducted in English, you realise
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what a wise provision was thus made from the very outset…if the result has been to make the Maori to lose his language, don’t forget that in its place he has the finest language in the world and that the retention of Maori is after all largely a matter of sentiment.578

By contrast, Ngata’s change of mind with regard to the teaching of Maori in schools was now obvious. It was based, in part, on his greater acknowledgment of the growth of language loss, and the changes that were going on as a result of family re-location, sometimes to urban areas. It had also made a big impression on him when prominent members of the Maori Battalion had returned from the war and publicly acknowledged they would have been much better officers if they had been able to speak Maori.579

He informed the Committee that:

I believe now, when so much Maori culture - such as it is - is finding its way into the schools, the non-Maori speaking youngsters become rapidly conscious and ashamed of their ignorance of their native tongue. The ‘action-song’ is helping to bridge a gap and the haka- in lieu of physical drill-invites a more intimate knowledge of the language…

If the teaching of Maori is to begin at Standard 1 the quality and efficiency of the teaching staff are most important …I suppose if a good knowledge of Maori paved the way to promotion, a good staff would be evolved over the years. Somebody will produce a yardstick to measure them by.580

The Committee made several recommendations relating to the school system. One of these was that the Maori language, arts and crafts, should be made an approved subject at the training colleges and be compulsory for future teachers in Maori schools. Moreover ‘the ability to teach Maori should be endorsed on a teacher’s certificate’. The Committee recommended that in primary schools, instruction in Maori should be mainly by the direct method, without the introduction of formal grammar. A bilingual method should be used to build vocabulary, correct pronunciation should be emphasized, and the subject matter should be based on the
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traditions, legends and folklores of the Maori. By Forms 1 and 2 pupils should be able to compose and use short sentences. From Form 3 on, in the secondary schools, ‘systematic language treatment including grammar should be undertaken’. The Committee identified the unavailability of a satisfactory school textbook as a limitation, but suggested that William’s First Lessons in Maori should be the basis and final authority.\textsuperscript{581}

In June 1947 Ngata pointed out to the Prime Minister that although there was a revival in the Maori language, there were no text books in print suitable for its instruction in schools, and received the reply only that the matter would be considered by the Government.\textsuperscript{582}

In 1950 the Member of Parliament for Marlborough, W. Girling, advocated the teaching of the language to both Maori and Pakeha students on the grounds that ‘the language is dying out; many Maori children themselves know very little about it. I think the language should be preserved and we should see to it that competent linguists are available to teach the children’.\textsuperscript{583} The member for Southern Maori, Eruera Tirikitane, agreed, saying it was time Maori was included in the curriculum.\textsuperscript{584}

But the idea of including Maori in schools continued to be regarded with disdain by contemporary Pakeha officials and most politicians. In 1951 W. Parsonage, now the Education Department’s Senior Inspector of Maori schools, wrote a 19-page Departmental paper, an edited version of which was presented to the Seventh Science conference in the same year. This can be regarded as the Department’s official view at the time.\textsuperscript{585} Parsonage surveyed the history of the place of language in Maori education from 1940, including the views of critics and advocates of the introduction of Maori into schools. The general tone and conclusion of his survey conveys to the reader a very pessimistic view regarding any practical possibility or value of introducing it, particularly into primary schools. He summarized the contemporary situation as being:
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1. English was ‘still the sole language used in the Maori primary schools’.

2. Maori was a compulsory subject for Maori pupils attending Maori post-primary schools, including the Maori District High Schools. Where Maori students were in other types of secondary schools, or adults wished to study Maori, they could enrol in it at the Correspondence School. Currently 122 pupils and others were enrolled, including 72 high school pupils taking the School Certificate course, 20 teachers in Maori schools, 18 mission workers, 6 degree students and 6 unclassified.

3. Maori was ‘not a recognized subject’ at the teachers’ colleges, although it could be studied ‘to a limited extent’ by members of the Maori club at each college.

4. Maori could be taken as a subject for the University Entrance Examination and the B.A. degree at the various colleges of the University of Zealand. But according to Parsonage, enrolments in Maori for the B.A. indicated there was ‘apparently not a great demand’ for it, with only 2 passes in 1949 and 4 in 1950.586

Surveying arguments for and against the teaching of Maori in schools, Parsonage focused mainly on the importance of the use of the English language since the arrival of Europeans. Most of the many examples he chose emphasized the difficulties of introducing Maori:

If this supremacy of the English language is not to be challenged, it would be well to familiarise ourselves with at least some of the difficulties associated with bilingualism…. I think it can be taken that the most ardent advocates of the study of the Maori language have no intention or desire to make Maori the medium of instruction in our schools, for such a course would be confronted by many practical difficulties not the least of which would be that 17, 647 Maori primary pupils (approximately 55 percent of the total) attend education board (as distinct from Maori schools) and are there intermingled with Pakeha children. The introduction of the teaching of Maori language as a subject would also demand a willingness of Maoris to resolve tribal and dialectical variations of the language so that a “standard” Maori could be taught.587

To support his case, Parsonage quoted from the work of various overseas scholars. Most of the examples he chose reinforced the view that the learning of a second language, whatever its merits, would impede the most effective learning of the first or primary language, in this instance English. He concluded that the evidence was sufficient to indicate that ‘bilingualism is attended by problems which have not yet been satisfactorily solved’.  

One of the reasons earlier officials, including Ball and his predecessors, had given for not being able to include Maori, even if its introduction had been considered desirable, was also raised by Parsonage. This was the difficulty of providing sufficiently trained teachers for the various age groups. He concluded that:

> It might well be that more effective transmission can be made by using English at this particular stage in the development of the Maori race. Or again, more might be done to preserve and foster the true cultural value of the Maori language by providing every facility for specially selected Maori scholars to make the most intense study of Maori and related Polynesian tongues, than by depending on all or the majority of Maoris being given what would be a relative smattering of the language.  

Parsonage’s paper, representing as it did his view as the Senior Inspector of Maori schools and that of the Education Department, was therefore not at all supportive of teachers and schools playing a role in the teaching of Maori in primary schools. It was a view reinforced at the time by both the Minister of Education, Ronald Algie, the Member for Remuera, and the Director of Education, Dr Clarence Beeby.

It was chiefly Maori themselves who now took the initiative. The Maori Women’s Welfare League in particular had begun to campaign strongly for the importance of the Maori language for Maori children to be recognised. A 1951 resolution stated that ‘there is a strong case for teaching Maori in Maori schools’, and pointed out that ‘even children who learn Maori in the home tend to lose their language owing to its absence from the school curriculum’.  
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But Algie, the Minister of Maori Affairs, was unsympathetic. Replying to the League he emphasized that all teaching in Maori schools was in the English language, and that ‘from a purely utilitarian point of view, the English language is still of paramount importance in the education of the Maori people’. He acknowledged that maintaining Maori might be important ‘from the point of view of cultural survival’, but could only suggest that it might be possible to increase the number of Maori teachers able to teach the language in the future.  

In 1953 the Secretary of the Wharekauri Tribal Committee at the Chatham Islands wrote to Beeby, informing him that the Maori children were ‘very backward in their own language, and asking him to approve the teaching of Maori to the pupils in the three schools on the Islands, with the Committee’s assistance. However Beeby replied that while he appreciated the interest and motive behind the request, the teaching of Maori ‘could not be arranged during the official school day’; it was difficult enough to meet the existing curriculum requirements in the hours available, but it might be possible to arrange tuition outside of normal school hours.

In 1954 the Maori Women’s Welfare League tried again, making a modest request to the Minister of Education that the Government introduce Maori as a subject to be taught at the Teachers’ Training Colleges in the four main centres, ‘if only to the degree of teaching correct pronunciation of names and places’. Bruce Biggs, recently appointed as a lecturer in Maori language at Auckland University, wrote to Algie asking him to favourably support the League’s request. There was, he wrote, ‘a body of informed opinion’ which considered that some instruction in Maori language should occur in schools where Maori pupils were taught, on the grounds that Maori was the second and in many instances the first language of the pupils. He suggested that important psychological effects stemmed from the complete exclusion from the curriculum of the language spoken by the child’s parents, and identified with their home life. Such omission also emphasized rather than minimised the cultural gap Maori children had to bridge. And when Maori was the first or only language of the
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child, the ‘adverse affects of the impossibility of free oral or written expression at school need not be emphasized, especially in the light of modern educational theory’. Biggs concluded with a lengthy statement on the importance for teachers of Maori not only to have a knowledge of the language, but also be specially trained in all aspects of teaching it properly.\textsuperscript{594}

Algie’s reply to the League, copied to Biggs, again unsympathetically rejected its request. Not surprisingly, he used reasons and language for doing so reminiscent of those used by his Departmental advisor, Parsonage, in his earlier paper:

I must emphasize a point that seems obvious; English is the prime language for all Maori children. This policy has been so well accepted and has operated so effectively that at least half the Maori children beginning school have little or no knowledge of the Maori language. In addition there are many Maori parents who do not wish their children to be taught Maori; some of them indeed hold firmly to the view that it can well be left to Maori parents to give such training if it is thought necessary.

Actually there are more Maori children enrolled in public schools than in Maori schools. To introduce the teaching of Maori into public schools even in the elementary way you suggest, would be very difficult, first, because there are not many Maori teachers serving in public schools and second, because it would not be easy teaching Maori to groups, often quite small, within schools.

I cannot accept without considerable qualification your contention that the learning of the Maori language seems to improve a child’s command of English. Most authorities are agreed that the quickest and the best way of gaining command of English is by speaking, hearing and writing English.\textsuperscript{595}

The Maori Women’s Welfare League continued to keep the pressure on respective Governments to introduce the Maori language into schools, its 1959 Dominion Conference calling on the Government to initiate an experiment in the teaching of the language beginning with the infant classes.\textsuperscript{596}

\textsuperscript{594} Biggs to Algie, 26 July 1954. E2 1956/4b. ANZ-W. DB.
\textsuperscript{595} Algie to Biggs. Ibid.
\textsuperscript{596} Dominion Secretary to Minister of Education, 30 October 1959. MA W2490 57/1 Part 3, Box 279 Committee on Maori Education, 1955-60. ANZ-W. DB.
4.6 Language and East Coast Native/Maori Primary Schools

4.6.1 Emphasis on English

The importance the Inspectors placed on Maori pupils mastering English was reflected in virtually all their inspection reports on East Coast Native/Maori schools, and the success or lack of it in instruction by the teachers was a major factor in their evaluation of their effectiveness.

At Hiruharama in 1907 the view of Inspector, William Bird, was that ‘Generally speaking the English subjects in the school are very weak. This is in my opinion due to faulty method in the early stages of the children’s tuition, and to the fact also that they use but little English in the school’.\(^{597}\)

At Horoera in 1926 the teachers were advised that:

> The methods used are not quite yet quite suitable for a Native School. The teachers must remember that an adequate knowledge of spoken English is the first requisite for success and all their efforts should be devoted to securing this...The lessons given in the Department’s pamphlet should be supplemented by talks about local phenomena, stories, nursery rhymes, talking games dramatic dialogues and simple songs.\(^{598}\)

Similar comments were made in 1928; ‘The teaching of the English language is the most important subject in Native Schools. The utmost effort should be made to teach the primer children to speak with accurate pronunciation and appropriate expression.’\(^{599}\)

The fact that most new entrants still came to school speaking mainly Maori was commented on by an Inspector at Horoera in 1935; ‘Where attendance has been good

\(^{597}\) Inspection Report, 20 August 1907. BAAA 1001, 246b. ANZ-A. DB.
\(^{598}\) Inspection Report, Horoera, 11th August 1926. BAAA 1001/934a. ANZ-A. DB.
\(^{599}\) Inspection Report, Horoera 12 August 1928. Ibid. DB.
the children have made fairly good progress, considering that only one child out of eight in Primer 1 have any English’.\textsuperscript{600}

In 1937, at Potaka, the Inspector was still identifying the need to master English as an impediment to the progress of the pupils, writing that ‘The pupils are nearly all Maoris and mastery of the intricacies of English is one of the main obstacles in the way of producing a high standard of subject achievement’.\textsuperscript{601}

The emphasis on speaking English well was evident in an inspection report on Tikitiki in 1929: ‘The whole of the Primer work and indeed of the whole school suffers from the fact that the children do not enunciate their words or moderate their voices properly.’\textsuperscript{602} And in his report on the same school in 1931 D. G. Ball wrote: ‘Enunciation. Still necessary to insist on; 1. Louder oral delivery; 2. Clearer enunciation (still mouth lazy)’.\textsuperscript{603}

That Apirana Ngata had retained his views on the need for Maori to master English, although by now he also had come to the view that that should not include the exclusion of Maori from schooling, was evident in an address he gave to the Waipu branch of the New Zealand Educational Institute at the Tokomaru Bay Native School in 1940.

An expert knowledge of English must come before everything else. That was his most sure key to opening up of a brighter future; not that the Maori language must be lost. On the contrary it must be purified and expanded, but at the same time English was the key with which to open the door to the sciences, the mechanical world and to many other callings towards which many Maoris find themselves drawn.\textsuperscript{604}

As was mentioned earlier, many Maori who wanted the Crown to provide a school also saw the school’s main role as that of teaching their children English. In 1882 the

\textsuperscript{600} Teacher’s Annual Examination Report, Horoera, 31 December 1935. Ibid. DB.
\textsuperscript{601} Inspection Report, Potaka, 4 November 1937. ABDJ Acc3568 33f. ANZ-W. DB.
\textsuperscript{602} Examination Report, Tikitiki, G. M. Henderson, Inspector, 18 August 1926. BAAA 1001/1056a. ANZ-A. DB.
\textsuperscript{603} Inspection Report, Tikitiki, D.G. Ball, 12 March 1931. BAAA 10001/1056a. ANZ-A. DB.
\textsuperscript{604} “Future of the Maori”, Address given at Tokomaru Bay, reported in the Gisborne Herald, 2\textsuperscript{nd} December, 1940. BAAA 1001/1093c, 44/1/43 Part 3. ANZ-A. DB.
Teacher at the Tokomaru Bay informed the Minister that ‘some of the best scholars in
the school have been sent to Napier, 4 boys to Te Aute and 3 girls to the school under
the charge of Miss Williams’. He added that there were now 14 children at the Napier
schools from Tokomaru who had been pupils at the school, and attributed this to
Maori ‘having a strong desire their children should learn the English language which
they contend is almost an impossibility in a Native School when they are compelled
to return to their Maori homes after school where Maori only is spoken’. 605

Wiremu Parker of Ngati Porou attended a Native School until 1929 and recalled that
on an area of the East Coast with ten Maori villages, all the children without
exception spoke Maori as their first language, and he suggested that at that time
parents believed that the primary purpose of going to school was to acquire what the
children did not have, mastery of the English language. Parker did not deny that in
some of the schools (although not his own) Maori children were punished for
speaking Maori at school, but claimed that ‘in schools where children were chastised
for speaking Maori in the playground, the parents invariably dismissed the incident
with the retort:’“Kaitoa! Mahara koe i tukua koe ki te kura ki te aha, ki te ako ra i te
reo Ingarihi! (Serve you right! Why do you think you were sent to school, to learn the
English language of course!)’. 606

However some East Coast Maori parents objected strongly when they felt that
punishments being given by a teacher were too harsh or unreasonable, for speaking
Maori, not speaking English to a teacher’s satisfaction, or for any other reason. The
inability of an eight-year-old boy attending the Mangatuna Native School to properly
pronounce an English word was a central factor in a claim by him and his mother that
he had received severe corporal punishment at the school:

I am a resident and live near the Mangatuna School. One of my
children, a boy aged 8 years, has been for sometime past, come home
to me with complaints of being slapped about the head, and on one
occasion about 2 weeks ago he showed me a raised mark just under his
ear which he said the teacher did with a strap, and he got so afraid of
being slapped about the head that I had difficulty to make him go to

605 Teacher Tokomaru Bay to Minister, 6 April 1882. BAAA 1001/652a. ANZ-A. DB.
606 Wiremu Parker, ‘The Substance that Remains’, in Ian Ward (ed.), Thirteen Facets, Wellington,
1978, p.189.
school. Yesterday he came home and told me because he could not pronounce a word in his reading lesson, ‘bulgeing’ I think was the word. The Teacher used the strap on him each time that he tried, and he could not say it. She then took him into the Master’s room, where he was caned by the Master. He was taken back to the Teacher’s room, the Teacher still insisting on him, while crying, to say the word, when there was further strappings. After the 3 beatings the Master came to him and said “Kaitoa” shove your fists into your eyes”. I took the child’s clothes off and saw marks on his back above his waist and below at the back where a cane had been used. I rung the Master to ask him not to be so severe on the child, as I already had a job to get him to go to school. I was not finding fault with Master for correcting him, but not to be so hard, I found it difficult to make him go to school. But he would not talk with me except to say the child was being encouraged to defy the Teacher, and to do wrong, which is as good as saying we tell him to do. It hurts us to be told, we would not do a thing like that. The Master later rung me to say he would not have the child at school. If the child was bad, or depraved child he could not have done more, even if he was stubborn does not call for such treatment as being expelled from school.607

The Teacher had already advised the Department that he had suspended the boy for misbehaviour, and upon receipt of Mrs Maurirere’s letter the Director wrote to him asking for his comments, particularly with regard to the complaint of slapping around the head, and reminded him that corporal punishment was only to be used as a last resort. He suggested that a boy of eight could surely be dealt with sufficient firmness ‘in some less drastic way than seems to have been adopted’. The Department only favoured expulsion in ‘most exceptional circumstances’ and the Minister’s consent was required unless a child was suffering from a contagious disease. He expressed satisfaction that the Teacher intended the suspension to only be temporary, and the Department expected that arrangements would be made for him to return when school re-opened.608

However a petition from 31 parents or guardians of children at the school indicated more widespread dissatisfaction with aspects of the role of the teachers at this time. They expressed the ‘extreme dissatisfaction existing amongst parents with the conditions under which the school is being conducted and the treatment to which children have been subjects to at the hands of the Mistress and Headmaster’ They

607 Mrs P. K. Maurirere, Parent Mangatuna, to Director, 26 November 1925. BAAA 1001/307b. ANZ-A. DB.
608 Director to Teacher, Managatuna, 22nd December, 1925. Ibid. DB.
wanted an ‘impartial enquiry into the running of the school and if conditions were
found to warrant action on the Department’s part we suggest that a transfer of
teachers would be in the best interests of all concerned’. 609 Nothing else appears on
the file. The teachers at Mangatuna at this time, a Mr and Mrs Scammell, generally
received very positive reports from the Inspectors which I have noted elsewhere but
these events suggest they could be harsh disciplinarians.

4.6.2 Exclusion of Te Reo Maori

In 1892 Pope still held the view, outlined in the 1880 Native Schools Code, that
Maori should generally only be used in a very limited way as a pedagogical device,
particularly in the junior classes, for assisting the pupils to learn English more
effectively. This was evident at Tokomaru Bay in 1892, in his comment that ‘The
master makes capital use of his stock of Maori; that is Maori is, in his hands, a means
of making his pupils grasp the meaning of English words or phrases. The Maori is
never made to supersede the English’. 610

Yet at this time Pope could still occasionally demonstrate a wider and more accepting
use of the language, as in his report on an English lesson at Rangitukia in 1888 that
‘A lively and interesting lesson was not so powerful as it would have been if more use
had been made of Maori’. 611

But in a report on Tikitiki in the following year, Inspector H. Kirk’s comments
reflected a hardening attitude against even limited use of Maori:

I think the teacher should cease to use Maori in school when the
necessary explanation can be made in English. It is quite likely that
the children will readily understand instruction given in Maori and that
they will make the greater progress in certain subjects, such as Writing
and Arithmetic, but they will not trouble themselves to understand
English if the teacher will speak Maori. It is to be borne in mind that

609 Parents Mangatuna to Officer in Charge, Native School Department, 15 December 1925. Ibid. DB.
611 Inspection report on Rangitukia, 9 March 1888. BAAA 1001/508b. ANZ-A. DB.
English is not only an important subject in itself but that it is a “key” subject to others.\textsuperscript{612}

This view was reinforced by Pope in his report on the school in the following year:

I wish that he (the teacher) would not use quite so much Maori in teaching.\ldots It seems to me that considerable stress ought to be laid on the importance of speaking English to the children constantly. About a dozen of the pupils are quite young and if they do not have the advantage of hearing a great deal of English spoken it is hard to see what advantage they derive from attending.\textsuperscript{613}

In an inspection report on Tokomaru Bay in 1900 Pope repeated an idea that he was advocating elsewhere as a general policy measure; a Maori settlement along Pakeha lines was needed, which would, among other things, enable Maori to ‘give up the tangi and other kinds of hui’, and ‘indiscriminate hospitality and general communism’, and provide a solution for the ‘relatively highly educated’ girls returning from Hukerere who ‘had to hang about the settlement waiting for an opening to lead the life they have come to appreciate, one which never came’.\textsuperscript{614}

There is another aspect of the attitude towards the use of Maori that should be mentioned here. From the beginning of the Native School system in 1867 East Coast Maori wishing to have a school frequently wrote to the Education Secretary in Maori, and Maori School Committees also frequently corresponded with Ministers and Departmental officials in Maori. The Department of Education employed no staff to translate these communications, relying instead on a request to an official in another Department, frequently the Secretary of Justice, to arrange a translation.

In 1888, when the Tokomaru Bay School Committee requested that the Inspector General always write to them in Maori, he responded that as so many of the people could read English and he could not write Maori they must excuse him if he wrote to them in English.\textsuperscript{615}

\textsuperscript{612} Inspection Report, Tikitiki, 15 March 1889. BAAA 1001/640c. ANZ-A. DB.
\textsuperscript{613} Inspection Report, Tiki Tiki, 14 February 1890. Ibid. DB
\textsuperscript{614} Inspection Report, Tokomaru, 9 May 1900. BAAA 1001, 653a. ANZ-A. DB.
\textsuperscript{615} Inspector General to Chairman, 22 March 1888. BAAA 1001/652a. ANZ-A. DB.
Pope reported on Rangitukia in 1892 that ‘in one of the standards the English work was so poor that it endangered the passing of every child in the class. The teacher, now removed to another school, made the serious mistake of speaking Maori to the children far too frequently’. He added that ‘It is not denied that a very sparing use of Maori may be advantageous, but, generally speaking, a school is successful in proportion as the children understand English and speak it confidently’.616

Pope’s report on Tokomaru in 1901 expressed his wider view of the aim of assimilation and schooling and their role in eliminating Maori cultural practice:

This school, too, has its problems waiting for solution. Girls on their return from boarding-school, highly educated relatively, have to hang about the settlement waiting for an opening to lead the life they have learnt to appreciate. No opening comes, but sometimes lamentable disaster. The problem is to find a bridge from the boarding-school to a Pakeha’s life in a Maori district. What is wanted is a kind of Maori village settlement on our well-known Pakeha lines where the village settlers shall be, largely, boarding-school ex-pupils, male and female, with such respectable elder Maoris as may be anxious to try the new way of life, and to do without the tangi and other kinds of hui; and generally, and above all, to give up indiscriminate hospitality and general communism. It is in some such direction as this that the welfare of the Maori lies.617

Yet occasionally, in areas not involving culture, some Departmental officials were occasionally capable of demonstrating understanding and flexibility. An example occurred in 1912, when a meeting of parents of pupils at Hiruharama asked the Head to enquire whether the Department would permit the school holidays to be adjusted to the third week in April rather than the third week in May to assist the lifting of the kumara harvest. Passing on the request, the Head said he had no objection if the Department approved, as it would reduce the absenteeism prevalent at that time, and the Secretary replied that the Department had no objection to the alteration.618

617 AJHR, 1901, E-2, p.11.
618 Head to Secretary, 12 February 1912 and Secretary to Head, 1 March 1912. BAAA 1001/246b. ANZ-A. DB
4.6.3 Maori ‘Errors’

The Inspectors referred constantly and disparagingly to what they described as the ‘Maori errors’ evident in the work of East Coast Maori children. Below I merely list examples of this.

English: Fair. Characteristic Maori errors were frequent. 619

English. Characteristic Maori errors have not been stamped out. 620

Characteristic Maori errors are still noticeable. 621

English. Fair. Characteristic Maori errors are common. 622

Many Maori mistakes are present. 623

Good exercises were handed in (in written English) by the pupils in S.3.4.5. although Maori characteristic errors were in evidence. 624

These disparaging comments continued to be used over and over again by the Inspectors into the 1930s, and even beyond:

Maori words should not be used in school by a teacher. 625

Sentences are marred by Maori errors which are abundant. 626

Sentence work in S.2 is fair but Maori errors are showing through in abundance. The compositions are marred by the persistent cropping up of Maori errors. 627

Maori errors are still in evidence. 628

---

619 Inspection Report, Whareponga, 21st August, 1912. BAAA 1001/763c. ANZ-A. DB
621 Inspection Report, Hiruharama, 19 August, 1912. BAAA 1001/246b. ANZ-A. DB.
623 Inspection Report, Horoera, 11 August 1926. BAAA 1001/934a. ANZ-A. DB.
624 Inspection Report, Tokomaru Bay, 7 September 1927. BAAA 1001/1060a, 44/6. ANZ-A. DB.
626 Inspection Report, Waiomatatini, 16 November 1934. BAAA 1001/1071b. ANZ-A. DB.
627 Inspection Report, Rangitukia, 12 June 1933. BAAA 1001/1012a. 44/6. ANZ-A. DB.
628 Teacher’s Annual Examination Report, Whakaangiangi, 31 December 1936. BAAA 1001/ 1077c. ANZ-A. DB.
Maori errors are being reduced.  

The compositions are marred by the persistent cropping up of Maori errors. Maori errors are showing through in abundance.

The usual Maori errors in grammar are very common.

The speech training scheme should contain a full list of speech difficulties peculiar to Maori children.

The number of Maori errors, especially in the use of tenses, was too great.

Maori errors are very common in the written work of Stds.1 and 2.

Maori errors are abundant.

In Form 1 there were serious weaknesses, particularly in the use of the full stop and the persistence of Maori errors.

The usual Maori mistakes in grammar were fairly common. Maori errors of all kinds were abundant.

There were ‘other Maori errors’.

The pupils have ability to tell a story but Maori difficulties in grammar and idiom are not uncommon.

In Form 1 Maori errors are common and will be difficult to overcome.

In written expression Maori errors in grammar and idiom are the chief weaknesses.

Maori errors in Std 3 are much too common, and remedial drills are urgently required.

---

629 Inspection Report, Whakaangiangi, 10 November 1939. Ibid.
630 Inspection Report, Rangitukia, 12 June 1933. BAAA 1001/1012a. ANZ-A. DB.
631 Inspection Report D.G.Ball, Horoera, 8 November 1933. BAAA 1001/934a. ANZ-A. DB.
632 Inspection Report, Waiomatatini, 5 May 1936. BAAA 1000/1071b 44/6. ANZ-A. DB.
634 Inspection Report, Whareponga, 22 June 1939. BAAA 1001/765a, 44/4. ANZ-A. DB.
635 Inspection Report, Tokomaru Bay, 13 November 1937. BAAA 1001/1060b. ANZ-A. DB.
637 Ibid;
638 Inspection Report, Tikitiki, 16 November, 1934. Ibid. DB.
639 Inspection Report, Tikitiki, A. H. Demne, 28 April 1936. Ibid. DB.
640 Inspection Report, Tikitiki, 17 June 1937. Ibid. DB.
641 Inspection Report, Tikitiki, 12 November 1937. Ibid. DB.
642 Inspection Report, Tikitiki, 4 August 1938. Ibid. DB.
The quality of the work is somewhat marred by the prevalence of Maori errors. 643

Maori errors are very abundant in Stds 3 and 4. 644

Even well into the 1950s the same disparaging language continued to be used by the Inspectors in their reports.

Written expression. Drill work must be used to overcome “Maorisms”. 645

Eradicate the common spelling errors and the many Maori errors. 646

Standards 1 and 2. There is a fairly pronounced Maori value given to English vowels in children’s speech.

Standard 4. Pupils’ speech is poor—there is a prevalence of clipped and shortened vowels together with Maori accent. 647

In written expression, while pupils showed good ideas, the expression of these was often marred by the use of Maori idiom. 648

The critical approach by officials extended to the choice of reading materials for the schools. In 1929 the Head Teacher at Horoera sent the Department a list of library books he proposed to buy with the support of the School Committee. His list for ages 8 to 14 included ‘Tales of the Maori’, ‘Legends of the Maori’, ‘Tales of Maori Magic’, and ‘Waireka, the Maori’. 649 In his reply the Director said the list was approved, with the exception of the books chosen for children between ages 10 to 14, and the Head was requested to replace those with a selection from a list the Department provided. All books in the Head’s list with Maori in the title were deleted. 650 The list of books sent to the Tikitiki Maori District High School in March 1942 reflected the continuation of an almost exclusively English emphasis. 651

643 Inspection Report, Tikitiki, 4 August 1938. Ibid. DB.
644 Inspection Report, Potaka, 31 July 1940. BAAA 1001 44/6. ANZ-A. DB.
646 Inspection Report, Tokomaru Bay Maori DHS, 9 April 1954. BAAA 1001/1061a. ANZ-A. DB.
647 Inspection Report, Tikitiki Maori DHS, 6 November 1957. BAAA 1001/1057b. ANZ-A. DB.
649 Head to Director, 10 October 1929. BAAA 1001/934a, 44/6. ANZ-A. DB.
650 Director to Head, 19 November 1929. Ibid. DB.
651 BAAA 1001/1056b. ANZ-A. DB.
Unlike the situation in the primary schools, Maori was being taught in the secondary Department at the Tikitiki Native District High School in 1947, but even here a difficulty arose. The Pakeha father of a female pupil in form 3, whose mother was Maori, refused to have her taught the language, and threatened he would remove her from the school if she was forced to take it, even though no alternative courses were available in the one teacher secondary department. The parent’s reasons were that ‘he does not consider Maori will be of use to his daughter when she leaves school and seeks work in a pakeha world and also that he does not consider Mr Jennings competent enough to teach the language as he is unable to converse fluently with the natives in the district.’ While the Head did not think the dropping of Maori would jeopardise the girl’s chance of completing her School Certificate in four years time, he did not think it was a good example to set the other pupils. But one month later the Head informed the Director that the girl had been withdrawn, with her father now wanting her to enrol with the Correspondence School so she could take a School Certificate Course including Shorthand, Book-keeping etc.

4.7 Other Forms of Assimilation and Socialisation

The emphasis on English and continued exclusion of Maori was the main but not the only way the Native schools attempted to continue to socialise East Coast Maori children into European ways. These included an official emphasis on the role of the teacher in inculcating European practices and beliefs with regard to manners, patriotism, health and cleanliness.

In 1873 the Crown’s Inspector of Native Schools, A.H. Russell, inspected the school at Uawa, and reported that the master, Mr Parker, appeared to have achieved a control over the children, ‘which has already reclaimed them from habits of theft, insolence and general annoyance, which were much complained of, but have now in a greater measure ceased’.

---

652 Head, Tikitiki MDHS, to Director, 10 May 1947. BAAA 1001/1056b. ANZ-A. DB.
653 Head, to Director, 5 June 1947. BAAA 1001/1057a. ANZ-A. DB.
654 AJHR, 1873, G-4, p.6.
In 1908, the pupils at Whareponga took part in a community fund-raising concert for church funds. They sang to accompany ‘a Japanese fan dance in costume’, but ‘the gem of the evening was a Maypole dance by the children’ and another ‘well received item was “ten little Nigger Boys” given by boys in character’.  

In the Te Makariri Scholarships Examination in 1901 several East Coast students were candidates, including Parekura Pewhairangi, Matiaha Tapaaia and Pango Rangi from the Native School at Tokomaru Bay and Etera Rihara from Rangitukia. In the writing examination the candidates were asked to write from dictation a passage which began, ‘A recent traveller in Africa says “We suddenly came upon six female elephants with five little ones of different ages. They were in a flat open bit of ground, and were basking happily in the sunshine, all unconscious of danger…”’.  

They were asked to copy a poem ‘very carefully on a clean sheet of paper with marks given for: (1) general style of handwriting; (2) correctness; (3) distinctness, and; (4) neatness. The first verse was: ‘The boast of heraldry, the pomp of power/And all that beauty, all that wealth o’er gave/Await alike th’ inevitable hour./The paths of glory lead but to the grave’. In Reading they were asked to read a passage on ‘The Buffalo Herd’, and give the meaning of selected words. The passage began ‘As we approached the herd they ranged up in a compact body, presenting a very regular line in front. From this line seven large bulls stepped forth and from their vicious appearance seemed disposed to show fight…’ A subject titled ‘Sacred History, New Zealand History, Laws of Health’, included amongst the questions the following:

State briefly what you know about General Cameron, Captain Cargill, Sir George Grey.

Have the Maoris lost or gained through the coming of the pakeha? Give reasons for your answer.

Give some interesting information regarding Saul of Tarsus, Barnabus, Philip.

Why is it dangerous to sit for any length of time with wet socks on? Explain as carefully as you can.

---

655 The Gisborne Times, 21 October1908. BAAA 1001/763b. ANZ-A. DB.
Explain carefully how the air in a crowded building g becomes unwholesome if fresh air is excluded.\textsuperscript{656}

The students were also examined in Arithmetic and Geography.\textsuperscript{657}

There was also a constant emphasis in the East Coast Native Schools on patriotism and loyalty to the Crown, reinforced by regular observances of Royal birthdays and related events. At Whangara in 1904 an Inspector reported that ‘The Committee have also provided a good flagstaff and before the exam the ceremony of hoisting and saluting the flag was performed. An aged Maori hoisted the flag, the Chairman gave an address, and the children sang God Save the King and gave three cheers.’ \textsuperscript{658}

\section*{4.8 Health}

The Crown continued to emphasize that the role of the Native (after 1947 Maori) school teacher should extend to encouraging health amongst the pupils and community, and while the ideas were always based on European concepts of health and a good deal of paternalism was evident, there is a fairly general acceptance that teachers often played a useful role in this regard. Where the paternalism was more evident, and at times objectionable, was in the constant emphasis on the cleanliness of the pupils. The form the Native School Inspectors were required to complete included a category “Cleanliness” of the pupil, and listed below are references to this aspect on the reports on East Coast schools:

Teachers at the Whangara School had done ‘excellent work’ and it had been the means ‘of elevating the whole people and a cleaner lot it is difficult to find’.\textsuperscript{659}

Cleanliness. ‘Good. The cleanliness of finger nails and feet require notice in some cases’.\textsuperscript{660}

‘The children are clean’.\textsuperscript{661}

\textsuperscript{656} R. D. D.Maclean-Correspondence re Te Makariri Scholarship candidate’s papers. MS-Papers-0032-0932. ATL.
\textsuperscript{657} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{658} Inspection Report, Whangara, 5 October 1904. BAAA 1001/747b. ANZ-A. DB.
\textsuperscript{659} Inspection Report, 18 October 1905. BAAA 1001/747c. ANZ-A. DB.
\textsuperscript{660} Inspection Report, Whangara, 12 April 1918. BAAA 1001/748a. ANZ-A. DB.
‘The cleanliness and uniformly tidy appearance of the children is worthy of special comment’.662

‘No exception can be taken to the cleanliness of the pupils’.663

Head Teachers and Departmental officials, also sometimes referred, outrageously, to cleanliness as an aspect when considering the appointment of Maori as teachers, an aspect that was never mentioned in the appointment of Pakeha as teachers. An example of this occurred in 1948, when the Head of the Tikitiki Maori District High School, in recommending a former pupil who had subsequently taken up nursing as a Junior Assistant at the School, described her as ‘attractive, clean, well-mannered and capable with children’.664

### 4.9 Racism, Discrimination and East Coast Schools

Maori children attending both Board and Native Schools and their parents faced racism and discrimination in various forms. (See the Chapter on Education Board Schools), and East Coast Maori children and parents were not immune from this.

In 1878 the teacher at the Tokamaru Bay Native School requested an increase in salary which would enable him to send the eldest of his two boys ‘to an English school quite away from the Maori association’.665

One can only wonder at what the attitude of the Teacher at the Tuparoa Native School must have been like towards his pupils, when he informed his successor that ‘Of all the natives that I have had to do with the Tuparoa natives are absolutely the worst.

---

661 Inspection Report, Horoera, 10 October 1949. BAAA 1001/934b. ANZ-A. DB.
662 Inspection Report, Horoera, 3 March 1959. Ibid. DB.
663 Inspection Report, Whareponga, 7 June 1910. BAAA 1001/763b. ANZ-A. DB.
664 Head to District Superintendent, 7 August 1948. BAAA 1001/ 1057a. ANZ-A. DB.
665 Teacher, Tokamau Bay to Native Minister, 10 October 1878. BAAA 1001/652a. ANZ-A. DB.
They are thieves of the worst order and take no interest in anything but beer and land.\footnote{666}

In 1912 Inspector Bird pointed out that the Board School at Tokomaru Bay had been erected in 1906 at a distance of about ten chains or less from the Native School, its purpose being ‘to serve the comparatively few European children whose parents for various reasons objected to their mixing with Maoris…The fact is that when Tokomaru Bay School was erected it served simply as a class school for a few Europeans and chosen ones from the half-caste population’.\footnote{667} One year earlier, when suggesting that attendance at the School could have been better, the Inspector had pointed out that the Teacher, Mr Coventry, ‘has however set a bad example by sending his own child to the European school, a fact which points to want of faith in his own’.\footnote{668}

In 1915 Inspector Bird described as ‘scandalous’ a policy whereby European and a number of ‘half-caste’ children from the Waima end of the Bay were being conveyed to the Board School, partly at Government expense, when pupils at the Native School some six chains further on were ‘compelled to walk along this road’. He elaborated that:

\begin{quote}
the Maori children from outlying places – Mangahawini, Waipara, Hikuwai, live really beyond the legal radius and are put to much greater inconvenience to attend school. No consideration is shown to them simply because they are Maoris and attend a Native School. Will the Department, under the circumstances, approve of a recommendation to pay board money at the usual rate in the case of Maori children who are coming from the outside places have to board with friends in the Bay, and will the Department also endeavour to arrange with the Board for the conveyance by the Board’s vehicle of the Maori children from Waima who are attending the Native School?\footnote{669}
\end{quote}

In 1925 the Hawke’s Bay Education Board’s Senior Inspector of Schools reported to the Director that he had interviewed Europeans whose children were attending the

\footnote{666 W. Broderick to Secretary, 2 April 1912. BAAA 1001 665a. ANZ-A. DB.}
\footnote{667 Bird to Secretary, 17 May 1912. BAAA 1001/654a. ANZ-A. DB.}
\footnote{668 Examination Report, Tokomaru Bay, 21 August 1911. BAAA 1001/654a. ANZ-A. DB.}
\footnote{669 Bird to Secretary, 17 August 1915.BAAA 1001/654b. ANZ-A. DB.}
Native School at Te Araroa, but who now wanted a Board School established, ‘so that European children would not have to attend the Native School’. He argued that in places where the European population was increasing, it appeared wise to establish a board school if the number of European pupils justified it, and Te Araroa appeared to be such a place. The application was supported by the Board, whose Secretary pointed out that because ‘the whole of Te Araroa is native land a site for a new school would either have to be leased or acquired outright under the Public Works Act’.

However the application was very strongly opposed by the Senior Inspector of Native Schools, now J. Porteous. He pointed out that a large Native School already existed at Te Araroa with 102 children enrolled, of whom 31 were classified as European. This ratio meant the stage had not yet been reached for implementing the policy of transferring a Native School to a Board when European pupils were in the majority, ‘and premature action in that direction would be decidedly prejudicial to the interests of a large number of Maori children, and would inflict a wrong upon them and their parents’. He added that it was ‘a separate school that is asked for, the object being to secure the segregation of the races in the matter of education’, and the request by the European section of the community was evidently being encouraged by the Hawke’s Bay Board. He reminded the Director that ‘The Department has consistently opposed the segregation of the races in the matter of education, not only because of the wasteful and indefensible expenditure involved in duplicating schools, but also with a view to discountenancing anything of the nature of racial antipathy. There is no shadow of doubt in my mind that the present agitation is based on purely racial grounds’.

Porteous described the Native School as having done very good work during the previous 12 years, during which the number of European pupils had steadily increased, with many pupils of both races gaining their proficiency certificates, so that the European children attending suffered no educational disadvantage. He pointed out that the Department had received frequent requests similar to those from the Europeans at Te Araroa:

670 Senior Inspector to Director, 15 May 1925. E2 1927/5b 33/4/228/1. ANZ-W. DB.
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and almost inevitably the requests and agitations have had their origin in the desire to draw the “colour line”…In my view any course which has for its object the segregation of the races is a reprehensible one and utterly opposed to the dictates of wisdom and justice. By such a course the racial inferiority of the Maori is offensively obtruded, with the result that resentment and hostility will be aroused not only among the adults but among the children.673

The outcome was that the Minister of Education declined to approve a Board School.674

The status of the Whakaangiangi School changed from Board to Native School in 1936, and a Pakeha parent, whose children ‘had about 22 years attendance’, was not happy about what he saw as the changes, it not being until:

the school was taken over by the Native Department have any of my children complained about the treatment handed out to them by the teachers. The Kelly’s told me that all children attending the school would be treated as natives….From my knowledge of natives from a Pakeha point of view it is impossible owing to the low moral standards of the Natives and I would say it is distinctly unfair on the Pakeha parents to have their children dragged to the level of the “Mat”.675

The writer pointed out that eight Pakeha pupils from two families attended the school, and as their representative on the School Committee he said he was not asking for any special privileges:

All we ask is that a decent clean Maori child (there are some) be sat with the white children and not the dirtiest smelliest children in the school as has been the policy of the Kelly’s in the past. A dozen other instances that I could give show that the Kellys instead of helping the white children to live with the Natives have gone out of their way to make things as bad as possible for them.676

The Head, who was well regarded by the Inspectors, responded to a request from the Director for an explanation by informing him that the parent had strongly opposed the

---
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change of status of the school from Board to Native, and had subsequently adopted, unfairly, a critical attitude to the teachers.\textsuperscript{677}

In 1938 the Minister of Education, Peter Fraser, visited Te Araroa and was approached by a Pakeha parent and several supporters who had children at the Whakaangiangi Native School They complained to him about the amount of practical work the students were expected to do, and pointed out that the school had originally been a Board School with a fair percentage of Europeans. They had a ‘definite grievance’, because they ‘made a very nice School’ and without a ‘by your leave it was taken over by the Native Department’ One of those present had the only two white children attending, and:

European children are out of place in a school where there are only one or two whites. According to the regulations we have to send one white child among 80 or 90 natives. I don’t think the Government should ask that sacrifice. That is my point of view; anything is better than sending a lone child to that school. I should prefer a correspondence course.\textsuperscript{678}

The Minister responded that if there were any difficulties like that he would be agreeable, but ‘What we have to worry about is creating race feelings’.\textsuperscript{679} Application forms for enrolling with the Correspondence School were subsequently sent to the complainant.

At Rangitukia the problem of finding suitable board for Pakeha assistant teachers was a perennial problem, and one which frequently appears in the files in other places as well. The long serving and much respected Chairman of the School Committee, the Rev. Kohere, offered to board such teachers in his home, but many were unwilling to live with a Maori family. In a letter to the Head Teacher in 1946 the Director pointed out that in the past the Rev. Kohere ‘had always undertaken to accommodate up to two assistants, but this, of course, practically restricts the appointments to your staff of Maoris’.\textsuperscript{680}

\begin{footnotes}
\item[677] Ibid;
\item[678] Report of meeting with the Minister of Education, Te Araroa, 7 June 1938. Ibid. DB.
\item[679] Ibid;
\item[680] Director, C. E. Beeby, to Head, 11 April 1946. BAAA 1001/ 1012b, 44/6. ANZ-A. DB.
\end{footnotes}
In 1954 the Senior Inspector of Maori Schools, W. Parsonage, advised the Head and Assistant at Potaka (Mr and Mrs Bennett) that they have been appointed to take charge of the Te Hauke Maori School, Hastings. He pointed out that the school and residence were new buildings, the entire staff would now be Maori and the school would be ‘very much in the eye of certain people in Hawke’s Bay who are not very well disposed towards Maori Schools’; there was therefore a need to ensure everything at Te Hauke was of the highest possible standard reflecting credit on the Maori Schools Service.681

4.10 Maori Arts and Crafts

4.10.1 Introduction

Several factors contributed to a modification of the Crown’s rigid assimilation policy with regard to the Native schools after 1930. One was a movement led by Apirana Ngata to ensure the maintenance of Maori culture and encourage a cultural renaissance. Ngata took a leading part in the creation of the Board of Maori Ethnological Research in 1923 and, in 1926, the Maori Arts and Crafts Act was passed. The following year the School of Maori Arts and Crafts, which concentrated on woodcarving, was established at Rotorua.

Another influence stemmed from developments within anthropology, and particularly in the way anthropologists viewed non-Western societies. The American anthropologist Franz Boas had pioneered cultural relativism, which now became fashionable. It was taken up by some British anthropologists who argued that different human cultures were equally valid when judged according to their own terms of reference; there were no ‘superior’ or ‘inferior’ cultures, and it was nonsense to argue that non-white people were ‘inferior’ just because their societies and culture were different from those in the West. It now became ‘the worst form of ethnocentrism ‘to place western society on the top of the evolutionary ladder and then to position other

681 Senior Inspector to Head, Potaka, 25 August 1954. BAAA 1000a 44/6. Potaka Correspondence & Inspection. ANZ-A. DB
societies underneath based upon judgments of how much they did or did not resemble western society'.

However, another group within British anthropology, and still the majority, continued to adhere to the structural-functionalist school, focusing on how social systems preserve themselves over time, and the importance of maintaining the social equilibrium rather than disturbing it. This was a conservative approach, which proved attractive to colonial policy-makers expecting to maintain authority in colonial territories for the foreseeable future, because it did not threaten the status quo. When carried over into educational policy by colonial European administrators, it had implications for the indigenous people who were its recipients, which were often less than favourable. Whether they intended it or not, the outcome of the functionalist approach in anthropology kept to the fore popular European ideas of “simple” people leading “simple” lives, needing protection, with limited capacity for managing their own affairs, possessing cultures that were “old” and needing to be “preserved”, rather than accepted as a living and dynamic part of contemporary life. New Zealand educators like Douglas Ball responsible for Maori education were aware of these trends and were influenced by them.

Another influence in New Zealand at this time was that the comparatively small number of Maori pupils who continued to reach the upper primary school standards had finally begun to raise questions amongst officials, one of which was whether the existing rigid assimilation policy might be hindering rather than assisting the progress of the pupils in the schools.

As a result of such influences the assimilation policy was modified from 1930 to permit selected aspects of Maori arts and Crafts, such as weaving and carving, and Maori songs and games to be taught in the Native schools. However although in British colonial territories in Africa and elsewhere the new thinking permitted the
inclusion of indigenous languages as well as arts and crafts, in New Zealand the rigid exclusion of the Maori language in the schools continued.

4.10.2 Sporadic or Limited Impact?

The effects of this change of policy were uneven, and at times artificial and superficial, not least because of the continued exclusion of the language, the heart of the culture. However, the change did undoubtedly contribute to some classrooms becoming more friendly and welcoming places for Maori pupils after 1930. Where Maori expert in the arts and crafts and other aspects of culture from the community were available and willing to give advice, and teachers and parents were enthusiastic, the effect on the atmosphere in of some schools could be positive. One Inspector, Tom Fletcher described how, ‘When I first visited Maori schools in 1931…there was practically nothing Maori in the schools except the Maori children. No Maori song was ever sung, there was no sign of Maori crafts or any interest in Maori history as part of the curriculum. The values in their own culture were ignored’.685

But it would be quite misleading to suggest that there was a sudden and universal flowering of Maori cultural activity in all the Native primary schools after 1930. In addition to the continued absence of the language, which was crucial, developments after 1930 were also initially impeded by the economic depression, which restricted the availability of necessary materials such as chisels for carving. Another of the limitations of the new policy was that the Pakeha teachers had had no training in and often had no knowledge of these new activities they were now expected to include in the curriculum, and the Department’s efforts to overcome this with refresher courses and articles in the Education Gazette were only partially successful.

685 AJHR, 1948, E-2, p.2.
4.10.3  **Maori Arts and Crafts: East Coast Native/Maori Primary Schools From 1930**

One sign of some new thinking within the Department was evident when the Director of Education visited Native Schools on the East Coast and Poverty Bay for the first time in many years in February and March 1929. In his report to the Minister he advised him that if he had the opportunity of visiting the East Coast he would be sure to be struck by the carving, including the beautifully decorated Church at Tiki Tiki. He saw an opportunity to link-up the Department’s enthusiasm for practical work for Maori with this and ‘where teachers find pupils interested in and able to undertake this kind of manual work it should be encouraged’.  

However the onset of the economic depression led to cuts in educational expenditure in New Zealand and, as mentioned earlier this was one of the factors which initially impeded aspects of the Department’s new policy. For example the tools required for carving work were not readily available, and even in 1936, when the Head of Horoera requested a supply of wood-carving tools, he was advised that a supply of the tools was on its way from England and when they arrived his request along with those from other schools would be considered.

A second impediment was that the Pakeha Head and Assistant Teachers had received no training in and usually had little knowledge of the Pakeha-selected aspects of Maori culture they were now expected to include in the work of the schools, and this was also evident on the East Coast.

In a report on Tikitiki in 1932 the Inspector wrote that ‘It is pleasing to see the extent to which the old Maori arts and crafts have been developed. Activities include wood-carving, taniko work, flax-weaving, raffia etc’.

---
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At Horoera in 1939 the Inspector, after describing the handwork as very good, added that it included ‘a considerable amount of work in the old Maori crafts in which the co-operation of the local people has been obtained’. 689

Similarly at Waiomatatini in 1936, the Inspector wrote that ‘We hope… to see a strong course in the old Maori arts and crafts’. 690

Evidence of aspects of the new policy was gradually evident in some of the East Coast schools but and virtually non-existent in others. The first reference to Maori arts and crafts in inspection report on Tokomaru Bay appeared in July 1933, when the Inspector commented that ‘In Handwork suitable attention has been given to the development of the Maori arts and crafts, with good results’. 691

In inspection reports on Tikitiki in the latter half of the 1930s there was virtually no reference to Maori arts or crafts, except for a comment in 1937 that ‘Woodwork, Maori crafts and other handwork activities are well done’. 692

At Horoera in 1933, the only reference to anything Maori in the Inspector’s report was ‘the usual Maori errors in grammar are very common’. 693 (No reference also appeared in his June 1934 report).

In inspection reports on Whareponga between August 1930 and May 1937 no reference was made to Maori arts and crafts’ However in June 1937, the Inspector wrote that at Whareponga ‘Maori design has been included. Handwork includes some taniko weaving for the girls, but further activities should be included for the boys’. 694

In inspection and examination reports on Waiomatatini from 13 March 1931 to 17 June 1935 not a single reference is made to any aspects of Maori arts and crafts in the work of the school. Yet on the staff during this period was a Junior Assistant, Miss N.
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Rangi, who received consistently good comments from the Inspectors for her work and presumably could have assisted with such activities.695

In the inspection reports on Whakawhitira, even in the latter half of the 1930s, not a single reference to Maori arts and crafts being present or encouraged was identified.696

It was not until April 1936 that any reference to Maori arts and crafts appeared in the inspection reports on Whangara, when the Inspector noted that ‘Maori Art and some good Taniko work’ had been done.697

The absence of comments does not necessarily mean that they did not happen. But it does suggest that despite Ball’s tendency to herald their inclusion as an important policy change, they were not an area of the curriculum that Inspectors regarded as being of high priority.

Effective progress usually required either the presence of a Maori staff member, most commonly at this stage a Junior Assistant, or for the Head to seek the co-operation of adults in the community skilled in the various arts and crafts to come into the school and give unpaid instruction.

At Tokomaru Bay in 1933, the Inspector wrote that ‘It is hoped that full advantage will be taken of the presence of the Maori carvers in the village’.698 At the same school in 1937, the Inspector wrote of the Junior Assistant, Miss Clark, that she was ‘one of our best Maori girls and may be considered later on for promotion. She handles a class very well and took charge of all the Maori action songs for the school’.699 Her presence undoubtedly contributed to frequent references to aspects of Maori culture in the work of the school during these years, as in 1939, when the Inspector wrote in his report to the Head that ‘I was very interested in your plan for

695 Inspection Reports, Waiomatatini, 1931-1935. BAAA 1001/1071b. ANZ-A. DB.
696 Inspection Reports 1936-1940. BAAA 1001/741c, 44/4. ANZ-A. DB.
697 Inspection Report, 27 April 1936. BAAA 1001/749a. ANZ-A. DB.
698 Inspection Report, 15 November 1933. BAAA 1001/1060a, 44/4. ANZ-A. DB.
consolidating and memorising Maori history through the composing of original songs and hakas'.

Similarly at Tuparoa in 1937, the responsibilities of the Junior Assistant, Miss T. Whangapirita, included teaching ‘Maori crafts, Maori songs and dances’.

At Rangitukia the Inspector wrote that it was ‘pleasing to state that the Maori adults have been co-opted to assist in the teaching of Maori arts and crafts and songs’. And the next year he wrote that ‘Local Maori men and women are helping with Maori songs and crafts’.

At Tuparoa in 1936, ‘The girls are plaiting baskets under the instruction of one of the Maori women, and the boys have started carving. Local history is also to be included’.

One former teacher in Native Schools from 1936 to 1941 recalled that, ‘At Potaka we had some Maori parents coming in to teach the girls taniko and things like that. And there was a singer in our group and he used to take singing…Most of the Maori songs that we knew were sung in Maori but based on Pakeha tunes and their singing was just superb’.

The end of the economic depression had a positive effect on the development of some activities in some schools. At Hiruharama in 1936 the Inspector recorded the children ‘doing fine work in Maori arts and craft, songs and history’. And at the same school in 1937 workshop activities included ‘Maori carving-large posts with use of carving tools for patterns and design on same’ and ‘tukutuku frames’, the Head commenting that ‘the new carving tools have brought increased interest from outside the school…The boys are very keen on this work and some are showing good

---
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promise’.\textsuperscript{707} The Minister of Education Peter Fraser was so impressed with the singing of Maori songs by the Hiruharama School choir during a visit in 1938 that he wrote to the Minister of Broadcasting suggesting that a recording be made.\textsuperscript{708}

At Tuparoa in 1937 the Inspector wrote that the ‘Singing is excellent and the Maori songs were very well rendered’.\textsuperscript{709} In 1938 the Head Teacher at Te Araroa applied to the Department for a supply of tools for Maori carving –his assistant (Mr Parker) and he having taken advantage of the presence of carvers currently engaged on the renovations of the Te Araroa meeting house, had ‘made a study of the work as it might be applied to school crafts,’ but ‘In view of the fact that I was totally ignorant of everything pertaining to Maori carving I did not make application for the set of tools supplied last year. I now regret it’.\textsuperscript{710}

At Whakaangiangi in 1936 ‘The children perform their Maori songs very creditably’.\textsuperscript{711} At the same school in 1940 the Inspector described ‘Art as applied to linocuts’ and ‘Maori action songs’ as the most pleasing features of the work.\textsuperscript{712}

In 1936 the Director wrote to the Head of Horoera returning to him ‘two Maori musical plays which have been read with interest. There is no doubt that the dramatization of Maori history and legends offers ample scope for those who have ability in this direction, and it will be interesting to note developments at Horoera Native School’.\textsuperscript{713}

At the Whareponga School in 1940 Maori action songs were ‘not neglected’.\textsuperscript{714}

An inspection report on Whakaangiangi in 1939 noted that ‘Good work is being done in Arts and Crafts and the Maori crafts are being included’.\textsuperscript{715}

\textsuperscript{707} Workshop Return, Hiruharama, 17 December 1937. BAAA 1016/1a. ANZ-A. DB.
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At the Waipiro Bay School in 1944 the Head wrote ‘Our carving classes are working overtime to the school and environs in appropriate Mairu style’.\(^{716}\)

But progress still sometimes remained slow, or fluctuated for some reason, such as a change of teachers. At Tikitiki in 1942 the Inspector wrote that ‘Maori arts and crafts are not a prominent feature’.\(^{717}\)

And even in 1952 an Inspection report on the Mangatuna Maori School suggested that ‘It would be of great value if some phases of Maori culture could be introduced’.\(^{718}\)

However in 1961, under new teachers, the Inspector wrote that ‘the teacher has done interesting and outstanding work with the senior girls in Maori culture’.\(^{719}\)

H. Jennings, an experienced East Coast teacher and Headmaster, made a fairly critical evaluation of the efforts overall which had been made by the end of the 1940s. He described most Maori culture taught in schools as limited in its scope, being ‘confined to action songs and hakas, weaving belts, carving and panel and rafter pattern work. Maori mythology and folk lore, traditional history, language, social customs relating to food, clothing, cultivation fishing and birding, housing, war, community life and so on, are not known and so not taught’. He claimed that traditionally Maori children of school age took no part in some of the activities being taught in schools, such as carving and garment making, these being skilled tasks taught under the direction of an expert or tohunga, some under the law of tapu. And he described much of the interest in such activities in schools as being ‘largely artificial, being stimulated by a keen teacher. Most Maori adults evince mild interest and even pleasure at the efforts of their children. But most of them will complain if these “Maori” activities impinge too much on the more important business of the school-the teaching of English in the broadest sense. There is, too, the question of a European giving the lead in, and teaching, Maori custom and language to Maoris’.\(^{720}\)

\(^{716}\) Teacher, E. Anderson, Waipiro Bay, to Senior Inspector, 27 September 1944. BAAA 1001/1075b. ANZ-A. DB.

\(^{717}\) Inspection Report, 22-24 September 1942. BAAA 1001/1056b. ANZ-A. DB.

\(^{718}\) Inspection Report, Mangatuna, 4 March 1952. BAAA 1001/951b. ANZ-A. DB.

\(^{719}\) Inspection Report, 23 March 1961. Ibid. DB.

However, the efforts continued. The Waiomatatini School Committee resolved in 1955 ‘that Mr W. Atkins and Mr P. Ngata arrange with suitable instructors in the district to give one hours instruction in Haka, deportment, pronunciation, Maori crafts’. And the Committee recorded one month later that, ‘The beginning of Maori arts and music instruction to begin and continue every Friday at 1pm’.

At the Tolaga Bay District High School the Inspector noted in 1956 that, ‘The Headmaster is alert to the particular needs of the school. He aims to broaden the curriculum to include aspects of Maori culture. With outside aid, a beginning has been made with action songs and haka’.

In 1952, when the Head of the Tikitiki Maori District High School asked the Senior Inspector of Maori Schools to supply material for testing the IQ of the children, he was advised that the Department did not supply such material because there was:

considerable doubt as to the real value of such tests, particularly when applied to Maori children because of different background experiences and linguistic ability. I would suggest that, as you are new to the Maori service your time would be much more profitably spent in enriching your knowledge of Maori culture, history, etc and applying that to the understanding of your Maori children.

By 1957 many more Maori teachers had entered the East Coast schools which undoubtedly contributed positively not only to the aspects of Maori culture already discussed, but also to the efforts now being made in the Maori District High Schools to teach the Maori language. The staff at the Tikitiki Maori District High School was an illustration of this, including in 1957 Mrs N. Mahuika, Mrs J. Kaa, Mr B. Wanoa, Miss E. Wanoa, Mr W. Kaa, Mr N. Kaire, and Mr N. Tawhai. In his report the Inspector wrote:

Maori: This subject is being well taught. The teacher has a scholarly approach and is very conscientious indeed. Most of the aspects of modern language teaching are covered. In view of the excellent
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background work being done in Maori life and customs and history, it is felt that to cope with this subject satisfactorily with this subject up to School Certificate, one more period should be allotted each year.\footnote{Inspection Report, Tikitiki Maori DHS, 6 November 1957. BAAA 1001/1057b. ANZ-A. DB.}

A 1961 report on Tikitiki noted:

Maori: The school features a Maori room with two walls panelled with fine specimens of Maori weaving. The language is taught by an untrained, unqualified native speaker, who is assisted by the local Maori vicar. She is using an excellent scheme of work, although there is heavy reliance on Will’s textbook for progression and for exercises. The level of work in Form 5 is satisfactory, and last year’s results in School Certificate, ranging from 45 to 75 percent were very commendable.\footnote{Inspection Report, Tikitiki Maori DHS, 11-12 October 1961. BAAA 1001/1057b. ANZ-A. DB.}

And in a further sign of developments, the District Senior Inspector of Maori Schools, R. J. McFarland wrote to the Head of Hiruharama in 1966 regarding:

Pilot Language Scheme. Thank you for the return of the tape with such interesting material on it. …As you may know the question of language development in Maori Schools and other schools with Maori children is gaining in importance. I am very anxious, therefore, that we take note of developments that have occurred in the last two or three years so that these may be made use of by other teachers after they have been evaluated.\footnote{District Senior Inspector of Maori Schools, R. J. McFarland, to Head Teacher, Hiruharama, 3 August 1966. BAAA 1001/933c. ANZ-A. DB.}
CHAPTER 5: PRACTICAL EDUCATION AND TRAINING AND EAST COAST MAORI

The natural genius of the Maori in the direction of manual skills and his natural interest in the concrete would appear to furnish the earliest key to the development of his intelligence. Senior Inspector of Native Schools, William Bird, in the Department of Education’s Annual Report to Parliament, 1907.728

In our opinion, Maori girls and boys would be better occupied in learning something of the dignity of labour. William Bird, in Department of Education’s Annual Report to Parliament, 1909.729

When I have said that the Maori should not be made a scholar, it is not that we cannot make a scholar of him. My view is that we can: but I think the life he has got to lead will be most useful to his people if we refrain.
Professor Harry Kirk, former Assistant Inspector of Native Schools, giving evidence to the 1906 Royal Commission on the Te Aute and Wanganui College Trusts, AJHR, 1906, G-5, p.102.

In none of the secondary Maori schools at the present time is there any attempt or desire to give what is usually understood by a “college” education. Generally speaking, the girls schools afford further training in English subjects and in various branches of domestic duties - cooking, sewing and dressmaking, housewifery, nursing and hygiene; the boys schools in English and manual training - woodwork, elementary practical agriculture and kindred subjects and that is all (Author’s emphasis). William Bird in the Department of Education’s Annual Report to Parliament, 1913.730
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Whenever I have come in contact with the education of the dark races, Maori, Samoan, Fijian, or Indian, I have noted with surprise their facility in mastering the intricacies of numerical calculations. This fatal facility has been taken advantage of in the Mission schools and even in the schools manned by white teachers to encourage the pupils to carry arithmetic to a stage far beyond their present needs or their possible future needs.

The New Zealand Director of Education, T. B. Strong, 1930.731

The Maori is not sufficiently far removed from his past to be well adapted for commerce, with its demand for strongly individualistic traits, which are in strong contrast to his ancient mode of living.

The Senior Inspector Native School, T. A. Fletcher, prior to outlining the philosophy behind the new Native District High Schools in 1940.732

Gratifying as these examination results are, it must be realised that few pupils will go on to university study and that prime consideration must be given to the great bulk of the pupils who will be entering a world of competitive employment. …The principal recommendation of this report will be that the controlling authorities of the school institute a technical course which will prepare pupils for the Maori Apprenticeship Training Scheme.

Report by State Secondary School Inspector on Hato Paora College in 1967 on the increasing success of the pupils in School Certificate and University Entrance examinations.733

There are still many teachers who doubt the ability of a Maori to take mathematics or history. Part of the problem seems to be in the mind of the teachers themselves when it is suggested that “Maoris thrive on practical courses” and “Maori pupils prefer not to enter academic forms”.


It is like asking a Queen’s Counsel to spend the rest of his days taking remand yard cases.

Principal of Gisborne Boys’ High School complaining in 1964 that good teachers would not be attracted to the school because of the preponderance of Maori boys in the lower streams.734

732 AJHR, E-3, 1941, p.3.
734 Principal to Chairman of the Board, 25th July, 1964.
Compared with the 42 percent of New Zealand residents who had no formal school qualifications, East Coast residents were disproportionately less likely than the general population to have a school qualification. Fifty-six percent of East Coast residents had no formal school qualification.

Education Review Office, 1997.735

5.1 Introduction

The views of Crown officials regarding the most appropriate type of schooling for Maori were shaped very early on by concepts of race and class, as is evident in the recommendation of a school inspector in 1862 that:

I do not advocate for the Natives under the present circumstances a refined education or high mental culture; it would be inconsistent if we take account of the position they are likely to hold for many years to come in the social scale, and inappropriate if we remember that they are better calculated by nature to get their living by manual than by mental labour.736

From virtually the beginning of the involvement of the Crown in schooling for Maori, the thinking of Pakeha politicians and bureaucrats was dominated by two main ideas; Maori were a rural people and would remain so, and this, combined with their personal, emotional and even genetic disposition as a race suited them much more than Pakeha to schooling of a practical rather than academic kind. The expectation also was that the appropriate place of Maori in the social scale was at the lower end, whether as rural labourers, manual workers, or later as tradesmen. Such attitudes condemned successive generations of Maori to limited educational, occupational and life opportunities.

After 1930 the schooling of Maori children continued to be influenced by the belief amongst Crown officials that Maori as a race would be associated with the land for the foreseeable future. This was combined with the persistence of stereotypes in

735 ERO, Improving Schooling on the East Coast, Wellington, 1997, p.34. Drawn from Statistics New Zealand, 1992
736 Henry Taylor, the first full-time Inspector appointed under the terms of the Native Schools Act 1858. AJHR, 1862, E-4, p.38.
official quarters that Maori as a race were somehow more suited to practical activities than Pakeha, and this also continued to influence official policy regarding their schooling.

Patronising stereotypes about Maori were reflected in such comments as that by the Mayor of Auckland, Sir Ernest Davis, that ‘The Maori is a child of nature; leave him in the country where he belongs- he does not belong in the town’. 737

One influential Pakeha academic at the time, Professor I.L.G. Sutherland, accepted stereotypes of Maori ability, suggesting that:

Maoris have no aptitude for Commerce and while a scattered few may European life in towns or cities, one sees no future for the people as a whole, save a life based on the land. 738

In 1937 the official policy of the Native Affairs Department stated that ‘the future of the Maori, his material existence, his economic, physical, and social welfare, is indubitably bound up in the soil…. The policy today is to assist the Maori to develop and farm his lands, to train him in those branches of agriculture most suited to his needs’. 739

Crown education policy for Maori therefore reflected commonly held Pakeha views, both official and unofficial, of what the social and economic role of the Maori should be. The effect was an emphasis on education policies for Maori at both primary school and secondary school levels with a much stronger bias towards practical activities than anything experienced generally in the state education system. ‘Instruction in elementary agriculture is of much more importance to the native race than to the Pakeha’, wrote the Director Education, T. B. Strong, to the then Senior Inspector of Native schools, John Porteous, in March 1929, when urging more emphasis on the subject in the Native schools. 740

The strength of the belief that the future of Maori lay on the land and this should be a major determinant of educational policy was also reaffirmed in Strong’s statement that an education should be provided leading the Maori boy to ‘become a good farmer and the Maori girl a good farmer’s wife’.741

Apirana Ngata’s enthusiasm for Maori land development meant that he also sometimes spoke in favour of a practical component being part of educational policy for Maori. But he never shared the enthusiasm of Pakeha educators for practical education being such a dominant factor. His vision for Maori was, by contrast, wide, optimistic and challenging, and in this respect presented a striking contrast to that demonstrated by the Crown’s educational officials. An early example of this was demonstrated in a paper he presented at the first Te Aute College Students’ Association Conference in 1897, in which he advocated for Maori to be employed across the full range of occupations.742

Ngata described Maori entering the professions as ‘the advance guard of the Maori reform movement, foremost in the field to point the way forward and upward’, and university training for this group was ‘almost an absolute necessity’. After giving advice on how students should proceed to graduate in Law, he pointed out that no Maori had yet graduated from the lengthy medical degree. But he was optimistic that a Te Aute student would very soon proceed to Otago, then to Edinburgh or London in that field, ‘to show others the way’. This was essential, because ‘we need Maori doctors and Maori lawyers’. The Church was another profession open to Maori, and satisfactory results had been achieved because the race had entered it longer than either law or medicine. Every year Te Aute sent graduates for training at a theological college and quite a few were already in the field. Teaching, particularly in the Native Schools, was another profession that should be open to well-qualified Maori.

Moving to farming, Ngata said comments were frequently made that Maori boys educated at the Maori boarding colleges did not farm, cultivate or improve their own land. But he claimed there failure to do so should not surprise anyone given the

741 Cited in Jackson, p.192.
difficulties in the way with regard to the uncertainty of the title of so much of it. However he also drew attention to the growing sheep industry carried on by Ngati Porou, where the only possible way of farming land held in common had been adopted.

He suggested all of the trades should also be ‘within reach of a Maori lad of ordinary intelligence and ability. We can be carpenters, saddlers, tailors, blacksmiths and shopkeepers, if we tried and had training.’ He knew of a former St. Stephen’s boy in Auckland who was a ‘first-class tailor, earning about £2 10s. a week’, and two former St. Stephen’s boys in Opotiki who were ‘successful blacksmiths’. He believed it was the Government that had assisted these boys to apprenticeships, so he would leave it to the Conference to decide whether an appeal to the Government should be made to establish a system by which boys from the denominational colleges could immediately on leaving school learn trades.

He then referred to employment opportunities requiring little education but great physical strength, some of it being of a seasonal nature only, including bush-felling, grass-seeding, sowing and reaping, sheep-shearing, gum-digging, mining, as shepherds, carters or general hands on farms, and in road-making and surveying.

Ngata challenged the view which he said was commonly held amongst some Europeans, including Education Department officials, that if Maori youth proceeded to further education they would become alienated from their own people. Further education was, he said, ‘the royal road to the professions’ and whether such alienation occurred or not depended ‘solely on the individual character’. 743

Yet there is also no doubt that Ngata’s enthusiasm for Maori land development later influenced him to emphasize more strongly that a practical component should be one important component in schooling for some Maori. One example of this occurred in 1906, when he was a member of a Royal Commission into the Te Aute and Wanganui School Trusts. The Commission recommended that because Maori still

743 Ibid, p.11.
owned considerable areas of agricultural and pastoral land, it was necessary for prominence to be given to manual and technical instruction in agriculture.\textsuperscript{744}

But as the 1930s progressed, Ngata was one of the very few at this time who realised that the land alone would not support the growing Maori population. Because of this he consistently returned to an earlier theme, the need for Maori to have a range of educational opportunities and acquire a range of skills for their own development and to enable them to compete on the same terms as Europeans. He was the chief spokesperson for this view. His optimistic and challenging approach to the future was symbolized in a speech he gave in Parliament in 1938, when he stated that:

\begin{quote}
With the increasing population and the necessarily slow rate of the long range land policy the (Maori) population will get ahead of the land resources. It is estimated that we can put 40 percent on the land. The rest must either go landless, or, what is nearly as bad, not land minded. The Maoris have the sense to see that only one or two in a family can go on the land. Today, to put the position quite briefly, when the young Maori asks me what about the future I say: ‘Well the Pakeha has got up into the air. That is the aspect of Pakeha life which has made far greater strides than any other-aviation’ and, as a race, we are going to be left on the ground. We have to follow the Pakeha into the air.\textsuperscript{745}
\end{quote}

In 1940 Ngata wrote that the idea that the future of the Maori people lay on the land had been ‘greatly exaggerated in the public mind’ and applied to less than one fourth of the total area of Native owned land’.\textsuperscript{746}

Ngata was very critical when he came across what he regarded as unequal treatment of Maori and inadequate effort being put into recognizing and encouraging their talents. He wrote in 1939 that ‘under the noses of Ministers of the Crown and of Under-Secretaries’ the treatment of Maori and Pakeha was not as equal as was professed’, and gave as examples Native Trust Properties, where ‘all Maori talent other than that of casual labour is conspicuously absent’, and the Native schools where there was ‘no whole-hearted attempt to discover and give opportunities to this
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talent.’ Moreover Maori were dismissed from public works and other jobs ‘whenever there is competition for these jobs’. 747

However Education Department policy in the 1930s led to a renewed emphasis on practical activities of all kinds in the Native primary schools. This included a strong focus on agricultural and other practical subjects such as woodwork for boys and domestic training for girls. By the end of 1932 the Senior Inspector of Native Schools Douglas Ball identified activities taking place in agriculture as including ‘experimental work and note-taking’, the keeping of garden diaries, school and home garden plots, calf clubs, tree propagation, and experimental plot work of value to farming practice in the district. 748

Activities reported up to the end of 1933 included sales of garden produce and agricultural shows, school and home garden plots, calf clubs, co-operation with ‘leading farmers, main crop studies and farming procedure’, and formation of a branch of the Women’s Institute, with meetings held in the schools and in the homes. 749

Ball emphasized the need for teachers to link up school instruction with the land development schemes and Maori homes whenever possible, reporting optimistically, that: ‘Agriculture is assuming a position of major importance in the curriculum of Native schools not only for its own intrinsic value, but also for the opportunity it affords to draw school and community closer together’. 750

The priority given to the practical policy was reflected in a ‘Statement of Principles’ circulated by the Department to all Native schoolteachers in 1934. The first principle stated that ‘all instruction be practical and related to the actual needs of the Maori’, and others that ‘in the case of girls, a practical knowledge of housecraft, including plain sewing, cooking, washing, and care of clothes, home cleaning and beautifying, mending, nursing be considered essential’; and, ‘That the vocational aspect of the

747 Ngata to G. Hutchison, District Governor Rotary International, 24 March 1939. Ngata Correspondence, q MS-1586. ATL.
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training be emphasized. Agriculture and woodwork closely correlated and in touch with the requirements of the district.\footnote{AJHR, 1935, E-3, p.2.}

5.2 Crown Secondary Education for Maori

Prior to 1940 the Crown and its Education Department officials had relied on the private Maori denominational boarding schools as the main means of providing schooling beyond the primary level for a small and selective group of Maori students.

The following statement appeared in the annual report of the Department of Education in 1936, and a somewhat similar statement appeared in the annual reports over successive years.

The Maori child has the same right to a free secondary education as a European. As a free-place pupil he can attend any secondary school, technical school or district high school. This right is of value only to Maoris who are living in the vicinity of such institutions, and thus it provides no real facility for secondary education for the Maori children living in the backblocks. For the latter, by means of a system of government scholarships, secondary education for two years is provided at selected private schools controlled by the authorities of various religious denominations.\footnote{AJHR, E-3, 1936.}

However by the end of the 1930s the large proportion of Maori primary school leavers not proceeding to any form of secondary school when compared with Pakeha was drawing increasing attention and concern. This was coupled with the long-standing failure on the part of education officials to direct the trustees of the Maori boarding schools to implement the kind of practical education they thought was most appropriate for most Maori students at the secondary level, an aspect which is discussed later in this chapter.

As a result, Education Department officials now began to develop plans for a new kind of rural high school and curriculum, specially for Maori students, which they rather than the trustees of the boarding schools, would control, and which would be
called Native (and from 1947 Maori) District High Schools. This would mark the end of the long period when for government officials and most Maori secondary education for Maori had been mainly what took place in the Maori denominational boarding schools.

In a speech in Parliament in 1938 Apirana Ngata criticised the church-administered trusts for not providing adequately for secondary schooling for Maori children. He pointed out that 21,000 Maori pupils were attending Native and Board primary schools, but at the end of 1937 only 501 pupils were attending the Maori secondary schools. He had no figures for the number of Maori attending the ordinary secondary schools, but only a very small proportion got to the Maori secondary schools and he added that ‘Here are the demands of civilization advancing rapidly, and here is a whole people in danger of being left behind in the march of civilization, and in the equipment of its individuals to take their proper place in the work of the Dominion.

The Education Department’s annual report estimated that in 1940 out of 778 Maori pupils leaving Form 2 of Native and Board primary schools, only 321 continued their education, and it acknowledged that in 1940 enrolments of Maori pupils at the denominational boarding schools were virtually identical with what they had been in 1880:

At the beginning of the Century…when the total Maori population was 45,000, there were seven denominational primary schools. In 1940, except for a small increase in the number of scholarships, the provision for the post-primary education of the Maori was the same, i.e. seven denominational schools with only slightly increased roll numbers, notwithstanding the fact that the Maori population had in that time doubled.

The report also re-stated that in 1940 every child in New Zealand was entitled to a free place at a secondary school, and those who lived in remote areas were entitled either to conveyance to a post-primary school or, alternatively, 7s. 6d. per week to assist them to board near a school. But in the Senior Inspector’s view, the

---
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implications of this provision was less generous to Maori children than it might at first appear. Many Maori families were not in a position to supplement the boarding allowance or provide the necessary clothing even if board could be found, and many were not willing to send their children away from home. This meant that ‘the generous provisions’ generally for post-primary education did not ‘provide for many Maori children’.756

An Auckland Star Editorial in August 1940 suggested that the country could not afford the consequences of educating only a few hundred Maori beyond the primary school stage.757 In the same years the Minister of Education, Peter Fraser, acknowledged that a gap still remained between primary education and adult life for which little provision had hitherto been made for Maori.758 And the economist Horace Belshaw argued that the relatively greater need of the Maori for more secondary schooling justified a much greater expenditure in proportion to population than amongst Europeans. This would be a sound investment, ‘even in narrowly economic terms’, because it would reduce financial dependence on Government and make Maori more economically productive.759

In Belshaw’s view providing more scholarships and meeting the ‘crying need’ for secondary education in the main centres of Maori population would be nothing more than ‘an extension of the principles of public policy as they apply to Europeans’. He added that ‘I doubt if any European population the size of the Maori population about Ruatoria would for long tolerate the absence of some sort of secondary institution’.760

In 1940 Ball, whose name had been synonymous with Government policy-making for Maori education during the thirties, acknowledged that the denominational boarding schools ‘cannot possibly’ cater for the increasing number of Maori pupils passing out of the Native and board primary schools. The need for additional facilities for ‘further training’ was ‘becoming urgent’ and the Department was giving the matter careful consideration. But whatever was planned, he continued, needed to ‘bear directly on
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5.3 East Coast Efforts to Develop Post-primary Schooling

The absence of opportunities for schooling beyond the primary level on the Coast had been a concern of residents for many years. One example of this was identified by the Teacher at Mangatuna in 1918, who in letter to the Director of Education, W.J. Anderson, advised him that:

The Maori at Mangatuna wish this school to become a centre for Maori education, with a workshop for technical instruction, and an opportunity for instruction in agriculture, and in fact to grow and develop into a College to cover all branches of education. In furtherance of this they are prepared to consider the giving of lands, or setting aside parts of rents for endowments towards this end, or assist in some way that may be suitable towards realizing their aspiration. I personally am in favour of their ideas, and would give any help I can in furtherance of the same. I would be glad to hear from you, you opinion of it.762

The Director’s reply was very officious and dismissive. He advised the Head that:

the conditions under which workshops may be established at Native Schools are sufficiently set forth in the regulations, and, as regards the large question (of a College) the Department has no intention at the present time of taking steps in the direction indicated. Should, however, such a course be contemplated at some future time, it is not likely that Mangatuna would be chosen in preference to a locality which would be more centrally situated for the Maori population whom it might serve.763

In 1919 the Minister of Agriculture forwarded to the Minister of Education an extract from a letter he has received from Mr G. Travers, Tuparoa, reading “Now that educational matters are being discussed, there is great need of a boarding and day school in this County situated centrally so as to benefit the settlers from Te Araroa
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down the coast to Tokomaru. The most central spot is probably Ruatoria and the land is available, and the Government now holds an ideal site (Mangaharei No.2).  

The Minister’s reply demonstrated little in the way of encouragement for the Pakeha settlers concerned or for the much larger majority of Maori who remained without opportunities for further schooling. He pointed out that it had not been made clear what kind of school was envisaged, primary or secondary, or a combination of both. Neither board primary schools or district high schools were provided with boarding establishments, ‘and it seems unlikely that the present requirements of the district would warrant the establishment of a district high school-much less that of a purely secondary school with boarding facilities’. He pointed out that that site referred to ‘is probably a piece of land given by the Maoris in 1862 as a site and endowment for educational purposes, and known as Ngawhakatutu or Manutahi’. It was understood to have since reverted to its Maori owners, and in any case, it was doubtful if still available whether it could be made use of ‘other than for Native School purposes for which it was originally intended’.  

So nothing came of this suggestion, and the unavailability of local opportunities for secondary schooling continued to exist for East Coast Maori. The number of scholarships to one of the Maori denominational boarding colleges was so small as to be of benefit to only a small minority of eligible East Coast students. Few East Coast Maori parents had the economic capacity to enable their children to enrol as private pupils in one of boarding schools, and the result was that the majority still finished primary school with no prospect of proceeding to a secondary school.

In 1920, Crown officials gave serious consideration to a request by Pakeha parents of Tolaga Bay, for the Tolaga Bay primary school to be developed into a district high school providing secondary education. In 1920 the Minister of Education, C. J. Parr, informed the Director that the European parents on the Tolaga Bay School Committee, of which Mr J. Somerville was the Chairman, had requested that a district high school be established at Tolaga Bay. He had informed the Committee that if they
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could guarantee 20 pupils for a period of two years there should be no difficulty in granting the request.\textsuperscript{766} The Minister then informed the Chairman that the Committee would need to apply to the Hawke’s Bay Education Board for the establishment of a high school, with a list of the names of pupils who had gained proficiency certificates and were qualified to hold free places, and the signatures of parents as a guarantee that the children would attend if a secondary department was opened.\textsuperscript{767} The parents of 20 children gave their signatures accordingly, but the Board’s Secretary then pointed out that its Senior Inspector had advised it that many of their children were still only in Standard 6, and it could not be absolutely guaranteed that they would have the necessary qualification. Nevertheless he regarded Tolaga Bay as deserving special consideration because it was an isolated but growing district, and, ‘Though the bare minimum of applicants has been obtained and though some of these are yet in Std 6 and others are Maoris, I recommend this application for favourable consideration’.\textsuperscript{768}

In a hand note written on the file on 3 December 1926 the Director, T. B. Strong, had written that he preferred ‘trying out the prospects’ by establishing a Std VII class, as had been done elsewhere, and subsequently advised that this course would be followed ‘so that the pupils who have passed Std 6 may receive instruction up to the standard Public Service Entrance etc’.\textsuperscript{769} The Minister subsequently authorized the Board to acquire a site of three acres under the Public Works Act for enlarged accommodation for the new class.\textsuperscript{770} Considerable efforts were put into increasing enrolments to the point where a high school would be justified. The Head of Mangatuna Native School enquired of the Director whether Jack Lawrence, who had obtained his proficiency at the school in September 1925, being over 15 years at the time, and then had discontinued attending, and Rahia Tautau, who obtained her Proficiency in 1924 and discontinued attending, were eligible to be included in the number of pupils in Std V11 at Tolaga Bay School where both pupils were now attending with a view of getting a sufficient number for a District High School. While he admired ‘the ambitions of the pupils to obtain secondary education’, and
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had ‘no wish to be antagonistic to the proposed High School’, he felt he would be ‘failing in my duty if I did not bring the matter to the Department’s attention’. The point he was making here was that the pupils concerned were too old to obtain free places at a high school.\(^\text{771}\) The Director advised him that as Tolaga Bay was not yet a high school their attendance was permissible.

At the Director’s request the Secretary of the Hawke’s Bay Education Board submitted the names of pupils who could attend the proposed district high school at Tolaga Bay. Nine pupils were in Tolaga Bay School’s Standard 7, of whom two could be identified by name as Maori; 18 were in Standard 6, two of whom could be identified as Maori, and three Pakeha pupils were in Standard 6 at the Mangaheia and Wigan Schools.\(^\text{772}\)

Assured that 30 pupils would attend, and describing Tolaga Bay as ‘the centre of a rich and developing farming district, the school was being enlarged and no extra staff would be required if the school was raised in status to a district high school’, the Board’s Senior Inspector recommended its establishment. He added that:

\[
\text{The development of the district is solid; two soldier settlements nearby are prospering. The land around is rich country, capable of much development …the School Committee including the Vicar, a Bank Manager and the Postmaster assured me of the stability and enthusiasm of the district. The parents are very anxious for the school to have the status of a High School, because of the social and commercial value such a status gives to their children’s Education. Times are hard, and an increasing number desire better education but cannot afford the expense of boarding away from home.}\(^\text{773}\)
\]

He continued with comments about the pupils already in Std VII, and was ‘assured that all those not entitled to a free place will pay. I may add that one of the girls is 20 years of age, a Maori, very enthusiastic, who obtained her P. certificate about five years ago. It would be a pity to turn her out so long as her influence is good’.\(^\text{774}\) On
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21 June 1927 the Council of Education recommended to the Minister that a D.H.S. be established and a junior high school appears to have begun.775

The need for more provision of schooling beyond the primary level on the Coast had been identified by the Director of Education, T. B. Strong, when reporting to the Minister of Education on a visit to East Coast schools in 1929. He commented that where Maori children were in such large numbers as they were in the Waiapu Valley ‘a State post-primary school mainly for native children might well be established’. The largest native schools in New Zealand were in the valley and ‘there is no better place to establish a secondary school that would provide a post-primary curriculum of the broadest possible type’. He suggested a Junior High School could be developed so as to:

give a few of the native children an opportunity of beginning purely secondary education that would lead to a higher secondary school, while at the same time the majority would be provided with those practical courses that are undoubtedly of most benefit to the natives. There appears to be no doubt at all that the future of the native lies in the development of his lands…there is no doubt in my mind that the schools for native children should provide courses of instruction that will fit the boys and girls to live on the land. If the Junior High School I suggest is established in the vicinity of Tiki Tiki or Ruatoria, I feel sure it would be well supported, provided it gives those courses of instruction that the natives themselves feel are of paramount importance to the race…the cultural value of English subjects would not be forgotten, and while the curriculum would in the main be practical, the cultural side would not be neglected.776

From time to time individual head teachers of Native Schools attempted to secure opportunities for further schooling for those of their Maori pupils who they saw were capable of benefiting from it. In 1932 the Head Teacher at Mangatuna,W, Scammell, wrote to the Director forwarding an application for a scholarship for Albert Wanoa, advising him that he had been very disappointed that he had not gained Proficiency, having ‘regarded him as a certainty’. He had failed in Composition, and Scammell asked whether, if the Spelling was omitted, Inspector Fletcher would reconsider that. He pointed out that if Wanoa had gained Proficiency, even if he had been
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unsuccessful for a scholarship, he could have continued his secondary education at Tolaga Bay Junior High School, but now he might be barred from either options. He had left Tolaga Bay School and come to Mangatuna ‘expressly for the purpose of obtaining a scholarship at Te Aute, and his failure had been a great disappointment to all concerned’. He could ‘only hope that the Department will give him further consideration which I feel he deserves’.777

By 1940 a district high school with a secondary department was operating at Tolaga Bay under the Hawke’s Bay Education Board. Significantly, this remained the only district high school on the Coast and, also significantly, Tolaga Bay was the location of one of the few Hawke’s Bay Education Board schools on the Coast and as such had been intended primarily for Pakeha pupils.

5.4 Secondary Education for Maori: The Native/Maori District High Schools

This section examines the Crown’s decision at the end of the nineteen thirties to develop for the first time its own secondary schools for Maori. The plan for the new schools was that they would be Native District High schools, built in the main areas of Maori population including the East Coast.

Plans were announced in 1940 by T. A. Fletcher, who had succeeded Ball as Senior Inspector of Native Schools, for three Native primary schools, all on the East Coast at Te Araroa, Manutahi at Ruatoria and Tikiti, to develop secondary departments and be classified as district high schools from 1 February, 1940.778 A fourth district high school, Te Kao, was officially opened in 1944, although in fact it had begun two years earlier. The Minister of Education, H. G. R. Mason, the Director of Education, C. E. Beeby, and Ball, visited the schools to meet the parents and to outline the scheme to them.

777 Scammell to Director, 17 December 1932. BAAA 1001/307b. ANZ-A. DB.
778 AJHR, E-3, 1941.
It was secondary education for Maori that was now being proposed. But the curriculum planned for the new high schools not only reflected the long-standing persistence in official circles of narrow and limited stereotypes of Maori ability and potential, and the idea of a rural-based future, despite it being increasingly obvious to many that this was now going to be unrealistic for the majority of Maori, but also how late in time such thinking persisted.

The ordinary state district high schools in rural areas had maintained the academic curriculum leading to examinations most parents wanted, despite official attempts to give them a practical bias. This was an additional reason Fletcher now gave for building special high schools for Maori; the curriculum of the existing high schools closest to their homes was not ‘satisfactorily adjusted to the non-academic child’ in the way that the Department thought was particularly desirable for young Maori. Whereas the secondary departments of the Native District High Schools would provide education of a kind the Department thought desirable for Maori who, although they would remain in rural areas, would not necessarily engage in traditional farming jobs.

Prior to outlining the curriculum, Fletcher re-stated in the Department’s annual report to Parliament a familiar and negative stereotype about Maori ability, describing ‘The Maori’ as being:

not sufficiently far removed from his past to be well adapted for commerce, with its demand for strongly individualistic traits, which are in strong contrast to his ancient mode of living.\(^{779}\)

It should be noted that it is the Crown’s leading official with specific responsibility for Maori education who is holding such prejudiced and stereotyped views about Maori as late in time as this. But he was not alone. Amongst prominent Pakeha officials and academics who regarded themselves as representing the progressive liberal point of view of their time with regard to policy appropriate for Maori was Professor I. L. G. Sutherland. He had written in 1935 that:

\(^{779}\) Ibid., p.3.
Throughout the world at the present time one notes significant evidence of the policy, now realised to be mistaken, of the deliberate Europeanisation and Americanisation of native people. In South Africa recommendations have recently been made tending towards the rehabilitation of the natives, the reduction of points of contact between them and Europeans, the provision of lands and the promotion of native settlement thereon. The United States of America has recently made a radical change in policy towards the Indian. After more than half a century of deliberately planned effort to turn the Indian into a white man, the fundamental error of the policy has been realised...and a vigorous campaign is now to be undertaken to restore him, so far as possible, to his status as a ‘good Indian’...This is a striking confirmation of the wisdom of the policy already set in operation in New Zealand (which) is part of a wider conception.\textsuperscript{780}

While Sutherland’s support for a modification of the outright assimilation policy represented liberal European thinking of the day, there were other aspects of his statement which have definite reactionary overtones, because if followed to their extreme conclusion as they were in South Africa they would have led to a rigidly segregated society.

Professor Belshaw writing in 1940 stated that:

\begin{quote}
In general the Maori is not interested in commerce and is less efficient in the professions or callings requiring abstract thinking. His main limitation, however, arises from lack of training, so that his undoubted capacities in many directions are insufficiently developed. Even in the realm of abstract thought, it is by no means certain that his limitations are other than environmental.\textsuperscript{781}
\end{quote}

Given thinking of this kind it was perhaps hardly surprising that the Department’s curriculum for Maori students enrolled in the new secondary departments would be almost entirely practical, without provision for conventional secondary school academic subjects leading to examinations. As the Department’s annual report stated:

\begin{quote}
The core of both schemes is home-making, home making in the widest sense, including building contraction and all its features, furniture – making, metal-work, and home gardening for the boys, and home-management, including cookery, home decorating and infant welfare
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{780} I. L. G. Sutherland, \textit{The Maori Situation}, Wellington, 1935, p.89.
\textsuperscript{781} Belshaw in Sutherland, 1940, p.193.
for the girls. The aim is to teach the skills and to develop the tastes that make the house not merely a place of habitation, but a home in the best sense of the word.\textsuperscript{782}

The qualifications required for the teachers for the secondary departments were described as, ‘An appreciation of modern trends in education, ability in some practical skill such as carpentry or home-management and faith in the inherent virtues of the scheme’.\textsuperscript{783}

Elaborating on the nature of the teaching and learning that was to take place, Fletcher wrote that in addition to the usual staffing of the departments, a man trained in building construction and a woman expert in home-management would be appointed and shared among the secondary departments of the three East Coast Native High Schools. They would be provided with a ‘covered van fitted with the more expensive tools’, and the curriculum of the schools would be planned around their work. Woodwork and cookery rooms would be provided and it was proposed that at each school a ‘full-scale building project’ would be immediately initiated, with a view to erecting a model cottage.

One editorial writer, welcoming the provision of the new secondary schools for Maori, expressed the view that it would be unfortunate if for lack of opportunity another Peter Buck or Maui Pomare were never to have their talent discovered.\textsuperscript{784} But their talents could not have been developed in the context of the Department’s vision of secondary education for Maori being provided in the new high schools.

It seems particularly striking and significant that just prior to the Crown’s plans for the new District High Schools being announced, the Minister of Education, Peter Fraser, had articulated the philosophy of the Labour Government regarding education in a statement generally attributed to the Director of Education Dr Beeby which was subsequently to frequently quoted. This stated that:

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{782} AJHR, 1941, E-3, p.3.
\textsuperscript{783} Ibid;
\textsuperscript{784} The Waikato Times, 2 November 1940.
\end{flushright}
The Government’s objective, broadly expressed, is that every person, whatever his level of academic ability, whether he be rich or poor, whether he live in the town or country, has a right as a citizen to a free education of the kind for which he is best fitted and to the fullest extent of his powers.785

The Crown’s view regarding what Maori were ‘best fitted’ for, as reflected in the curriculum of the secondary departments of the new Native District High Schools, was limited and narrow in the extreme, and unlikely to be conducive to any of the students being extended to the fullest extent of their powers.

5.5 The East Coast Native/Maori District High Schools.

At Tikitiki the parents saw the high-school pupils (boys and girls) working for hours in the school gardens where they grew thousands of onion and cabbage plants for sale. Poultry, and for a time bees, were also kept. The parents saw little constructive work, and little to justify the practical courses.786

Their (Education Department planners) interpretation was that the pupils should study no subject unless it was of a practical nature and this developed into, in many cases, too much manual labour, as carpenters labourers, farm labourers and the like. The idea spread that these Native District High Schools were to be only for those pupils not capable of study…no academic subjects, no survey of pupil progress, no external examinations, led the Maori people to believe that the schools were catering for ‘second grade’ pupils.787

Senior education officials met the elders, parents, and Heads of the Schools at Ruatoria, Tikitiki and Te Araroa towards the end of the 1940. They discussed their proposals for secondary education of a practical kind, without the opportunity for the “brighter” pupils to study subjects leading to school certificate or any other examination, which they thought was most appropriate for East Coast students leaving the primary schools. The officials reported to the Minister, over-optimistically as events were to prove, that ‘The Maoris of the East Coast have received the scheme with enthusiasm’.788 And it was also claimed that ‘The enthusiastic co-operation of all

785 AJHR, 1939, E-1, pp.2-3.
786 Jennings, 1950, p.137.
787 Official Report on Native District High Schools: Te Araroa, Tikitiki, Manutahi, 8 April 1947. BAAA1001/1093b, 44/1/43. ANZ-A. DB.
788 AJHR 1941 E-1.
the parents, both Maori and European, has been freely offered, and it is well understood that education of a practical nature only will be provided'.

A very revealing exchange occurred when Dr Beeby the Director Education, travelled to a hui in Te Araroa to discuss the curriculum for the new schools and was told by parents that they wanted their children to be taught Latin and Typewriting. When Beeby had finished his speech advocating the virtues of an education with the hands rather than the head, one of the elders asked him if he had studied Latin at school. When he admitted to six years of learning, the response was, ‘Look where it got you’. Beeby later wrote that ‘Nearly half a century later I have still not thought of an apt reply’.

The reason why this example is revealing is that it conveys that Maori parents like most parents everywhere sought the best education for their children. Most had always wanted them to succeed in the new order to the best of their abilities and to have the same opportunities available to them that people like Beeby apparently had open to them. And Beeby himself, coming from a working class background, was a prime example of the upward social mobility apparently available to at least some Pakeha children via the education system. Instead, the anecdote reflects an institutional outlook ingrained over many decades that was premised on a more circumscribed view as to the educational opportunities that ought to be available to Maori. What the example of the early development of the Native District High Schools on the East Coast was to demonstrate was that Maori strongly resented the idea, exemplified in the thinking of officials, that somehow ‘coming off’ the standards that were regarded as the norm for secondary education for Pakeha students should somehow be acceptable for Maori.

In October 1940 the Department required Maori parents to give written assurances that they would send their children to Form 3 of the about to be opened Native District High School at Tikitiki, and 14 did so.

789 AJHR 1941 E-3.
791 Parents and Guardians to Director, 6 October 1940. BAAA 1001/1056b. ANZ-A. DB.
The three East Coast Native primary schools at Ruatoria, Tikitiki and Te Araroa were officially raised in status to Native District High Schools at the beginning of 1941. Advertisements for the positions of Head Teacher at Tikitiki, and three secondary Assistant Masters for the Te Araroa, Tikitiki and Manutahi Native District High Schools reflected the practical emphasis. The Head should have had ‘experience in Native Education with special reference to its practical and vocational aspects’, the three Assistants ‘should have ability to teach general subjects and experience in building construction, woodwork, engineering or agriculture’, while provision was also made for the appointment of a ‘domestic science instructress’.792

One of the first problems to be encountered was that the raising of the three primary schools to high school status was accompanied by little change in the provision of rooms and buildings, or the school environment generally, a beginning which was not to prove conducive to the success of the plan. The extra classes forming the secondary departments had to be accommodated in existing rooms, either by compressing the primary departments into fewer class-rooms or by converting cookery rooms or workshops, and generally it was the latter option which was adopted. The secondary department was confined to one room in most instances, meaning the pupils were cramped for space and there was little space available for the limited amount of equipment available.

Hugh Jennings who was an Assistant Master at Tikitiki in 1945 and became Headmaster of the Tikitiki Maori District High School, wrote an M.A. thesis on the development of the High Schools which is by far the most detailed account of the early years of the schools on the East Coast. He commented that because of the accommodation limitations referred to:

practical work (especially cooking, sewing and woodwork) was hampered, and the general development of normal high-school activities was confined to a bare minimum. Perhaps the most important effect of this was the inability of the secondary departments to establish themselves as units. All their activities were limited to the

792 *Education Gazette*, 1 and 15 November 1940.
scope of the primary schools. What facilities remained available for practical work were shared with the primary classes.793

5.5.1 Case Study: Te Araroa

At Te Araroa an effort had begun earlier, in 1939, to develop secondary education of a conventional kind, with the Head and a temporary male Assistant forming a Secondary Department with eleven pupils in Form III, two in Form IV and two in Form V. The three forms were taught together in a room originally intended for a dental clinic, but although conditions were cramped and there was a lack of textbooks and equipment, considerable progress was made, with the Department supplying text-books and science equipment later in the year. However an application to the Department to establish a district high school was declined on the grounds that the initiative was experimental and no regulations existed for such a change.794

The roll increased to 26 pupils in 1940, with 12 in Form III, two in Form IV and three in Form V. The Department supplied more textbooks and a further supply of texts in History and Latin was requested. Jennings attributes the early success of the scheme to the ‘enthusiasm and energy of the head-teacher and his assistant and to the whole – hearted support they received from the school committee and parents. Already “results” in the form of examination successes were in sight’.795

However during the year Inspectors continued to emphasize the importance of practical work in their reports on the school:

Science work, including General Biology Agriculture and Science, was discussed with Mr Smith regarding content of courses records etc. Outdoor agriculture was planned in some detail. Some plots are to be established at school for general experiments and demonstrations and other work of this nature is planned in several home gardens. Work will include potato trials, a fertilizer trial, a maize variety trial, and forestry work. 796

794 Jennings p.68.
795 Ibid.
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The Inspector noted that in the Primary Department the Infants ‘have done a considerable amount of gardening’ and the ‘Lower Infants have a garden under way’.796

The Head was advised that Te Araroa was authorised to ‘be supplied with seeds and manure to the value of £2.10.0 for the special work in agriculture which I understand is to be undertaken by the Secondary Department’.797

By May 1941, the boys of the Secondary Department had ‘formed an A and P Association to control our work and studies in connection with the area of land recently leased by the Education Department for our use’; an extensive plan for developing a cropping area, fencing, pasture experiment and grazing of stock was outlined, the ploughing of the field was well advanced and requests were made for plants and equipment to ‘commence our field, nursery and propagation projects immediately’.798

The Senior Inspector Native Schools was advised by the Assistant Director of Education that ‘when you proceed to Ruatoria you could discuss with the Head-teacher his preference for the teaching of Science. The Department considers it particularly important that Mr Black’s scheme in Science should fit in with the general plan for a “homemaking” course which is being put into effect in the Secondary Department in the School’.799

On 1 February 1941, Te Araroa’s status was changed to Native District High School, with the aim of implementing the Department’s concept of “home-making” as the central focus of secondary education for Maori primary school leavers on the East Coast. Jennings comments that almost immediately, and ‘contrary to expectations’, the change ‘appeared to be a retrograde one’. In 1941 enrolments fell from 33 at the beginning of the year to 15 at the end, and in 1942 from 15 to 13. He gives two main reasons for this:

---

796 Inspector to Head, Te Araroa, 12 June 1940. BAAA 1016/8b. ANZ-A. DB.
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799 Assistant Director to Senior Inspector of Native Schools, G. H. Stubbs, 14 July 1941. Ibid. DB.
1. The parents disapproved of the change from an academic course aiming at examination results to a home-centred course in which they could see no prospect of these results.
2. The promotion of what were described as ‘retardates’, aged 14 years and more from the primary school to make up the number in the secondary department (some moved from as low as Standards 3 and 4 into Form III) ‘had the unfortunate effect of lowering the relatively high standard of the of work and the general tone of the high school’. 800

A decline in roll numbers also occurred at the Tikitiki and Ruatoria Native District High Schools at the same time, the combined enrolment of the three new high schools falling from 70 in 1942 to 50 in 1942, a fall the Senior Inspector Maori Schools attributed to the demand for male labour on farms, a claim Jennings disputed. 801

The absence of additional buildings and confining of the new secondary departments to the existing primary school, with consequent overcrowding and other difficulties was referred to earlier. Jennings described Te Araroa as having been the ‘worst off of the three East Coast Maori District High Schools in this respect’. The high school classes were taught in one classroom with overflow classes (usually the Form IV and V pupils) in the former dental room and the cookery room, which they had to vacate when it was required for cookery lessons, and ‘the congestion was acute… whenever classes were engaged in cookery, science experiments, library work etc, desks had to be shifted and classes transferred to other rooms’. 802

Any initial enthusiasm the people may have felt for the new high school soon began to be qualified as they became more aware of just how much the idea of practical education dominated the curriculum, how poorly equipped they were, and how far they departed from the long-held Ngati Porou tradition of academic education and training for leadership associated with the denominational boarding colleges. This was reflected in a lengthy press statement by Reweti Kohere who was critical of the fact that at Te Araroa:

800 Jennings, p.69.
801 Jennings, p.70.
802 Ibid, p.98.
The curriculum is “practical” and does not take pupils to matriculation standard, a standard usually associated with a high school curriculum... The Director of Education, Dr C.E. Beeby, who spoke at Te Araroa, stressed the importance of teaching the hands, as though Maori were only hands. This is how he introduced his “practical” curriculum for a Native High School: ‘Hence carpentry, cooking, housekeeping and gardening will find an important place in the curriculum’...I am sceptical about the usefulness of teaching Maori girls fancy pakeha cooking at school, for Maori cooking is very simple and sufficiently meets the dietetic wants of the people...

There is an opinion afloat amongst Europeans that the Maoris do not need such education as is given to their own children...A gentleman who was for many years a Senior Inspector of Native Schools told me frankly that the Maoris did not need higher education. I replied that I could not see why a pakeha blacksmith’s daughter and not a chief’s daughter should attend a high school....

The feeling has been growing on me that it is the general opinion among Europeans that Maori should not receive the same kind of education as that given to white children. These people are unconsciously perhaps drawing the colour-line which unfortunately is becoming acute in the Dominion.

If there is anything that will intensify the colour-bar in the country it is the denial to Maori children of cultural education. I have quoted Dr Beeby as saying that what the Maoris needed was to be taught how to use their hands. I thought the advice came ill from a man who spent some years to obtain a doctorate in philosophy. The Maori is a handyman, at the same time he has a mind and a soul to cultivate...we don’t want to make the Maori a race of “drawers of water and hewers of wood”, a subject race.803

5.5.2 Case study: Tikitiki

The secondary department of the new Tikitiki Native District High School was like that at Te Araroa opened on 1 February 1941. It appears that initially the new department was received with enthusiasm, it being felt that the long-felt need for free post-primary education for East Coast Maori was at last to be realised. But here also reservations became apparent amongst elders, school committee members and other

803 Newspaper article, 22 January 1942. AAZY W3901 44/1/1 Box 218. ANZ-W. DB.
parents. when the realization grew of the extent to which the academic traditions of the denominational colleges were being departed from.\textsuperscript{804}

Jennings points out that the fall-off in enrolment at Tikitiki in the first four years was never less than 66 per cent, and in 1944 was as high as 82 percent. The home-craft curriculum was an important cause of this, but he also points out that the situation was not helped by frequent staff changes and the withdrawal of Rangitukia pupils in 1944.\textsuperscript{805}

In September 1942 the Tikitiki Headmaster, T.A.Murphy, informed the Director that the secondary roll had now fallen to ten-eight girls and two boys. But he assured him that no pupil had left ‘on account of dissatisfaction with the high school’; some had secured ‘desirable employment’, while others were taking the place on farms of men who had been drafted into camp. While the outcome was ‘disappointing to all concerned in pioneering the project of secondary education among the Maoris’, he was convinced that it was ‘by no means the harbinger of failure’ and was confident that the situation ‘would be retrieved in due course’.\textsuperscript{806}

However realizing the limited scope of the curriculum, the parents of able students at Tikitiki and the other schools continued to view a scholarship to one of the Maori boarding schools as still their only chance of academic success. In December 1942 the Senior Inspector informed Murphy that ‘With regard to those pupils in the secondary department who desire to apply for a continuation scholarship at one of the private Maori secondary schools, I may say that they are quite in order in doing this…on this occasion we are quite prepared to take your recommendation and consider Hiraina Ngata along with the other pupils who present themselves for continuation scholarships.’\textsuperscript{807}

When a new Head, P.A.Eaton, was appointed to Tikitiki in 1944 he was extremely critical of the physical and instructional arrangements which had been made for

\begin{footnotes}
\footnotetext[804]{Jennings, p.83.}
\footnotetext[805]{Jennings, p.84.}
\footnotetext[806]{Headmaster, Tikitiki MDHS to Director, 15 December 1942. BAAA 1001/1056b. ANZ-A. DB.}
\footnotetext[807]{Senior Inspector, T. A. Fletcher to Murphy, 18 December 1942. Ibid. DB.}
\end{footnotes}
practical instruction, the over-rapid promotion of primary pupils to make up a secondary department, and other problems. He described the condition of the workshop on his arrival as ‘ample evidence that something was lacking in those who were responsible for the workshop before I came. It was roughly a couple of months before it was ready for me to take a class for woodwork and I am not satisfied yet’. He was particularly critical of the quality of the teachers, describing the teacher responsible for woodwork as someone who ‘can only be regarded as a Junior Assistant who is not competent enough to take charge of a class of boys’. The Teacher in charge of the Cookery Room was ‘willing enough but has neither the training, education, initiative or background to run a home science course with the big girls’. The Teacher responsible for the rest of the secondary department was described as willing but having the ‘unfortunate knack of ruffling the big girls and causing them to sulk. While at the same time his discipline is weak…he has no idea of activity methods. Again I have to prepare the work and check it over afterwards…I would have saved more time and worry if I had taken the lesson myself’. The secondary class he took himself was ‘not a satisfactory one because only about five out of the 30 in the High School have passed S.6. while the remainder have been promoted from S.4. and S.5’. He concluded that:

The secondary department of this school at present is looked upon with a great deal of ridicule by both Pakeha and Maori in this district so that it is my wish to lift it out of the rut into which it seems to have slipped….But it will never be much good unless a competent teacher with the interest of the Maori at heart can win the confidence of these elder boys and girls.808

In a report on Tikitiki at the beginning of 1945 the Senior Inspector noted that the secondary roll had fallen to 14 pupils, which appeared to compare unfavourably with the 26 enrolled in 1944. But he then added that of the 26 only 13 had Primary School Certificates, the other 13 being pupils who had been:

promoted without any reference to their standard of scholastic achievement. This policy of indiscriminate advancement has apparently ceased, and the roll number in future should be a fair indication of the number who have gained Primary School

808 Headmaster, P. A. Eaton, to Senior Inspector of Native Schools, 26 November, 1944. Ibid. DB.
Certificates….One complaint voiced in the district was that the Native District High Schools did not carry the prestige which attached to “pakeha” schools. This state of affairs will not be remedied as long as the secondary pupils are taught with Forms I and II.

The length of the school week is only 22 hours (being the same course for both primary and secondary departments)…It is felt that the time should be extended to at least 23.5 hours for secondary pupils.

All the pupils in the secondary department are taking the same course—a “Home-Centred” course, which consists of English, Social Studies, Elementary Mathematics, General Science, Music, Arts and Crafts and Physical Education for all, with Woodwork for boys and Homecraft and Clothing for girls. Mr Jennings is hoping to introduce Maori into the curriculum for all pupils soon.809

The staffing at the school continued to cause serious difficulties. In 1950 the Head advised that ‘Out of eight teachers we have four uncertificated and four certificated. There are also a PA and a Junior Assistant’.810

Later in the same year the Head again expressed his concerns, particularly with regard to ‘The staffing of the secondary dept’ which was ‘a vital issue at this school. The present position is unsatisfactory and the matter has been raised by the school committee. The school has little chance of receiving the support of parents of secondary pupils and holding here those children best suited to higher education when it is known that they are to be taught by an uncertificated Maori lady whose only teaching experience has been with primer children’. He had earlier suggested that the model cottage be used to accommodate a prospective married couple as teachers, which would mean that it could not be used for Homecraft lessons, surely a come-down from the high hopes expressed earlier for the model cottage concept. But the official reply was that model cottages were not to be used to accommodate married couples.811

---

809 Notes on a visit of inspection, 26 March 1945. Ibid. DB.
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5.5.3 Case study Ruatoria (Manutahi)

Ruatoria was the largest of the three new district high schools to participate in the experiment for Maori secondary education, with eight primary schools contributing to the Ruatoria Native District High School. At the opening of the Department senior Education Department officials emphasized as they had elsewhere that the scheme was experimental, the courses were to be non-academic and essentially of a practical nature. Over one third of the time for the boys was devoted to manual training in woodwork, carpentry and practical trades connected with house building. As at the other schools a model cottage, which took several years to complete, formed the basis of the activity and of much of the classroom lessons. While agricultural activities at Ruatoria were de-emphasized by comparison with Te Araroa and Tikitiki, the manual training extended beyond the model cottage to having the boys build pig-sties and cow-bails in the district. Jennings claims that the greater range of occupations and activities in Ruatoria township had the potential to give the practical orientation of the secondary department more advantages than those that existed at Te Araroa and Tikitiki, the Head and his wife were dedicated to the work, and more support was eventually shown for the scheme by parents and elders than at the other two schools.\footnote{Jennings, p.88.}

Nevertheless, the new department suffered from many of the same difficulties experienced at Te Araroa and Tikitiki. Jennings describes Manutahi ‘opening its secondary department with no teachers, no building, no equipment and no text books’, with the 31 pupils entering at the beginning of 1941 having to be ‘squeezed into what space could be made available by compressing the primary classes’.\footnote{Ibid, p.100.} Enrolment also ‘fell off considerably during the early year’; out of the 36 pupils admitted to the secondary department in 1941, 22 (61 percent) left during or at the end of the year. In 1942, 35 out of 46 pupils enrolled (76 percent) left. And thereafter about 50 percent of those enrolled left annually.\footnote{Ibid, p.89.}
Moreover as at the other schools the basis of the scheme for the secondary department was that, ‘All work is based on the practical occupation of building a cottage, furnishing it, and living in it’, and the curriculum was planned so that ‘one complete week in every three is devoted exclusively to manual work. In addition, one day in each of the other two weeks will be devoted entirely to practical work’.  

Jennings wrote that at this school and the others from 1941 to 1944:

shortage and poor quality of materials, tools and general supplies, were largely responsible for the poor progress made. Not properly qualified staff, constant changes of pupils, lack of discipline and other such problems all seem to have contributed to the slow, unsatisfactory progress of the scheme. Further, the parents, seeing only the obvious state of affairs, namely, slow construction and poor discipline, soon were outspoken in their criticism. However some of the blame must be diverted to the practical activities of the secondary departments. For instance, at Tikitiki the parents saw the high-school pupils (boys and girls) working for hours in the school gardens where they grew thousands of onion and cabbage plants for sale. Poultry, and for a time bees, were also kept. The parents saw little constructive work, and little to justify the practical courses.

5.5.4 Post-mortem and Some Developments After 1947

When Education Department School Inspectors visited the three East Coast Native District High Schools in October 1941 to examine the progress being made they wrote a highly critical report. They found that ‘The scheme is by no means working smoothly as yet’, which they partly attributed to the rooms not yet being complete. At Te Araroa the woodwork room was still not occupied, at Tikitiki there was no equipment in the science room, and at Ruatoria ‘the builder had just commenced the new secondary block’ and as the roll seemed likely to increase another classroom seemed necessary.

---
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Moreover ‘the personnel has not yet given satisfaction’; none of the Headmasters were ‘completely satisfied’ with the itinerant woodwork instructor whose reputation ‘will stand or fall by his attack on the cottages it is proposed the boys will build’ or his wife ‘who was the domestic teacher’. They ‘variously asserted that he was inefficient as a teacher, careless in looking after tools…and a poor organiser’. His wife ‘needs a strong Headmaster to rule her, but apart from that there is still some doubt whether she will appeal to adolescent girls… The Secondary Assistants are not inspiring either…The drawings prepared of the model cottages left a good deal to be desired. Agriculture. So far nothing has been done….There is not much enthusiasm for farming in Ruatoria School as far as I could see…At Te Araroa no cookery has been taken as the room was still in process of construction’.  

Their report continued:

I had to discuss again with Mr Black and Mr Utting the question of a third and fourth year course leading to School Certificate for those who wish to be teachers etc….but I took the opportunity to reiterate that the schools were designed for a special purpose and that anything in the nature of a purely academic course would tend to wreck the scheme. I think it has been said that those who want an academic course can go elsewhere…For my part I consider a course leading to School Certificate will be almost as academic as one leading to Matriculation and as much to be avoided.

In a hand-written note one of the Inspectors wrote to Dr Beeby that, ‘teething troubles were only to be expected, but I am confident that it was worthwhile to start the scheme as the only way of finding out the troubles, some of which can clearly be put right—the material ones. Personal ones will be much more difficult to handle’.  

Realising the seriousness of the situation Beeby advised Ball that the situation would need ‘very careful watching early next year or the whole scheme will fail’. He asked him to visit the Coast himself early in the year, and said he would like to accompany him if at all possible, adding that ‘Some of the staff are unsatisfactory. If they still prove so next year when they have adequate equipment we must get them out at all
costs. We cannot have this scheme fail through over-consideration for inefficient or unsuitable teachers'.

Jennings commented that because not all Maori schools leavers would be able to work on the land it was evident that ‘too much emphasis on agricultural courses in Maori schools and especially in Maori secondary schools is not justifiable’. And he added that Maori economic, social and cultural progress in relation to schooling was ‘long overdue-in fact, that the “homemaking” policy should be completely overhauled’.

He regarded Maori education as ‘not keeping pace with the changing conditions of Maori social and economic life’, and gave as instances of this the place of:

agriculture, home-making, arts and crafts as primary features in Maori education. It is questionable whether the extent to which these are taught in our Maori schools is justified in the light of the social and economic conditions of the Maori today, and during the rapid changes of the last eight years. The changing conditions of the Maori were well past the all-out agricultural stage by 1941, and are certainly beyond it today. Home-making for Maori children smacks of high idealism. It is far too limited in scope.

But it took until 1946 for an Education Department official to acknowledge, with something of an under-statement, that ‘the innovation of the district high schools did not make an immediate appeal to the Maori people of the East Coast area’ who did not want ‘any suspicion of inferiority about their district high schools’.

What can only be described as an extremely damning report on the East Coast Maori District High Schools was written by the Senior Inspector of Native Schools, A. E. Golding in April 1947. It included the criticisms that:

In the minds of the teachers the original concept of the curriculum was interpreted rather vaguely and nebulously and the term “practical courses” was not clearly enough defined, all of which led teachers to the assumption that definite courses and schemes were undesirable and aims of the post-primary education for these Maori girls and boys were
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822 Jennings, p.21.
823 Ibid, p.25.
825 AJHR, 1946, E-3, p.6.
rather desultory. The staffing of the secondary departments was not sound. Teachers of little experience, teachers without any secondary experience, even foreigners were appointed to these positions. These teachers were apparently incapable of interpreting the original aims into a sensible and comprehensive secondary school course. Their interpretation was that the pupils should study no subject unless it was of a practical nature and this developed into, in many cases, too much manual labour, as carpenters labourers, farm labourers and the like. The idea spread that these Native District High Schools were to be only for those pupils not capable of study…no academic subjects, no survey of pupil progress, no external examinations, led the Maori people to believe that the schools were catering for ‘second grade’ pupils.826

It is relevant to note here several points raised during a meeting between the Inspector and Tikitiki residents, who maintained that the secondary department was designed for “second grade” pupils, the pupils were made to fit the institution not the school fit the child, the departments were regarded as good enough for children whose parents could not afford to send their children away to colleges, Maori had not been consulted, and all boys should not be trained as carpenters.827

Towards the end of the war pressures for the introduction of academic subjects to the Maori District High Schools, largely coming from East Coast Maori themselves, increased. Also influential was H.C. McQueen’s research into educational and vocational opportunities for Maori youth published in 1945. McQueen made some strong statements that Maori students had an absolute right to be given equal opportunities with Pakeha in terms of the type of post-primary education available to them. Although McQueen intended his remarks to apply generally, there is no doubt the he had the Maori District High Schools particularly in mind when stating that:

It is important that the curricula of schools in which Maoris predominate should resemble very closely those of pakeha schools…They should give adequate preparation to all who are able, to permit them to choose any career whatever. Hence all schools need to have provision for those who wish to obtain a School Certificate in order that they may enter those occupations for which it is a prerequisite. Moreover, there must also be opportunity for those who are competent to undertake university studies to do such work as will

826 Report on Native District High Schools: Te Araroa, Tikitiki, Manutahi, 8 April 1947. BAAA 1001/1093b, 44/1/43. ANZ-A. DB.
827 Ibid;
enable them to go on...there should be no barrier...to prevent any Maori boy or girl from obtaining any educational qualification that can be gained by a pakeha.\

Looking back years later the Director Education at the time, Dr Beeby, commented that he had viewed the Maori District High Schools in their original conception as complementing the more academic role played by Te Aute and Hukarere. He defended their strong vocational emphasis, and said that if faced with the same situation he would have made the same decisions. But he also acknowledged that he would have ensured School Certificate subjects were in place as an academic credential to be gained for the classroom work the schools were attempting. In that respect, he acknowledged that the schools which ‘were my very own idea ...I bungled’.\

Officials now proposed that with the broadening of the School Certificate course it should be possible for a minority of the Maori students to reach a School Certificate standard, and the curriculum would be modified with this in mind. In his 1947 annual report the Minister of Education wrote of the Maori District High Schools that:

The new secondary school curriculum is allowing the district high schools to develop a practical course satisfactory to the majority of Maori pupils, at the same time that they prepare the more academically able children to sit for the school certificate. This appears to be meeting the objections originally raised by some Maori parents’.\

Jennings concluded that the progress of the Maori District High Schools:

would have followed a much smoother path had the Department maintained closer relations with the parents and tribal leaders and consequently adjusted the scheme to counteract the weaknesses which were revealed in the first year or two. The elders and the parents wanted more than the practical home-centred training the high schools offered. The long-established traditions of the denominational colleges had built up high standards of achievement in academic and leadership training. The district high schools were measured against this and found wanting...the leaders were outspoken in their denunciation of

---

828 H. McQueen, *Vocations for Maori Youth*, Wellington, 1945, p.52.
the too-practical courses pursued, and in their demands for academic courses and for results in terms of examinations. The outcome was the withdrawal within the first four years of tribal and parental support to an alarming degree.831

He added that the schools had been:

thought of as an experiment. They have drifted on for eight years with no systematic planning or policy to guide them and consequently they have had boom years and periods of near collapse. More of them have been formed in the last two years, and they struggle on despite many difficulties. And yet, no analysis has been made of their growth, their functions, or purpose, no conclusions have been formed as to their success or justification, and no future policy has been proclaimed. Well might the Minister of Education ask: “What are to be the functions of the Native district high schools?”832

In March 1948, the Director of Education in recommending the expenditure of £800 for the provision of library facilities at the Maori District High Schools, made the telling acknowledgment that this was now necessary because when they had been established ‘no provision was made for adequate library facilities and the majority of the books in the libraries are of the text-book variety and most unsuitable for Maori Post Primary scholars’.833

Even in 1946, when a secondary department had also been developed at the Tolaga Bay District High School, a telling comment was made on it by an Inspector which showed that the kind of thinking which had led to the original concept of the Maori DHS had been only partially modified:

The department provides one course leading to the school certificate and university examinations….As the majority of the pupils are Maori girls extra time could very well be given to home crafts, home nursing, infant welfare etc. The core mathematics should also be boldly adjusted to meet their needs. The more academic course could be reserved for those who intend to stay the full three years and sit the school certificate examination….It is to be regretted that circumstances have prevented use being made of the woodwork room. The technical

831 Jennings, p.47.
833 Director to Minister, 22 March 1948. BAAA 1001/1093b, 44/1/43. ANZ-A. DB.
side of the curriculum should be emphasized to cater for the Maori boys coming up from F II next year.834

Even as late as 1949, the Senior Inspector of Maori Schools, W. Parsonage, was commenting in his annual report that ‘the most serious handicap in the Maori district high schools is the lack of adequate, suitable buildings. Nearly every Maori district high school secondary department is over-crowded, and laboratory, library and craft facilities are poor’.835

This was further acknowledgment by a Senior Crown education official of what amounted to long-standing inequity on a massive scale, in terms of the provision of adequate secondary education for Maori in the Maori district high schools including those on the East Coast. It had not been, in my view, in any sense secondary education as that term was commonly understood in the rest of the country at the time.

5.5.5 Further Comment on Tikitiki Maori District High School

Because the main focus of this report is the East Coast, I will conclude this section by discussing some further aspects of development at the Tikitiki Maori District High School. In September 1946, an inspection report on Tikitiki gave promise of better things to come, concluding that ‘There should be an excellent future for the post-primary department under the present organization and vigorous teacher’s methods which have already helped to raise the general tone of the department’.836

However in June 1947, with School Certificate courses now intended but not yet in place, the Headmaster informed the Director that a parent had withdrawn his daughter from the Secondary Department because, although he had initially seemed ‘quite content with the home-centred course here’, he now wanted to enrol her with the Correspondence School so she could take a School Certificate Course

834 Inspection Report, Secondary Department Tolaga Bay, 15 December 1946. ABDJ W3568/45d pt. 3. ANZ-W. DB.
835 AJHR, 1949, E-3, p.5.
836 Inspection Report, Tikitiki Maori DHS, 23 September 1946. BAAA 1001/1056b. ANZ-A. DB.
including Shorthand, Book-keeping etc. One of the Head’s concerns was that the secondary roll would be down to 15 by the end of the Term, the minimum allowable.\footnote{Headmaster, P. A. Eaton, to Director, 5 June 1947. BAAA 1001/ 1057a. ANZ-A. DB.}

School Certificate subjects were still not being offered at Tikitiki in 1948, an inspection report that year noting that the school offered two courses: (a) Home Centred Course (12 girls), involving core subjects supplemented by home-craft, clothing and geography, and; (b) an Agricultural Course including Core subjects with Agriculture (Horticulture and Geography additional). The Inspector noted that he had discussed these with the Headmaster and made several suggestions to him ‘in view of the possibility of a Form V next year’ (Author emphasis).\footnote{Inspection Report, 9 April 1948. Ibid. DB.}

Even in April 1950, there is still no reference to School Certificate being offered, and an inspection report also reveals how the plans for practical education had still not been adequately realised. The post primary roll on 1 March 1950 was 32 (9 boys and 23 girls), including 15 third-formers (5 boys and 10 girls), 13 fourth formers (1 and 12) and four fifth formers (3 and 1). The pupils were doing the core subjects of English, Social Studies and Core Mathematics, but ‘no work appears to have been done very recently in General Science or Arts and Crafts’; for Woodwork. An itinerant instructor travelled from Ruatoria for one day weekly, with four periods being given in the High School, and ‘In general the course appears to be satisfactory meeting the needs of the practical side of the boys’ curriculum’. In Agriculture the Inspector reported that ‘Very little serious work appears to have been done through lack of suitable staff. A garden plot is available but there has apparently been very little planned work done in it. It is recommended that Horticulture take the place of Agriculture’. In Home-craft and Clothing, although the timetable showed eight periods per week, the only available work for inspection was a set of elementary notes on the various stitches used in needlework. But the Inspector left no doubt as to his view on the importance of practical education, adding that in Cooking or Nutrition:

No work has been done either in the laboratory or in the kitchens, owing to lack of qualified staff. The beautifully-equipped and
appointed Model Cottage is at present standing empty, and no use is made of it. The kitchen is also well-equipped but is used only for primary classes. Considering that two thirds of the school are girls and that some of them come from more remote outlying districts, and that almost all of them will undertake domestic duties and responsibilities within a few years, it seems fantastic that the curriculum they are offered in their own High School should be so far removed from their needs and interests, and so lacking in practical training. It is hoped that a teacher of practical Home-craft will soon be appointed to remedy this disastrous lack of balance for the girls’ course.839

In 1957, by which time School Certificate certainly was being offered at Tikitiki, the Inspector nevertheless chose to begin his report with a sweeping generalization about the Maori pupils in the district, in that, ‘Because of the very limited background of the pupils in this remote school, emphasis has been given to the core subjects’.840

He described how at the beginning of the third form level the pupils were placed into A (Professional) and B (General) streams and this organization was maintained through to Fifth form. Pupils from the A Forms attempted School Certificate when they reached the third or fourth year; pupils from the B Forms did not attempt School Certificate but at the Fifth Form level ‘are given a greater amount of time at Home-craft or Woodwork’. At Third Form level 19 students were in the Professional Course and 23 in the General; by Form V 10 were in the Professional and 24 in the general course. In 1956 only one pupil had passed School Certificate.841

The Report continued with a revealing comment about the narrow range of expectations held by the Inspector for these Maori students in 1957, with him noting that ‘during the last few years through the efforts of the Headmaster and the Vocational Guidance Officers a comparatively high proportion of the boys have been placed in apprenticeships. An apprenticeship is one of the significant goals for a boy from this school’.842

839 Inspection Report, 20 April 1950. Ibid. DB.
840 Inspection Report, 6 November 1957. BAAA 1001/1057b. ANZ-A. DB.
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From this, it seems reasonable to conclude that the official emphasis in 1940 on secondary schooling for a practical and largely unskilled life on the land, had now been extended to practical work in a trade.

The Inspector’s expectations for these Maori secondary students and tendency to blame their backgrounds for more success not being achieved at school, was reflected in another very revealing comment, when he noted that:

The standards of work achieved by the pupils of this school have shown steady improvement. Concrete evidence of this can be seen in the results of the School Certificate examinations over the past three years. Although only one pupil passed the examination set in 1956, three others were very close to success. This, when considered against the background and lack of encouragement for study at home with which these pupils are faced, must be considered a very worthy achievement.843

At Tikitiki, in 1960, four students passed School Certificate, but none achieved Endorsed School Certificate or University Entrance. In 1961, the Inspector noted that of the five classroom teachers in the secondary department only one was permanent and he was the only one with a university credit. Three of the relieving teachers were primary-trained and the other was untrained

In Mathematics, on account of shortage of qualified staff, the subject has been taken over recently by a young primary trained teacher who has no secondary experience. As he is unfamiliar with the requirements he is attempting to follow a scheme prepared by a former teacher. The classes observed were working industriously but the type of problems that was being set and the methods employed to solve them were most unsuitable

General. The work of this school is severely handicapped in that there is no Senior Secondary Assistant in charge of the Department, and with the exception of two teachers all of the staff are inexperienced or untrained for secondary work.

The Head-teacher acts as Careers Adviser. The placement of pupils in suitable positions is considered to be an important function of the

843 Ibid;
The Army, the Post and Telegraph and Trade Apprenticeships are the main avenues of employment.\textsuperscript{844}

In 1962, the District Superintendent of Education described Tikitiki Maori District High School as always having ‘been a problem school. Its roll, now at 113, is substantial and …I was pleased to see that despite difficulties, 4 passes in School Certificate had been gained’.\textsuperscript{845}

In 1963 there were 2 School Certificate passes. In his 1964 report the Inspector commented that:

The few pupils who pass School Certificate show a preference for teaching, nursing or trade apprenticeships.

General: The School has its difficulties. There have been five Head Teachers in the past three years. The continuing lack of a permanent Senior Secondary Assistant in a school staffed largely by relieving teachers creates further administrative problems. Some very good work was seen in certain departments but the overall impression is one of fragmented effort.\textsuperscript{846}

Other difficulties had restricted opportunities for some East Coast primary school leavers. In 1955, the Chairman of the Horoera School Committee, H. J. Dewes, wrote to the Department that the Committee had been informed that scholarships and secondary allowances were again available and the Committee would be pleased to have this good news confirmed. He pointed out that the community had ‘missed these very much indeed, as our children could not enjoy, fully, the handy privileges of secondary school education offered by our Te Araroa District High School owing to the isolated nature of this area caused by the unbridged Awatere River which has become really worse during the past two years.\textsuperscript{847}

\textsuperscript{844} Inspection Report, Tikitiki Maori DHS, 11-12 October 1961. Ibid. DB.
\textsuperscript{845} District Superintendent of Education to Senior Inspector of Secondary Schools, 11 January 1962. Ibid. DB.
\textsuperscript{846} Inspection Report, Tikitiki Maori DHS, 6-7 May 1964. BAAA 1001/1057c. ANZ-A. DB.
\textsuperscript{847} Chairman to District Superintendent, 13 September 1955. BAAA 1001/934b, 44/6. ANZ-A. DB.
5.6 The Native/Maori Primary Schools

5.6.1 Introduction

The views of Crown officials regarding the most appropriate type of schooling for Maori were shaped virtually from the beginning by their views of race and class. In this respect it is worth repeating here the statement by Henry Taylor who was appointed the first School Inspector under the terms of the Native Schools Act 1858:

I do not advocate for the Natives under the present circumstances a refined education or high mental culture; it would be inconsistent if we take account of the position they are likely to hold for many years to come min the social scale, and inappropriate if we remember that they are better calculated by nature to get their living by manual than by mental labour.848

The final phrase was to be a dominant influence in the thinking of Crown officials regarding schooling for Maori at both the primary and secondary levels for at least the next 90 years. It was strongly evident throughout the years 1880 to 1904, when James Pope was the Education Department’s official in charge of Maori education. Pope constantly emphasized the importance of practical activities of all kinds, both outside the classroom in the form of model school gardens and workshops and inside it. He wrote in his 1902 report:

It is understood that in almost all Maori schools there is a good deal of manual and kindergarten work done; that the children like it, while the teachers are becoming alive to its beneficial effects on the other work of the school… and that, generally, much of the good promised in connection with this kind of work is being full realised. Such operations as paper-folding, paper-weaving, work in plasticine, cane – weaving and “bricklaying” are now regularly taught in most of these schools. There has also been progress made in teaching woodwork.849

---

848 AJHR, 1862, E-4, p.38.
The practical emphasis was reinforced when George Hogben was appointed Inspector General of Schools in 1899. Hogben was an enthusiast for an expansion of manual training and technical education in all New Zealand’s schools, but described his ideas as having ‘a peculiar force in relation to our Native Schools’ (Author’s emphasis).850

The practical focus was re-emphasized when Douglas Ball took charge of the Native Schools in 1930. The priority given to practical education was reflected in a ‘Statement of Principles’ the Department circulated to all Native School teachers in 1934. The first principle stated that ‘all instruction be practical and related to the actual needs of the Maori’, and others that ‘in the case of girls, a practical knowledge of housecraft, including plain sewing, cooking, washing, and care of clothes, home cleaning and beautifying, mending, nursing, be considered essential’, and, ‘The vocational aspect of the training be emphasized. Agriculture and Woodwork closely correlated and in touch with the requirements of the district’.851

5.6.2 The East Coast Native/Maori Primary Schools and Practical Education

More time could be given to Handwork. If necessary Arithmetic could be reduced by thirty minutes’, and ‘Increase Drawing and Handwork as discussed, deducting time from word-building and number.
Tikitiki Native School Inspection Report, 1936.852

It was ‘most disappointing to learn that such little use had been made of the excellent facilities that have been provided for the development of the practical side of education…Much more use could have been made of the crafts and baths building which must not in future on any account be used for classroom purposes. The Department regards the adequate use of this building as of more importance than the giving of academic instruction in the classroom and I have to instruct you to take immediate steps, if you have not already done so, to bring the crafts building into full operation (Author’s emphasis).
Director Education Beeby to Waiomatatini Head Teacher, 1941.853

850 AJHR, 1899, E-1. See the section on ‘Manual Training and Technical Instruction’.
852 Inspection Report, T. A. Fletcher, Tikitiki Native School, 28th April, 1936. BAAA 1001, 44/6, 1056a. ANZ-A. DB.
853 Director of Education, C.E.Beeby, to Head Teacher, Waiomatatini, 23rd October, 1941. BAAA 1001/1071b, 44/6. ANZ-A. DB
In his inspection report on Hiruharama in 1900 Pope wrote that ‘The fruit plantations are so far successful. The Maoris too have planted a large orchard presumably in imitation of the school’.  

At Tokomaru Bay in 1903 Inspector Bird wrote that ‘Good progress has been made in cardboard and calico work samples of which were produced for inspection. The cane work is also well done and many pretty baskets were turned out. Straw plaiting is very well done’.

At Whangara in 1904 the Inspector found that ‘Handwork finds due recognition here and paper weaving and folding, cane-work and plasticine work are satisfactorily done’.

At Waiomatatini, while the basket work was ‘satisfactory’ the ‘cardboard and carton work is not done with that accuracy one would like to see. Plasticine work is also done’.

The paper weaving at Whareponga in 1905 was ‘well done. Plasticine work excellent. Models being made from natural forms’.

It is obvious from the records that not all East Coast Maori were happy by any means with the practical emphasis, particularly if they thought that the activities being taught in the school were already being done in the home or could be. The Teacher at Te Araroa advised the Education Secretary in 1907 that the bigger boys had begun work on preparing the land for the school garden:

---
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the boys seem to enjoy it very much but not so the parents. Several of them waited on me and stated that I was not to teach their children gardening or ‘mahioneone’ as they termed it. They could teach them this, in fact the children had too much of it already. They did not object so much to ‘carpentry’ or ‘smithing’ but they had a decided objection to mahioneone (‘working soil’). The Chairman is not with us in the matter of school gardening and this will explain the whole matter.860

A handwritten note on the file by Bird states that the matter ‘Had better wait for visit of Inspector’ (Author’s emphasis).861

The Inspector reported on Whareponga in 1922 that ‘Elementary agriculture is taken by the upper pupils who are encouraged to have home gardens’.862

And another report on Whareponga, later in the year, identified ‘Basket work, plasticine, paper folding, mat weaving, sewing’ as being ‘very good indeed’.863

The Head of Te Araroa, Mr Whitehead, advised the Education Secretary in 1919 that after discussion with Inspector Bird he understood that ‘as the girls are taking Health and Domestic Instruction there is no need for them to take Agricultural Science’.864

A workshop was established at Hiruharama in 1925 and the following year the articles made by each of the boys and the hours they had worked by the quarter of the year ending 30 June was listed under ‘Instruction given and work done’ alongside their names. The list included ‘ventilator, bar bells, music stand, welcome sign, drill wheels, fairy wands, platform and supports, barrow, stile etc’, and most of the boys had worked between 40 and 43 hours.865 This was a large number of hours to be taken up by such work in that period of time. For the quarterly return of 30 September in the same year further articles made were listed, another 35 hours having been put in by

860 Teacher to Secretary, 29 November 1907. Ibid. DB.
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most boys. The final return in December listed further work and further time put in of from between 25-30 hours.

At Whareponga in 1929 the Inspector pointed out that ‘More handwork is necessary especially for the standard boys’.

In the report written after he visited East Coast Native Schools in 1929 the Director of Education, TB Strong, wanted improvements made in the practical activity that he had observed, commenting that several of the schools he had seen were equipped with manual training rooms but ‘several had fallen into disuse. This should not be allowed, and I propose that greater interest shall be taken in manual training for Maori children. The best manual training I saw is being given at Ruatoria (Manutahi School), the head-teacher’s woodwork and his wife’s cooking and needlework being excellent’.

The presence of Maori pupils in Hawke’s Bay Education Board Schools was not often repeated on in much detail by Inspectors (See the Chapter on East Coast Maori and Education Board Schools). But one exception which is relevant to this discussion was in 1901 when the Board’s Inspector, H. Hill, drew particular attention to the practical activity being encouraged at the Waerenga-a-Hika School which was under Board control at the time but enrolled many Maori students. Apparently the presence of so many Maori pupils had led to an expansion of practical activities thought appropriate for them, because Hill reported that ‘the children make hammocks, baskets, summer curtains and a variety of other things’, and the ‘problem of teaching cookery to the girls has been solved with commendable success by the Mistress. One afternoon a week is set aside by the wife of the master for instruction in practical cooking and household management. The girls meet at the teacher’s residence, and they go through a course of training-scrubbing, polishing, baking and cooking-such as will be of great value to them in the future’.

---
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It is important to make the point that practical activities were also encouraged in rural Board Schools at the time, although they never received anywhere near the same emphasis as they did in the Native Schools. Nevertheless some Boards appointed agricultural inspectors to encourage the work, which could be viewed as another sign of the advantage of their greater autonomy and decentralized administrative structure. As a result, Native Schools on the East Coast began to receive occasional visits from the Hawke’s Bay Education Board’s Agricultural Inspector, who provided detailed reports on the progress being made. These reports indicate the amount of equipment used and the time and effort pupils and teachers in the Native Schools were putting into the practical activities. One report on such activities covering June and July 1931 identified:

- **Tuparoa:** Home plot work to be introduced as well as main crop plots. Pupils knowledge is good in both divisions.
- **Whakawhitira:** Levelling and grassing completed. New main Study plots marked out.
- **Tikitiki:** Fine forward movement in grounds. Home plots made good showing. Indoor records show progress.
- **Rangitukia:** Plot work, eg green manure is more definite. Home plots to be more adequately organised and supervised.
- **Te Araroa:** Good indoor progress. I have adjusted school garden plots, etc, for new fencing. Main crops to be studied.
- **Potaka:** Progress in levelling, grassing, planting etc. Shelter belts now prominent. Home plots to be re-continued as in similar schools.
- **Wharekahika:** Seasonal work hindered. A dry autumn and early winter favours schools further south, e.g. Tikitiki, but prevents progress in sandy soil. Nevertheless by October, showing in plot and garden will be normal. 

---

871 Report by R. Lockhart, Hawke’sBay Education, Agricultural Instructor. BAAA 1016/8b. DB.
But as with attempts to teach selected aspects of Maori arts and crafts after 1930, financial constraints imposed by the economic depression often impeded the work. An example of this occurred at Te Araroa in 1932 when the Head advised the Director that ‘Our supply of spades is not sufficient to equip each boy doing gardening work with a tool. This necessitates the finding of odd work for a few boys on each occasion of practical work in the gardens, an arrangement which is rarely satisfactory’. However the following year the Head outlined to the Director his ambitious plans for developing a school ‘Forestry scheme’. He pointed out that ‘The plan is extensive; two thousand seedlings had already been planted in the school’s seed beds ready to be lined out in nursery rows in the next few weeks’, where they would be left until September when they would be ready for planting out. His plans for 1933 also involved ‘experimental research with the Pine species in order to discover the best type of Pine for this district'; steps had been taken to approach the Native Land Court to acquire land comprising about 100 acres and ‘planting such a large tract would, of course, have to be done progressively’. Subsequent reports make it clear that the forestry work and tree planting was developed although on a smaller scale than that originally envisaged.

At Te Araroa in 1938 under a heading ‘Club work’, the Inspector was ‘very impressed with the manner in which the “Gardeners Union” was conducted. It is a real “Club” and the members are certainly keen and interested in the work. Entries for sweet peas 15 and calves 15 are good. Record books will be supplied for calf projects’. The Inspector was not impressed with the garden work at Tikitiki in 1933, or with the teacher, Mr Bowman, when ‘questioning his pupils on the science underlying the growing of the marigolds. My impression is that the work has been almost mechanical and that the children have learned very little of scientific principles’. But things had improved the following year, Ball describing ‘much good work’ having been done at the school in agriculture, ‘and home gardens and calf club work have been
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instituted. Your follow up of this work, including visits to the homes, has been very sound’. 876

However ominously for the academic progress of the Maori pupils at Tikitiki another Inspector, T.A.Fletcher, wrote in 1936 that ‘More time could be given to Handwork. If necessary Arithmetic could be reduced by thirty minutes’, and ‘Increase Drawing and Handwork as discussed, deducting time from word-building and number’. 877

At Waiomatatini in 1937, although ‘Some handwork has been done’, the Inspector regarded the amount as ‘not sufficient for a Native School’. 878

A report on workshop activities undertaken at Hiruharama in 1937 listed the pupils in the class and alongside the practical activity each has been engaged in. These included ‘repairing furniture, tools and building’, making a fire-screen, table, deck-chairs, ‘painting, polishing and varnishing’, ‘sharpening of planes, chisels and saws’ and much more.879

At any one time approximately 10 per cent of the pupils attending Native/Maori schools were Pakeha, and some of their parents sometimes complained about what they regarded as the over-emphasis on practical activities rather than the conventional academic subjects such as the ‘three Rs’. An example of this occurred in 1937 when a Pakeha parent wrote to the Director of Education pointing out that his children had had an aggregate attendance of 22 years at Whakaangangi, but it had not been until ‘the school was taken over by the Native Department’ that any of the children had ‘complained about the treatment handed out to them by the teachers’. Prominent amongst his complaints was that with:

the amount of work the boy has to do outside he would no doubt have gained a navvy’s proficiency. Is it not a policy of the Department that a child who is going for proficiency does practically no outside work but is coached in weak subjects when work is going on outside. My boy in company with another had to drag two 20 foot manuka poles ½ a mile
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up a paddock to make a wireless mast for the headmaster. That could hardly come within the scope of Education. Also the carting of metal from the river in a barrow about 300 yards may gain marks for the teacher, but what of Education? For 30 yards the track rises about one in six. Then there’s the matter of the headmaster’s garden and mowing of lawns. 880

In 1939 only six pupils out of 157 enrolled at Rangitukia were in Form 11 and the Inspector praised their academic progress. But he made no suggestion that more children should be pushed on through to Form 11. Instead, in his report on the upper standards, he particularly praised the fact that ‘Very good work has been done in Agriculture, which has been very practical in nature and designed to assist in the beautification of the school grounds and district’. 881

The Director of Education, C. E. Beeby, in a very telling comment to the Head of Waiomatatini in 1941 made it clear where he stood with regard to the importance of practical instruction for Maori pupils. He wrote that it was:

most disappointing to learn that such little use had been made of the excellent facilities that have been provided for the development of the practical side of education…Much more use could have been made of the crafts and baths building which must not in future on any account be used for classroom purposes. The Department regards the adequate use of this building as of more importance than the giving of academic instruction in the classroom and I have to instruct you to take immediate steps, if you have not already done so, to bring the crafts building into full operation (Author’s emphasis). 882

5.7 The Maori Denominational Boarding Schools

The boarding schools slowly revived after the wars, but most continued to be little more than primary schools with a practical orientation during the 1870s and 1880s. William Williams Bishop of Waiapu wanted to replace the schools for Maori boys and girls along the lines his family had operated at Waerenga-a-Hika. He advanced a loan in the 1870s to assist the building of a school for boys at Te Aute, and denoted the land for a boarding school for girls at Napier to be called Hukarere, which opened
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on 5 July 1875. It is these two schools that I mainly focus on in this section mainly because they were attended by many East Coast pupils.

5.7.1 Hukarere

Williams’s philosophy for Hukarere reflected CMS policy to convert Maori to Christianity and parallel with the policy of the Crown to ‘civilise’ Maori through assimilation. Kuni Jenkins and Kay Morris Mathews suggest that while these policies also applied to Maori boys at the brother school of Te Aute, ‘Maori girls were regarded as worthy of special attention’, in that by being encouraged to conform to a European ‘model of ideal motherhood’ they were ‘seen to be the future guardians of morality through their roles as wives and mother’. According to these authors, the Pakeha middle-class concept of women as ‘Angel of the House’ had as much to do with transforming Maori girls as it had with “saving” them.883

Girls from the East Coast north of Gisborne enrolled at Hukarere from the beginning. For the initial years they appear to have come mainly from Tokomaru Bay and Uawa, as the following list demonstrates: Tokomaru Bay 1876 (2); 1877 (2); 1878 (1); 1879 Uawa (1); 1880 (Tokomaru (1) Uawa (1); 1881 Tokomaru (1) Uawa (1); 1882 Tokomaru (3) Uawa (2). But as time went by girls they enrolled from virtually all districts, e.g. Akuaku (1); 1883; Waiomatatini (2); 1891; Whareponga (1); 1894 Te Araroa (1); Rangitukia (2).884

The Crown was able to exercise some influence over the curriculum at Hukarere and the other Maori boarding schools through the system of government scholarships introduced in 1880. These gave selected pupils a further two years of schooling after completing Standard 4, which at the time was the highest class in Native primary schools, in what was intended to be a finishing off of the primary school course rather than secondary education in the commonly understood usage of that term.

This is shown in Pope’s account in 1884 of the syllabus covered by girls on government scholarships at Hukarere after two years in residence. They were expected to pass a strict examination of the Native primary-school standards, and in particular to demonstrate that they had made satisfactory progress in writing and speaking English; to translate a Maori letter, a paragraph from a Maori newspaper, or a verse of a Maori hymn into good, idiomatic English, to ‘show acquaintance with the rules of health’, and answer easy questions on the history of New Zealand. They were also expected to have made considerable progress in the additional subjects of singing and drawing, to have mastered a course of gymnastic exercises, and to have a good knowledge of needlework and domestic duties such as washing and cooking. Pope also noted that each government scholar was spending one month in the laundry as well as being school cook for a month, and although this accounted for much normal school time being lost, he regarded these activities as likely to contribute to one of the major ends desired, ‘namely, that when the girls leave the institution they shall know how to do most forms of housework in the European fashion’.

Pope accepted a suggestion which emerged from the 1897 Conference of the Te Aute College Students’ Association, that Maori settlements would benefit from trained Maori nurses. The following year a scheme began whereby two girls who had passed their second year’s examination at Hukarere or St Joseph’s attended the Napier Hospital for one year as day-pupil trainees in the theory and practice of nursing and dressing, and cooking for invalids. At the end of the year the girls were to go back to their own communities. Four years later, the tenure of the scholarships was extended to two years, or three if considered desirable, on the recommendation of the hospital authorities. Subsequently the arrangements were modified to allow Maori girls to become fully qualified, but still on the understanding that they returned to their own people and community. This was in line with the view of the Inspector-General of Education, George Hogben, in 1900 that every educated Maori girl should return to her own district to help, as he put it, ‘bring an uninitiated but intelligent and high spirited people into line with civilization’.

---
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While the need for training Maori girls as nurses was generally recognized, Bird complained that ‘the hospital authorities—with one or two notable exceptions, of which the Napier Hospital trustees are the most prominent—find many objections, even in districts with a fairly large Maori population, and decline to give any support whatever to the scheme’.  

Academic standards in the denominational boarding schools were slow to develop, with the exception of Te Aute, which will be discussed later. In 1907 the formal work in most of them still generally followed the work prescribed in the Native primary schools, with the Native School Code as the guide for the lower classes, and the education board syllabus for the higher classes. A heavy practical emphasis persisted. In a written statement to the 1906 Commission on the Te Aute and Wanganui School Trusts, the Principal of Hukarere, Miss A.M. Williams, described the programme of her school:

Religious instruction is given regularly...the girls are taught all kinds of domestic work, including cooking, washing and ironing, and to make and mend their own clothes. The elder girls learn dressmaking, to which about five hours per week are devoted, and once a week they attend a cooking class in the town....The girls rise early, as no servants are kept, and all the work of the house has to be done before 9 o’clock, one girl only remaining out of school to prepare dinner. The work is taken in rotation, being changed every four weeks, so that all may have a chance of learning the various branches of the work. The prayer bell rings at 7.30 a.m.

It was hardly surprising therefore that as Jenkins and Morris Mathews found in their history of Hukarere although many students were guided into nursing and teaching, very few went on to study at university, and that even as late as 1950, when some had graduated from university, the educational objectives for Hukarere girls was outlined by the school’s proprietors as follows:

Hukarere is entirely a boarding school. The government gives scholarships to the most promising in the Maori schools. These are tenable for two years, but are renewed for the best of these girls for a further two years, enabling them to obtain School Certificate, which

---
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opens to them the chance of attending Training College, teaching in the Maori schools, nursing, dental nursing, which, with dressmaking, are the professions usually followed by our girls. Some are working among their own people as welfare workers and in the Department of Maori Affairs.\footnote{Te Aute Centennial Celebration, 1950, p.9, in Jenkins and Morris Mathews, p.32.}

Of course these were all important occupations, and an expansion of the earlier view that the schooling of Maori girls was to be for domestic service and as the wives of Te Aute boys back in their home communities. But the statement also reflects the continuing influence the Crown was able to exert over a school like Hukarere through the provision of government scholarships. It also reflects, in my view, the continuation even into the 1950s of the rather narrow and limited stereotype of Maori abilities and capacities which had existed on the part of Crown education officials for at least the previous 80 years.

5.7.2 Te Aute College

The exception with regard to the academic level achieved during the 1880s was Te Aute. The reasons for this lay in the philosophy of its Headmaster, John Thornton, supported by the Chairman of the Board of Trustees, Archdeacon Williams, and the natural aptitudes of many of its students.

As the Pakeha Headmaster of a private school intended primarily for Maori students, there was one aspect of Thornton’s educational philosophy which particularly stood out amongst Pakeha educators at this time. This was the strength of his belief that Maori were as intellectually capable as Pakeha of attaining the highest academic educational level possible. He saw his responsibility as Headmaster as being both to encourage them to do so, and to put in place the practical means for them to do so. Thornton’s philosophy is best described in his own words:

I tried from the very first to raise the standard of the school and a few years later I conceived the idea of preparing Maori boys for the matriculation examination of the New Zealand University. What led me to this idea was that I felt the Maori should not be shut out from any chance of competing with English boys in the matter of higher education. I saw that the time would come, when the Maoris would
wish to have their own doctors, their own lawyers, and their own clergymen, and I felt it was only just to the race to provide facilities for their doing so.891

Thornton did however share the enthusiasm of his contemporaries for socializing the Maori to become Pakeha, telling his students that ‘when a weaker nation (Maori) was living side by side with a stronger (European) the one weaker, poorer and more ignorant…with no fixed custom, laws and habits, this weaker nation would soon die out, if it did not emulate the stronger race’.892

As early as 1882 Pope was describing Te Aute as a ‘good secondary school’, providing education of a ‘superior kind’.893 The questions set for the examination (of history, geography, English, mathematics and elementary science) were described as the equivalent of those set for an ‘advanced class in a European grammar school’, and of a kind that could not have been dealt with by mere cramming. No paper had been sent in by any boys in the senior class that was less than respectable, and answers given to the science paper on Huxley’s “Introduction to Physics” were ‘remarkably good’, demonstrating that the pupils had thoroughly mastered the work.894

In 1883 Pope described the work being done by the pupils in mathematics and science as being of such quality that it would do credit to any secondary school.895 By 1890 several candidates each year were sent up for matriculation, Thornton explaining that ‘the fact that our standard is the matriculation examination of the University of New Zealand defines the curriculum to a very great extent. Everything leads up to that.’896

Students from East Coast Native (and later Maori) primary schools enrolled at Te Aute, or were able to continue studies at it, in a variety of capacities. Some won one of the Government scholarships referred to earlier, others were awarded a Te Makarirí Scholarship, provided by means of a fund established by R. D. Douglas McLean in
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accordance with the views and wishes of Sir Donald McLean and in memory of him, while some were sent as private fee paying students.

In December 1892 the Head of Tuparoa reminded the Education Secretary that the three boys who had passed their 4th Standard were keen to go to Te Aute. In a report on Tuparoa in 1894, which he described as ‘this excellent school’, Pope reported that at a meeting after the examination ‘the Maoris showed themselves anxious that arrangements should be made for carrying the education of their children somewhat beyond the limits laid down in the Native-school standards’.

The three successful candidates for the Matriculation Examination at Te Aute in 1890 were Apirana Turupa, John Damon and Tiweka Anaru, their average passes in an examination in English Arithmetic, Algebra, Euclid, History, Chemistry and Latin being 91.8, 77.2, and 60.7. Pope commented that while three Matriculation passes might not be considered remarkable in an ordinary secondary school, it became ‘a great triumph’ when achieved by candidates using a foreign language.

All the candidates for the Te Makariri Scholarships in the same year were already enrolled at Te Aute, and consequently the ordinary policy which gave one scholarship to a boy from a boarding school and two to Native school pupils could not be acted upon. The Trustees gave one of the Senior Scholarships to Renata Paratene, formerly of Waiomatatini, a Junior Scholarship to Hatara Kereama, and a third scholarship to Apirana Turupa, who was dux of Te Aute for the year, to enable him to pursue his studies further at Te Aute or elsewhere.

In 1898 the Junior Scholarship was won by Niha Wiremu of Rangitukia. In 1899 the Native School Junior Scholarship was awarded to Te Mauri Mauheni of Rangitukia, and other candidates included Karaitiana Poi of Tikitiki and William Parker Turei of Rangitukia.

---
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5.7.3 The Response of Education Department Officials

This section discusses the reaction of Crown education officials to Thornton’s high expectations of academic success for the Maori students, and their views regarding the most appropriate kind of education that the denominational boarding schools should offer. It demonstrates, in a particularly stark way, the narrow and limited view officials held of most Maori students, their potential, and their future possibilities.

A negative reaction against what was being attempted at Te Aute, and particularly reservations amongst Education Department officials about the academic emphasis described, was soon apparent. Pope’s own reservations were made clear in his 1886 report when he suggested to the Te Makariri Scholarships Fund Trustees that they might:

> with advantage substitute some kind of technical scholarship for the senior scholarship now given as a final reward for scholastic success. Such a scholarship would make the transition from the school to practical every-day life much easier than it is at present, and probably far less dangerous.903

The latter comment implied that an academic education would make the students unsuited for what officials regarded as desirable for the majority, their return to village life. In the same year W. J.Habens, the Inspector-General of Schools, asked Pope to ‘question the utility of a little Latin for these boys’ at Te Aute and to report on ‘handicraft exercises’.904

In his report for that year Pope then noted that the ‘highest part of the work of this school has been abandoned- most judiciously I think. There is now no matriculation class’.905
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He acknowledged that the school had demonstrated that it could prepare boys for matriculation, but described this as being at the cost of making the rest of the school weaker. Boys were still doing good work in ‘higher’ English, algebra, euclid, elementary physiology and elementary physics. but it was ‘not advisable to ask for more or to expect more’. He noted aspects of the work he did find pleasing had been described in the last report by his fellow inspector, H.Kirk, and had reflected a greater emphasis on practical activity including ‘careful instruction in the use of carpenters’ tools’. 906

However the matriculation class was resumed in the following and subsequent years. No reason is given for this temporary abandonment, but given Thornton’s philosophy and the comments by officials, it seems likely that Departmental pressure, including the leverage officials had over the Board through the College’s reliance on government scholarships, probably played a part. An opening shot, perhaps, of what was to develop into a consistent campaign to try and force all the denominational colleges to maintain a predominantly practical rather than academic curriculum. At Te Aute in 1888 each pupil had his own garden and some furniture was being made in the school workshop, but carpentry work lapsed when the instructor left. 907

In 1897 Pope wrote to Habens that he had informed Williams and Thornton that the Te Aute estate was ‘eminently fitted to be the site of an institution at which Maori boys could be taught agriculture, market gardening, stock farming, poultry keeping and bacon curing’; but ‘all the resources of the of the estate were being diverted to literary work’. 908

Yet in his 1898 report on the school Pope was back to acknowledging its academic achievements, describing the work the senior form was attempting as equal to that in the top form at Wellington College. 909

906 Ibid;
908 Pope to Habens, 4 January 1897. BAAA 1001.
909 AJHR, 1898, E-2, p.11.
Sections of the academic syllabus in use for the second highest form in 1898 give some indication of the level of the work which was being attempted: *English literature*: Byron’s ‘Prisoner of Chillon’ and Macaulay’s ‘Armada’ to be learnt by heart; extracts from Scott, for reading only; Macauley’s ‘Hampden’, 11 pages, the text to be learnt by heart; *English Grammar*: Smith’s ‘Manual of English Grammar’, all the syntax, noun, adjective, pronoun, verb, and adverb; *Latin*: English into Latin, Wilkin’s Prose Exercises, the ‘Eclogae’ to the end of Hannibal. About the same standard of difficulty was set in Euclid, algebra, arithmetic, physiology, and geography.

Thornton’s insistence on providing a matriculation class, his qualities as a teacher and motivator, and the natural abilities of the students, inevitably led to high academic success for some of them. Apirana Ngata’s matriculation results in 1890 were so good that Thornton encouraged him to enrol at University, the Makariri Trustees providing a special grant to assist him. He enrolled in papers for Arts and Law degrees, including Latin, Greek, Constitutional History, Political Economy, Mathematics and Geology.910

Graduating in Law he became one of Te Aute’s most distinguished graduates, but there were many others. Peter Buck (Te Rangi Hiroa) described in his autobiography how Thornton encouraged him to take on the additional subjects necessary for entry to medical school. After graduating and briefly entering politics as the member for Northern Maori, he went on to a distinguished international career as an anthropologist with honorary degrees from Yale, Rochester, Hawaii and the University of New Zealand, British and Swedish knighthoods, the Huxley medal, the Terry Prize (Yale) and the Hector Medal of the Royal Anthropological Institute. Maui Pomare, after graduating from Otago Medical School, became the first public health officer with special responsibility for Maori health, then entered politics and held office as Minister of Health. There were other medical graduates, including Doctors T. Wirepa and E. P. Ellison, and graduates in other fields, too numerous to mention here.911

Under Thornton Te Aute’s reputation for academic excellence became so high that the staff at St. Stephen’s denominational boarding college for Maori boys encouraged any pupil who showed academic promise to transfer to it. ‘Because of Te Aute’, the St Stephen’s Principal stated in 1906, ‘we do not give any boys a secondary education…we are very glad to have Te Aute to send our particularly clever boys to. I think it would be a loss if there were no such place’.  

However Education Department officials continued to apply pressure to the denominational boarding schools, and Te Aute in particular, to make their curriculum more practical. In the Department’s 1902 report to Parliament James Pope outlined the emphasis being placed on practical activities in the Native primary schools and then gave his view on the emphasis he believed was also needed in further education for Maori:

It will be seen from the above that, in order to accomplish successfully the task of educating the Maoris in such a way as to raise the tone of the ordinary village community, more and more emphasis is being placed upon the teaching of English and upon manual training. This remark raises the question of the desirability of reforming the courses prescribed in the secondary boarding–schools for Maoris; for the two subjects just named must be considered as far more important than more bookish forms of instruction, which tend to unfit Maori boys and girls for the simple life of the pa, and give them no training that will enable them to perform willingly and intelligently the work that has to be done in connection with their homes. There are very few Maori boys, and, up to the present, no Maori girls, who have become students at the University Colleges, and it seems accordingly a waste of effort to teach Latin and other purely academic subjects to those who should be taught in a practical way the principles that underlie agriculture, domestic work, and the other occupations of their future lives. The few who show sufficient ability to warrant their being taken for a considerable time away from their own people could, at a far less total expense, receive at the ordinary secondary schools the training necessary to prepare them for a university career.

---
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In a later section of the report he elaborated further on his views regarding secondary education for Maori:

Now and then a real Maori genius turns up. When one of these is fairly recognised, the opportunity should be made the most of, and no pains should be spared to give this genius a sound education, and full opportunity to do good to his own people as a doctor, lawyer, or teacher of some kind…..With this exception no young Maoris should stay away from their people more than a couple of years or so at a time, or long enough to get out of touch with them, and so be unable to re-establish or maintain thoroughly friendly relations with them.914

However Thornton continued to insist on an academic emphasis to the highest level possible, a view which increasingly conflicted sharply with those held by officials within the Education Department. Speaking at a national gathering of Maori council representatives and other persons interested in the welfare of Maori in 1908, he urged equality of educational opportunity for Maori and Pakeha children, pointing out that he had identified a general feeling that Maori youths were good enough to go on the land, or become carpenters, but not good enough to become members of the learned professions. Whereas he maintained that the Maori was in every way the intellectual equal of Europeans, and he moved that:

Having regard to the fact that Maori should have the same educational advantages and opportunities as Europeans and that it is desirable that Maori youths of approved ability should be encouraged to qualify for the learned professions, this congress is of the opinion that the heads of Maori secondary schools should be urged to select suitable students with a view to their becoming matriculation candidates.915

But changes to senior personnel within the Education Department, linked to changes in thinking about educational policy and practice and the continuation of stereotyped views regarding Maori ability and educability, were now to have profound and negative implications for the education of Maori, particularly at the post-primary level.
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George Hogben’s intentions when he was appointed Inspector-General of Schools in 1899 were discussed in the earlier in relation to primary schools, including his enthusiasm for manual training and technical instruction and view that these ideas had ‘a peculiar force in relation to our Native schools’. He had been disappointed with the response of Pakeha parents and pupils and the staff of the district high schools to the idea that they would become rural community centres for pupils who would remain in the rural areas, and he now turned with enthusiasm to the Maori boarding colleges as suitable laboratories for these ideas. He and the Native School inspectors and their successors devoted considerable efforts to establish at them a particular type of curriculum, one which they hoped would influence the direction of the overwhelming majority of Maori students into manual and technical occupations in rural areas. The trustees of the boarding colleges were susceptible because, accepting government scholarships which were important for the economic survival of the colleges, also meant that they came under departmental inspection, meaning the Department could have a say in their operation and direction.

The need to ‘reform’ the courses they were offering was referred to in the Education Department’s annual report for 1902, when the teaching of English and manual instruction was emphasised as:

far more important than the more bookish forms of instruction, which tend to unfit Maori boys and girls for the simple life of the pa, and give them no training that will enable them to perform willingly and intelligently the work that has to be done in connection with their homes. There are very few Maori boys, and, up to the present, no Maori girls, who have become students at the University Colleges, and it seems accordingly a waste of time to teach Latin and other purely academic subjects to those who should be taught in a practical way the principles that underlie agriculture, domestic work, and the other occupations of their future lives. The few who show ability to warrant their being taken for a considerable time away from their own people could, at a far lesser expense, receive at the ordinary secondary schools the training necessary to prepare them for a university career.916
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Hogben’s views, supported by Bird, were particularly relevant to the discussion going on regarding the most appropriate kind of education which should be offered by the Maori boarding schools.

Ngata’s much wider and more optimistic views regarding the range of educational opportunities and occupations which should be open to Maori were mentioned earlier. Peter Buck agreed with Ngata at this time that a steady stream of Te Aute graduates should train as clergymen, enter the universities and the professions, learn trades or find employment in the civil service. Like Ngata, he also believed that whether individuals became alienated from their home community or not would depend entirely on their individual characters.\textsuperscript{917}

Such views were supported by Ngati Porou kaumatua who, in welcoming the formations of the TACSA, had declared that it was the responsibility of the people ‘to see that the children shall not stop at the primary level, but be pushed on to the colleges so that they can become tradesmen, artisans, professional men and people who will be able to lead and help’.\textsuperscript{918}

However Maui Pomare, after graduating from Otago in medicine, and, no doubt influenced by his work as the first Maori Officer of Health, differed from Ngata and Buck in this respect, and revealed thinking more in line with that of Departmental officials. He advocated curtailment of academic education, particularly for Maori girls, and an increase in the amount of time devoted to practical and technical education that he believed was more suited to the Maori stage of development. A small matriculation class had been started at Hukerere and in 1903 Pomare criticized Hukerere specifically, but also by implication the curricula of the denominational boarding schools generally, for having become too academically orientated:

\begin{quote}
Strike the mothers and you strike the entire rising generation. Educate the mothers to recognize the efficacy of the bathtub, cleanly warm clothes, plain and wholesome food, and you will regenerate the Maori quicker than by teaching the youths and maidens embroidery, Latin and Euclid…You
\end{quote}
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have taught us how to read and write, you have taught us Greek and Latin, you have taught our girls how to couch endearing terms to their lovers, teach us also how to cultivate our lands.  

Buck was by no means alone amongst Maori in advocating that education for many Maori needed to include a practical component. Hone Heke, the Maori Member of Parliament for the Tai Tokerau electorate, urged the Government to establish an agricultural and technical college for Maori children to be sent to after finishing primary school.

In the Wairarapa, some members of Ngati Kahungunu told a 1905 Land Commission that they wanted a more practical type of schooling to enable them to farm their remaining land effectively, and have young people enter trades. Te Whatahoro Jury suggested that income from all the school trusts within the district should be put towards ‘one good school’ because despite decades of education none of the children were yet engaged in any European trades. More technical and industrial education, ‘to teach our children trades so that they may be equipped for the future’, was also requested by Hapeta Whakamairu and others.

But as was demonstrated earlier, leaders like Ngata and others had never wanted the kind of extreme emphasis on practical education at the secondary level which was now to characterize the Crown’s education policy for Maori for at least the next 40 years, and this also probably applied to those referred to above.

Hogben now advocated the introduction of more practical and technical training at Te Aute more forcibly than Habens had earlier, but the Department initially made little headway. In his report for 1902 the Minister of Education complained that difficulties in the way of introducing handwork into the boarding schools had been considerable.

---
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The Department had offered in 1900 to subsidize the erection of a carpentry work-shop at Te Aute, contribute towards the cost of instructing pupils in carpentry and increase the number of government scholars from 10 to 15, if the school would provide no fewer than four hours of practical instruction a week. But Thornton demurred at four hours a week for all his pupils, and the offer hung. In the meantime, St Stephen’s completed its workshop, with the boys doing much of the work of construction under the supervision of an instructor, and it was not long before the school was being commended by the inspectors for its courses in woodwork.\(^{923}\)

Changes were also being made at Hukerere. During an inspection visit in December 1904, Hogben queried the usefulness of teaching the girls Latin, apparently successfully, because Bird subsequently observed that since Latin and other matriculation subjects had been withdrawn from the timetable, ‘English subjects have improved very much, and more time is given to needlework and domestic work of all kinds, and to cooking’\(^ {924}\). But that also meant that the opportunity for any girl to matriculate would be denied.

5.7.4 The Royal Commission on the Te Aute and Wanganui School Trusts.

The issues were brought out in a Royal Commission investigation into the Te Aute and Wanganui School Trusts in 1906.\(^ {925}\) The evidence heard before the Commission is revealing for the insights it gives into the views of the Crown’s leading education officials, including the Inspector-General of Education, George Hogben, and the Inspectors of Native Schools, regarding Maori aptitudes, the Maori future, and, stemming from that, the type of schooling beyond the primary level that was most suitable for Maori.

As well as enquiring into whether the original purposes of the trusts had been carried out, the Commission was asked to consider whether there was sufficient provision for manual and technical instruction, and whether agricultural classes could be established and practical farming taught. Its members included Ngata, now member
for Eastern Maori, and Robert Lee, the experienced Wellington inspector. The witnesses, who provided an illuminating range of contemporary opinion, included Hogben, Buck, Raweti Kohere, Pope, Thornton, and others.

When Hogben gave evidence he was a forceful advocate for ‘radical change’ at Te Aute. He told the Commission that Hukerere had at his suggestion already ceased teaching Latin, and he would also ‘right away drop Latin, Euclid, and Algebra out of the Te Aute curriculum altogether’ (Author’s emphasis).926

The effect of that, if implemented, would have been that as at Hukarere the pupils would have been denied the opportunity to matriculate.

Hogben proposed an alternative weekly curriculum of six hours of English, one hour each of geography, civics, health and arithmetic (including book-keeping) and drill. Instruction in agriculture and woodwork would occupy eight hours and because it was ‘no use trying to do these manual subjects by halves’, both subjects would be compulsory for all boys. He predicted to the Commissioners that when the plans for agriculture and other practical subjects were fully established, Te Aute would have no role to play in preparing boys for matriculation and higher education; such boys, when identified, should be transferred to secondary schools for European boys. (Author’s emphasis).927

The argument that a more practical education would encourage and prepare Maori boys to stay in their own home communities was put forward by Bird. ‘The whole idea of Maori education’ he said, ‘was to fit Maoris for life amongst Maoris’. This led to the following exchange between him and the Chairman, Charles Kettle, a District Judge:

Kettle: Do I understand you do not want to encourage Maori boys to enter into any employment away from their own people?

Bird: Personally I should discourage it
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Kettle: Why?

Bird: Because if you take the best Maoris away from the kaingas and put them into towns, these boys are practically lost to the Maori race. You do not want to train the individual at the expense of the race.928

Linked to this emphasis on the purpose of education being for rural residence, another idea emerged from the evidence presented by Departmental officials; schooling for Maori was not to equip them to compete with Europeans for employment in European society. ‘I understand you are educating Maori boys and girls for the Maori people only, and not to mingle with Europeans and compete with Europeans in trades and commerce?’ Kettle asked Bird, who replied ‘That is my opinion’.929

Bird, the senior Crown official in charge of Native School policy, emphasized a related theme in his official annual report on Maori education in the same year; the most important feature of any higher education for Maori he wrote was manual training, ‘such as would fit them to take their places as members of the Maori community’ (Author’s emphasis).930

This view was reinforced by Pope who presented what he described as a ‘biological’ approach he attributed to Harry Kirk, the Professor of Biology at Victoria University, who had previously been Assistant Inspector of Native Schools for seventeen years:

To systematically take the most promising members of a community and train them in a way that will make it almost incumbent on them to desert that community must…leave it somewhat weaker …should this process of selection be repeated frequently it would amount to a contrivance for securing the survival…of the more unfit…To deprive the Maori settlements of their best members by giving them scholarships and other inducements to forsake their own people for good would be one of the cruelest and most certain means that could be adopted for making the race as such deteriorate and die out.931

---
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Kirk’s own evidence represented an amalgam of the above views. When asked whether the intellectual capabilities of Maori were capable of being highly developed, he replied:

Yes, I think so. When I have said that in my view the Maori should not be made a scholar, it is not because we cannot make a scholar of him. We can: but I think the life he has got to lead will be most useful to his people if we refrain.932

According to Kirk, education for Maori should not give them a distaste for the ‘Kainga life’, or train them to live amongst Europeans, thereby denying their own race their potential as leaders and their mental and moral influence. It was important to train the Maori to ‘use his hands intelligently’, (but) ‘I do not think that should go to the length of making him an artisan’. Some schools (‘not exactly secondary schools’) were necessary for Maori pupils beyond the primary stage, but the instruction they provided for the great majority of pupils must not discourage them from returning to live among the Maori people. What was needed was an ‘increase in the manual work and in everything that will give the Maori the use of his hands’.

Asked by the Chairman whether practical farming should be taught at Te Aute, Kirk replied:

Yes, so long as it is on strictly limited lines. I think that to teach a Maori boy to farm as a boy would be taught at Lincoln College would be a very great mistake, because he would go back to his village to entirely different condition. With respect to industrial training of Maoris, I think we should endeavour to make the Maori a handy-man as far as possible. I know it may be said that it would tend to make him a “jack of all trades and master of none”, but I think that is perhaps what is wanted of the Maori at present. In going back to his own people he has to go back to very primitive conditions, he has to work with simple appliances, and his habits are such that if he had modern appliances they would frequently be neglected. We ought to teach him to use simple tools-to use them effectively, and give him such a general idea of farming that he can apply his knowledge to his own circumstances.933

932 Ibid, pp.100-102.
Another reason put forward for curtailing academic instruction and increasing practical instruction was that it was important for Maori to learn virtues associated with the ‘dignity of labour’ and the character-forming qualities of trade-training. Hogben was a forceful advocate of this view:

As to the supposed objection on the part of some of the Maori people to technical training, on the ground that manual labour is lacking in dignity. I think that one of the things that is a most important part of our education is to make people recognise the dignity of manual labour’. 934

A related argument, stated most explicitly in Bird’s report on Te Aute in the same year that the Commission sat, was that there was something in Maori nature inherently suited to non-academic activities:

The natural genius of the Maori in the direction of manual skills and his natural interest in the concrete would appear to furnish the earliest key to the development of his intelligence. 935

Another criticism, directed in this instance at Te Aute, but also made in relation to secondary education generally, was that while all the students studied for matriculation only a small percentage passed the examination. When Thornton gave evidence Bird asked him:

Is it fair that 95 out of 100 Maori youths …should be kept for a year or two learning Euclid, Algebra, Latin and other branches of education that will be of no use whatever to them after they leave school in order that five may receive a superior education in their company? 936

Attached as an Exhibit to the Commission’s proceedings was a quite extensive report by Pope on ‘Secondary Education for Maoris’. In this he re-stated a view he had first put forward in 1902, which was that, ‘Now and then a real Maori genius turns up’, and when this occurred ‘no pains should be spared to provide the genius with a sound education and the opportunity to ‘do good to his own people as a doctor, lawyer, or teacher of some kind’. But with this exception, ‘no young Maoris should stay away

934 Ibid. p.84.
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from their people more than a couple or so years at a time, or long enough to get out of touch with them, and so be able to re-establish or maintain thoroughly friendly relations with them. 937

Thornton and Williams mounted a vigorous defence of the existing curriculum, which they justifiably saw as being under attack. Thornton described his philosophy to the Commission, which had led him to introduce the matriculation examination so Maori boys would not be shut out from competing with European boys in the matter of higher education, because they would need their own doctors, lawyers and clergymen.938 Williams told the Commission that ‘the English, with all the assistance they got, ought to show a generous spirit and allow the Maoris to have a school for higher education’.939

Thornton responded to a suggestion by Hogben that the most academically able boys should be sent to other schools by stating that Maori boys needed to be kept together because they required a particular style of teaching; it was necessary to know the Maori mind, and it was unlikely that the kind of special attention needed would be available to Maori boys in a grammar school.940 Moreover attempting to ‘graft trade-learning onto scholastic training’ would overload already hard-worked boys; he was not opposed to the idea itself, but it should be carried out in separate industrial institutions. Similarly, having an agricultural college such as Lincoln College was desirable, but ‘it would be a pity to try and graft it onto this institution’.941

When Commissioner Hogg asked Thornton if he thought the higher education the boys were receiving in any way unsuited them for taking up industrial work, or led them to consider it a ‘degradation’ to work hard at any employment they may be offered, he replied ‘not at all’. Many Te Aute graduates were working on their tribal lands, he told Hogg, and although not many had gone into trades, this was not because they thought them degrading. More should enter trades such as blacksmithing, carpentry, and saddlery, but not many had taken to the idea. Ibid. To answer the

937 Ibid, p.228.
938 Ibid, p.32.
939 Ibid, p.22.
940 Ibid, pp.32-43.
941 Ibid;
criticism that all the boys took academic courses leading to matriculation but only a small percentage passed, Thornton drew an analogy with Oxford; hundreds of students went up to the university every year, but only one was a double first, yet, ‘you would not say Oxford was a failure because it does not turn out 100 double firsts’. When Williams was asked by Hogg whether he thought educating the Maori boys so well would interfere with them ‘doing useful work afterwards’, he replied; ‘Not in the least…it is the same for most of our race. The educated European will do better work than the uneducated one and it is the same with the Maoris’; the College encouraged boys to enter farming and it was the well-educated boys who were much more likely to follow this encouragement.

Thornton, Williams, Hogben and Bird all claimed that their views regarding Te Aute were also those of Maori parents. Thornton and Williams said the academic instruction it provided was what Maori parents wanted; agricultural instruction would be against their wishes because their attitude was, ‘we can teach them this (agriculture) ourselves. We send them to you not to be taught what they can learn at home, but to teach them what they cannot get at home’.

By contrast, Hogben had claimed in his annual report for 1906, the same year in which the Commission sat, that Maori parents had ‘a keen desire’ for manual and technical subjects of a kind likely to be most useful to the young Maori. He claimed evidence of this could be seen in their support for building workshops attached to the primary schools, and the Department was beginning to find that when boys and girls could obtain a practical training at home ‘their parents did not wish them to attend a secondary school’.

Bird reinforced the idea of Maori enthusiasm for the Department’s proposals, claiming that the Maori boys at Te Aute favoured the introduction of technical
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education as much as he did.\textsuperscript{946} He said he knew nearly all the Maori in the main areas of Maori population and there had:

begun a desire on the part of the parents for manual and technical instruction...If, as it has been said, a Maori rangatira comes to a secondary school and finds his child engaged in digging, I think he has a right to object. If you, Mr Chairman, went to a school and found your child engaged in scrubbing the floor, would you not object? But if, on the other hand, you were told that this was part of an organised scheme of instruction in domestic economy and that the instruction was not just menial work, but organised directly towards a definite end...I think you and most parents would say “That is all right, that is what I want my child to learn”.\textsuperscript{947}

Maori who appeared as witnesses demonstrated a range of views. Some Te Aute old boys such as Peter Buck and Raweti Kohere were well aware that denying Te Aute students an opportunity to prepare for the matriculation examination would also deny them access to the universities and professions. Giving evidence on behalf of the Wanganui Branch of the TACSA, Buck said it would be ‘loathe to see any lowering of the present intellectual standard...(and) very loathe indeed to see the matriculation class done away with. We should like to see it present’.\textsuperscript{948} Kohere told the Commission that as a school where the best Maori intellects could be developed, Te Aute should never be done away with, the most promising boys should go there, and ‘be sent to the university’.\textsuperscript{949}

These men obviously regarded as extreme the views of officials wanting to reduce, if not eliminate, the advanced academic subjects and strongly opposed them. But this did not mean that they were opposed altogether to the introduction of some practical instruction in, for example, agriculture. Indeed they favoured it, because they saw its potential for teaching the skills necessary to assist with the working of remaining Maori land. Buck told the Commission that the Wanganui Branch of the TACSA had also agreed unanimously that ‘greater prominence should be given technical education and agriculture’ in the Te Aute curriculum, because of the large areas of suitable agricultural and pastoral land still under Maori ownership. Buck said his own
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view was that at the fourth standard a division should be made; boys suited for academic education should enter the matriculation class, whereas those more suited for agriculture or manual labour should go into those classes. Kohere agreed, a department teaching ‘high class farming’ should be added to the existing academic ones.

Several other Maori called as witnesses also spoke in favour of an increase in the practical instruction at Te Aute. Paratene Ngata, Apirana Ngata’s father and an assessor at the Native Land Court, expressed the view that his people wanted an ‘industrial school’ to be established, either at Waiapu, Waerenga-a-hika or Te Aute, to teach ‘agriculture, poultry-farming, dairy-farming, pig-raising, horticulture and all classes of farm-work’. Paraire Tomoana, a farmer at Hastings and Te Aute old boy maintained that after leaving he had always maintained that teaching technical education and trades at the school would be the best means of advancing the interests of the Maori people as a whole, and these were aspects he now requested should be taught.

However William’s prediction at the conclusion of the Commission’s sitting that an attempt would be made to ‘convert the school into a farming establishment’ was to have more than a grain of truth in it. The Commission’s first recommendation, that Te Aute and sister school Hukarere be maintained as secondary schools for Maori, although not necessarily exclusive of European pupils, was followed by the second and third that:

(2) Having regard to the circumstances of the Maoris, as owners of considerable areas of suitable agricultural and pastoral land, it is necessary to give prominence in the curriculum to manual and technical instruction in agriculture, and (3) if for financial reasons it becomes necessary to choose between a course including Latin, geometry, and algebra in the higher forms, and scientific and technical subjects, preference be given to the latter.
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Ngata himself gained considerable satisfaction from sitting on a commission to enquire into his old school, and ‘no one knew better than he the importance of Te Aute as a training ground for Maori leaders’. He had had been a regular visitor to the school after leaving, maintaining a close interest in its activities and the progress of the pupils, and was in demand as a speaker at school assemblies. Walker describes him as the school’s ‘friend at court’ as a commission member, and it was ‘a distasteful experience to have his mentors Williams and Thornton …interrogated on their stewardship of the school’.

His enthusiasm for the development of the remaining Maori land at the time appears likely to have led to him supporting this recommendation. In the same year that the Commission sat, speaking in Parliament in his capacity as member for Eastern Maori, he told the Minister that he had a splendid opportunity of asking for endowments from Maori for education; he himself had asked the Ureweras to set aside 1 per cent of their 656,000 acres to endow an agricultural training college for Maori. Reminding the Minister that he had promised to visit the ‘backblocks’, Ngata said he hoped he would ask Maori tribes everywhere to either set apart land or a portion of their revenue from it ‘to assist the Government in the technical education of the Maoris. Liberal provision had already been made for secondary education, but for technical and agricultural education, further endowments should be made, and this was the time to do it’.

Ngata’s enthusiasm for the development of the remaining Maori land was also evident in 1907 when he was a member of a two man Commission which produced a report on *Native Lands and Native Land Tenure*. One of its recommendations was that ‘the primary education of the Maori should have what may be termed an agricultural bias’ and a more practical bias should also be encouraged in the secondary schools for Maori where ‘an ordinary grammar-course not adapted to the needs of the Maori people’ was maintained.

---
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But it needs to recalled that earlier, in 1897, Ngata had strongly advocated education for Maori which would enable them to enter the full range of available occupations, including the professions, and it was a view he was to consistently maintain and advocate throughout his career.

However reinforced by the Commission’s findings Departmental officials renewed their assault on the Te Aute curriculum with even more vigour. An inspection report in 1909 noted that while a matriculation class was still being maintained, a new class in practical agriculture that had been introduced had grown all the vegetables the college required. The inspector viewed the positive effects as twofold: the boys were receiving useful practical training and the Trustees were spared the expense of employing a gardener. However the Department wanted to see the work expanded to include ‘training in agricultural science suited to the peculiar requirements of Maori boys’.  

The following year agriculture was reported as now being included as a subject in the syllabus of instruction; a large vegetable garden had been cultivated, and over two acres planted in potatoes had produced a crop sufficient to supply the College’s needs and ‘a ton of potatoes’ for the girls at Hukerere as well. Woodwork classes were also successfully established, the boys making the furniture for the new school at Hukerere that had been rebuilt after a fire in 1910.  

Thornton’s vision for the College remained much different from that of the Department’s officials and he resisted the pressure for change. An example of this was an acrimonious debate between him and Bird over a boy Bird said he would have liked to have recommended for Te Aute but ‘His talents lie of course in the direction of manual labour and agricultural work rather than in literary pursuits and of course, there Te Aute has nothing to offer him.’  

---
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Thornton resigned due to ill health in 1912 and his successor, the Rev. J. A. McNickle proved according to one writer ‘quite amenable to further developing technical and agricultural instruction’ as the Department wished.965

Practical activity was already well established at Hukerere, as was pointed out earlier. And it was also now increased at St Stephen’s where woodwork became a speciality and was described in the Department’s annual report for 1911 as an endeavour ‘to direct the mind of boys towards industrial pursuits’.966 Elementary agriculture was also taught, although the limited extent of the school’s grounds placed restrictions on what could be done.

Nevertheless Bird’s reports increasingly expressed his satisfaction with developments in the boarding schools. By 1906 six University scholarships were being offered, of the kind that had assisted men like Ngata and Buck to proceed to University. But in his 1909 report to the Minister Bird pointed out that the Department had ‘decided that the scheme should remain in abeyance’. He acknowledged that nobody would deny that the Maori boy should have access ‘to the highest degree of education for which it was possible for him to attain,’ but few would assert that such education was necessary or even desirable for everyone and, ‘in our opinion, Maori boys and girls would be better occupied in learning something of the dignity of labour’ (Author’s emphasis).967

Education for the Maori as for the European should be to fit him for his work in life and it would be:

Of greater service for them to know the principles and practice of agriculture, the elements of dairy farming, wool classing, and the management of stock, than the declension of Latin nouns and verbs.968

The aim of officials within the Education Department continued to be to channel the educational and occupational future of the great majority of Maori students towards
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practical subjects. This was significantly reinforced in the eligibility requirements for the scholarships available for selected pupils from Native primary schools to proceed to a denominational college. The 1909 revision of the Regulations Relating to Native Schools gave emphasis to the more practical type of syllabus now required. These included two new developments: the Maori language, so rigidly excluded from the primary schools, could now be studied as an optional subject in the syllabus for boys only, and senior scholarships, allowing for further study beyond the initial two years, were now restricted to industrial scholarships or apprenticeships, available only to boys who wished to be apprenticed to a trade or related practical activity.

The programme was to be arranged so that the best qualified scholarship holders could reach the standard indicated by the Public Service Examination. In woodwork, ‘any suitable course’ would be accepted as long as it was directed to the end of giving the pupils a knowledge of principles and practice ‘as will be of use to them as Maoris’.  

The Minister of Education’s report for 1920 re-stated that the purpose of the scholarships, the ‘great majority’ of which were held by former pupils of Native schools, was ‘to secure such industrial training as is considered desirable in the case of Maoris; the boys learn agriculture and woodwork, and the girls take a domestic course’.  

By 1913 Bird reported that all the boarding schools were making provision for practical vocational training in some form or other, and a number of boys had succeeded in passing the Civil Service Junior Examination, subsequently gaining cadetships in a branch of Government. However the ‘number of suitable openings in the Public Service for the most promising Maori boys is comparatively limited, and we should much prefer to see them choosing other occupations than that of clerks’. Moreover:

In none of the secondary Maori schools at the present time is there any attempt or desire to give what is usually understood by a “college”

---
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education. Generally speaking, the girls schools afford further training in English subjects and in various branches of domestic duties – cooking, sewing and dressmaking, housewifery, nursing and hygiene; the boys schools in English and manual training – woodwork, elementary practical agriculture and kindred subjects and that is all. 971

Two years later these comments were repeated with the added emphasis that:

So far as the Department is concerned, there is no encouragement given to boys who wish to enter the learned professions.972

The education of Maori girls was primarily directed towards making them what the officials regarded as good mothers and housewives in European terms. In the girls’ colleges Domestic subjects consequently formed an important part of the curriculum and in 1915 Bird observed that:

Greater provision is made for these subjects in some of the schools than in others; and we should like to see even more time devoted to these important branches, especially in the case of girls who have already a certificate of proficiency or competency, beyond which there is, in our opinion, no need for them to go (Author’s emphasis).973

Departmental officials were not alone in advocating a limited and narrow focus for Maori education at this time. In 1907 Waerenga-a-Hika, the Maori boarding school near Gisborne, introduced a secondary school curriculum that was recognized by the Department. Five scholarships were provided for the school on the assumption that it would offer training in agriculture and woodwork, but satisfactory woodwork instructors proved hard to find. In 1910 the Principal, M. V. Butterfield, told the 14th Conference of the Te Aute College Students Association that Maori were generally ‘not fitted to the various professions’. Approximately ‘999 out of 1000’ could not:

bear the strain of higher education. In commerce, the Maori could not hope to compete with the pakeha. In trades, the Maoris were splendid copyists, but not originators. As carpenters they could cope under a capable instructor but not otherwise. Agriculture was the one calling suitable for Maoris, the only difficulty here being the natural aversion
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of boys to work on the soil. It was therefore necessary to teach them the “nobility of labour”.\textsuperscript{974}

The Principal advised Porteous in 1914 that some parents were unhappy about the boys doing ‘all the digging and general cultivation required to supply fodder for the cattle, vegetables and fruit’.\textsuperscript{975} As a result the school reverted to a primarily academic curriculum which meant pupils were disqualified from receiving government scholarships, drawing the response from the Acting Director of Education, W. J. Anderson, that industrial training was more ‘suited to the Maori genius’ and the school should not be aiming at attaining the matriculation standard.\textsuperscript{976}

The Native School Teachers’ Association passed a resolution at their 1920 Annual Conference calling for the Department to provide vocational training for Maori. It was forwarded to the Director of Education by the Secretary, Henry Vine, accompanied by a letter suggesting that the time was quickly approaching when the Department should have total control of all secondary schools which Maori scholarship pupils from the primary schools were sent to and:

\begin{quote}
The teachers were of the opinion that after leaving the village school the pupils should, as far as possible, be drafted into vocational schools or schools where their training, apart from English language should be mainly technical, where boys should be taught mainly in connection with their lands, and the girls should be made capable housewives.\textsuperscript{977}
\end{quote}

While Bird’s reports on Te Aute after 1906 had been generally optimistic about new directions, later reports reflected a more realistic and, from the Department’s perspective, depressing picture of the progress being made. The difficulty for the Department was that practical courses of the kind they favoured proved no more popular with Maori parents than they had with Pakeha. John Porteous, now Senior Inspector of Native schools, reported it as a matter for regret in 1925 that a large number of boys at Te Aute did not take the agriculture course, which was likely to be
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of more benefit to the majority of them, and that ‘the tendency to prefer the more academic type of education is to be deplored’. 978

In 1923 the Te Aute Board’s Secretary sought the Department’s view regarding the steps necessary for it to gain formal registration as a secondary school. The Director of Education, J.Caughley, was not encouraging. Te Aute would again need to provide courses up to matriculation standard and staffing and equipment levels equal to those in state secondary schools. But he added that that might not be in the best interests of the government scholars:

If the College should be led…to follow the curriculum and the ideals of the more academic high schools and to neglect the more practical and vocational courses followed at present then …registration may be considered as “detrimental” to the College. 979

The Te Aute Headmaster, E. Loten, was warned that if courses were provided for scholarship holders that the Department regarded as unsuitable government payments for them might cease. 980

In 1925 Caughley wrote to the trustees reminding them that following Loten’s appointment it had been anticipated that the curriculum would show a ‘distinct bias in favour of agriculture and kindred subjects’. But only 13 students had enrolled in the agricultural course for the year, as against 33 prospective matriculation students. The Department’s view was that it would be more desirable if the numbers were reversed, Loten was requested to ‘firmly repress the Maori lads preference for the academic course’, and advised that only in exceptional cases would Government scholars be permitted to take Latin, a subject that remained necessary for matriculation.(Author emphasis) 981

Part of the problem for the Department lay in the number of private students at the college during these years, which limited the amount of influence it could exercise.
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But the greatest impediment appears to have been the continued lack of appeal of the agricultural course. As Loten remarked to the Minister of Education, ‘a Maori parent is exactly the same as a European…when I suggest an agricultural course they want their boy to take matriculation’.  

But Loten and the Board continued to maintain an academic course at Te Aute, despite official disapproval, while simultaneously further developing agricultural instruction. Loten’s description of the 4th Form agriculture class at work on the school farm in 1929 gave an idea of what the latter involved:

The boy’s work and look after the team, plough, cultivate, sow and harvest such crops as are grown on the farm. They do the haymaking and build the stacks. We supply ourselves with meat - the boys do the killing and the dressing of the sheep and cattle. They plant, cultivate and harvest the potatoes. The boys also do the milking and separating…each boy in the Agricultural form spends ten hours on the farm per week out of school time.

A Native School Inspector, G. M. Henderson, reported in 1927 that most pupils in Form 6 were sitting for matriculation; they were ‘a good class and should do well in the examination’. He described the agriculture class, (‘Form 4 Remove,’) as having done well in written tests in composition, agriculture and arithmetic, and an oral one in dairy farming and literature, particularly since half of their time was devoted to practical work on the farm and in the laboratory. Henderson’s comments reflected the Department’s views, and also the link the inspectors often made between practical work and the formation of superior character traits:

This class is the one that is doing the most useful work for Maori boys, as it is work that will be of direct use to them in their after life. The experience of the Head teacher also shows that the type of boy produced by this course is stronger in force of character and common sense than those who have been through the literary course.

---
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The following year Henderson described the agricultural form with 24 boys enrolled as ‘the largest and most important form in the school’. Statistics collected by the Headmaster suggested that the majority of boys entered farming when they left, and his teaching of the form was regarded by Henderson as a matter for satisfaction because it was ‘proper that this branch of the school should receive the most skilled attention’.986

However a newcomer to the Native School inspectorate, D.G. G.Ball, was much less impressed with this course in 1929, reporting that:

Too little experiment has been introduced with the outside work. The boys…work more at the level of farm hands than of students…There has been no recording of work done by the boys in note books…Furthermore, the inside work is not correlated, more than superficially, to the outside work.987

After World War Two most of the denominational boarding schools made solid academic progress. But a stereotyped view of Maori and their abilities still lingered in some quarters. Hato Paora College was established in the Hawke’s Bay in 1946 as an alternative for Catholic boys to Te Aute and St. Stephen’s. That academic progress at it was somewhat slower after 1946 than with the other colleges was not surprising, given the limited expectations held by the Headmaster, Fr. Chris Duggan, who stated in 1949 that:

Our curriculum is organised with the special needs of Maori boys in view. Not many are likely to achieve even the limited distinction of School Certificate, and to force all along the restricted path that leads to it would be nothing but an intolerable drudgery for teachers and pupils alike. We have found it necessary to keep a finger on the pulse of the Maori boy and adjust the curriculum accordingly.988

A strong emphasis was therefore placed on the manual training course which in 1949 was very reminiscent of the practical activities associated with the home-building
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activities characteristic of the Maori District High Schools during the 1940s.\textsuperscript{989}

Agricultural education was developed under a farm manager, despite many parents feeling that this could be achieved just as well at home, and expressing a preference for academic courses.

However academic subjects were not entirely neglected, although the beginning was hardly auspicious. The three students who sat School Certificate in 1951, and the five in 1952, all failed. By 1952, all the Fifth Form students studied English, Chemistry, Woodwork and Maori, although students who were possible candidates for School Certificate also included Latin.\textsuperscript{990}

The College received its first visit from Departmental Inspectors in March 1952 and they expressed general satisfaction with the teaching and the subjects offered. But it was not until 1954 that the first two Hato Paora students passed School Certificate, and in 1960 the first student University Entrance.\textsuperscript{991}

In 1967 the College began to focus entirely on preparing students for School Certificate, with the result that the Agricultural courses were phased-out. In that year, ten pupils passed School Certificate and two the University Entrance Examination.

A report by State secondary school inspectors on these results must be regarded as extremely ominous if it reflected their general view with regard to Maori students at secondary school. This is particularly so given that it is now 1967. It shows that the former official tendency to hold lower expectations for Maori students than for Pakeha students, including a rather fixed view of what type of education and occupation was desirable for Maori students, was by no means dead:

Gratifying as these examination results are, it must be realised that few pupils will go on to university study and that prime consideration must be given to the great bulk of the pupils who will be entering a world of competitive employment. …The principal recommendation of this report will be that the controlling authorities of the school institute a

\textsuperscript{989} Ibid, pp.46 and 51.
\textsuperscript{990} Ibid, p.48.
\textsuperscript{991} Ibid, p.51.
technical course which will prepare pupils for the Maori Apprenticeship Training Scheme.\textsuperscript{992}

This suggests that in the minds of these Crown officials, the former idea of agricultural education for a rural, agricultural-related future for the majority of Maori students, had been replaced by the idea of practical education for a future in technical employment and trades.

5.8 State Secondary Schools

The belief amongst officials that Maori were somehow peculiarly suited to practical study was not limited to the Maori District High Schools, the Maori primary schools, or the Maori denominational boarding schools.

In its submission to the Royal Commission on Education in 1960 the Department of Education pointed out that the proportion of Maori taking practical courses in secondary schools was high and that taking academic courses low. ‘The question arises’, it commented, ‘whether this situation is as it should be. Evidence showed no inferiority of intellect’.\textsuperscript{993}

But ominously the attitudes some teachers still held towards Maori students was raised by the Department as one possible reason for this. It pointed out that:

\begin{quote}
There are still many teachers who doubt the ability of a Maori to take mathematics or history. Part of the problem seems to be in the mind of the teachers themselves when it is suggested that “Maoris thrive on practical courses” and “Maori pupils prefer not to enter academic forms”.\textsuperscript{994}
\end{quote}

As the example of Hato Paora College above showed it was an attitude which still also existed in the minds of at least some of the Department’s own secondary school inspectors seven years \textit{after it made this submission} (Author’s emphasis).

\textsuperscript{992} Inspection Report, in Lawton, p.89.
\textsuperscript{993} Submission by the New Zealand Education Department to the Commission on Education 1960-61.
\textsuperscript{994} Ibid;
The legacy of not providing opportunities for many Maori children to proceed to a secondary school prior to 1940, and the limited nature of the curriculum of the Maori District High Schools from 1941, was long-lasting. In 1964 out of 3,878 Maori children who left school, 7.6 per cent had School Certificate or better compared with 39.1 per cent of Pakeha.\textsuperscript{995}

The official report from which these figures come concluded that ‘Because of the pre-war situation where most pupils received only primary education, many Maori parents have a relatively low educational attainment and therefore can offer little help or guidance to their children particularly in the matter of homework’ (Author’s emphasis).\textsuperscript{996}

5.9 East Coast Examples

5.9.1 Gisborne Boys’ High School

The following example, from 1964, illustrates the persistence of a mind-set within a mainstream East Coast state secondary school of low expectations regarding Maori boys that they were suited for and would be enrolled in Industrial rather than Professional Forms. One sees here the danger when stereotypes of a particular group define a situation as real, it become a self-fulfilling prophecy, and becomes real in its consequences. What also stands out is the absence of any attempt within the institution to question or change the situation.

In 1964 the Principal of the Gisborne Boys’ High School wrote to the Chairman of the Gisborne High Schools’ Board, complaining that his school was being disadvantaged, with implications for its possibilities of developing strong sixth forms, partly because of a public perception that newer schools such as Lytton College were superior, and also because of an enrolment policy adopted by the Board based on ‘who gets up first

\textsuperscript{996} Ibid, pp.104-105.
in the morning’. Under a heading ‘Maois’, the Principal suggested that because of the enrolment system adopted:

the Maoris, who tend to hold back on enrolling day, find that the only schools left to them are Boys and Girls High School, and they are, in effect, zoned into these. This has resulted in a Maori proportion of 1:4 in Boys High as against 1:11 for Lytton. This preponderance of Maoris accentuates the difficulties already mentioned. Most of them take the Industrial Course, few are capable of the full Professional Course, fewer still manage to reach the Sixth Form. Despite the high proportion of Maoris in the School there are none in the Sixth Form this year. Third form enrolments in the last two years have been 28% Maori. This will tend to increase the Maori proportion in the School, as these classes work through.

We live in a multi-racial community and one of our duties as educators is to teach our pupils to live in the kind of community they will find when they leave school. We are unable to do this, as more than a fair proportion of Maori pupils are forced on us while Lytton is taking less than its share. Because Maori boys do not normally perform as well in school as their Pakeha contemporaries they tend to be in the lower forms. Some of these have a proportion as high as two thirds Maori with consequent problems of teaching and discipline. One of the Post-Primary Inspectors made the comment ‘Alabama’. There is a real danger of virtual racial segregation developing in the schools with Boys and Girls High being known as the Maori Schools and Pakeha parents taking positive action to avoid them.

The Principal added that the situation would affect well qualified teachers at the school:

who do not mind taking slow learner classes provide they get some good classes to extend them, but they will not be satisfied if all their work is with the poor classes. It is like asking a Queen’s Counsel to spend the rest of his days taking Remand Yard Cases.

While he attempted to consult the parents of all new parents prior to enrolment, ‘for various cultural reasons a majority do not make themselves available’, and he then adds that ‘Each year the test results reveal an intake in which slower groups

997 Principal, Gisborne Boys’ High, to Chairman, 29 July 1964. ABFI W3556/95. ANZ-W. DB.
998 Ibid;
predominate. Approximately half of this year’s beginners are either retarded in their attainments or of low IQ’.

5.9.2 Gisborne Girls’ High School

In 1972 the Principal of the School presented a paper giving ‘An outline of activities for slow learner’s classes.’ She pointed out that ‘Many of the pupils in these classes come from homes of low socio-economic level and the majority are of Maori descent’. In describing what she thought would be a suitable course of instruction for the pupils she acknowledged that ‘Too often in the past these classes have been excluded from the library or from cultural activities in the school because it was thought they could not appreciate these things’.

5.10 Trades and apprenticeships

5.10.1 Introduction

As had already been demonstrated in several sections of this report, Crown officials sometimes raised the possibility of Maori school leavers entering a trade as part of their enthusiasm for Maori undertaking practical education and occupations. So did the Maori leader Apirana Ngata, although a significant difference here was that he saw trade training as just one of many options that should be open to Maori amongst the full range of occupations including the professions.

The authorities at St. Stephen’s had early on tried the experiment of apprenticing some boys to trades. And James Pope, drawing on the writings on Indian education by the United States Bureau of Education in his I884 report was enthusiastic about extending the scheme in the belief that there should be:

999 Ibid;
some sort of arrangement under which all boys that have finished their school education should have an opportunity of learning a trade . . . All that it would be necessary to do would be to make it a rule that every boy who had gone through the village school course should, if his parents wished it, be apprenticed by the Government to some trade, but giving him the option of first going to St4 Stephen’s or Te Aute’.1001

He was also considering the possibility that apprenticing boys directly from the Native primary schools to trades might be of more use than them spending two years at a boarding school.1002

However most efforts to get Maori boys apprenticed to trades were initially quite unsuccessful, although Pope remained optimistic that the St Stephen’s experiment might produce better results, and the industrial scholarship evolved as part of official policy. In 1886 he reported that Government scholars at St. Stephen’s were being given the opportunity of attending a smith’s forge and being taught the nature of the different operations of ‘firing, blowing, shaping, welding and shoeing’, and then putting what they had learnt into practice’.1003

At Te Aute senior pupils were learning the elementary operations of carpentry, and work of these two kinds seemed to Pope that ‘most suitable and useful for young Maoris’ next to farming and seafaring.1004

In 1894 there were six boys serving apprenticeships, one each with a blacksmith and carpenter, two each with printers and saddlers – all in Opotiki. Two years later, the number of apprentices reached 14, but thereafter it declined. In 1897 Pope explained further that ‘In suitable cases boys entitled to scholarships may, if satisfactory arrangements can be made, be apprenticed to learn European farming, or some mechanical trade, instead of being sent to a higher school’.1005

1002 AJHR, 1883, E-2, p.11.
1003 AJHR, 1886, E-2, p.10.
1004 Ibid; Native School Code, 1897, p.9.
At the end of 1900 four former Native school pupils were holding industrial scholarships, in Auckland one saddler and one coachbuilder, in the Bay of Islands one saddler, and in Opotiki one printer.1006

The following year an additional three more were training; a saddler and blacksmith at Opotiki and a blacksmith at Lyttleton, to make a total of seven. In 1904 Pope acknowledged that the result had not been as encouraging as the Department wished. Apart from the problem of finding suitable teachers, and difficulties in binding a boy for four or five years because, ‘He may set his heart on being a carpenter today and prefer to go maize-picking tomorrow’. According to Pope things did not always go smoothly either when, with his training in a Pakeha environment completed, a young man returned to the kainga. He described one successful apprentice who after training as a saddler:

got together some stock and returned to set up for himself in business in the kainga. The Maoris of the place, however, could not believe that he would charge a Maori for work done; they simply carded out their communistic ideas to their full extent, and the result was that the saddler soon found that his stock was exhausted, while he had not received any payment. Today, I regret to say, he is practicing as “apostle” to a faith healer.1007

In the revised Regulations Relating to Native Schools 1909 the conditions for apprenticeships were altered and a separate scholarship for agriculture was introduced. These became senior scholarships which could be awarded to any Maori boy who had obtained a certificate of proficiency and had received not less than one year’s training in some branch of technical work. The scholarships were for two to three years, and the agricultural scholarship was to be taken either in the service of a farmer or at a farm under the control of the Agricultural Department. The first agricultural scholarship was awarded towards the end of 1910, to a boy who became apprenticed to a Waiapu sheep-farmer. In addition, there were eight other boys

1006 AJHR, 1901, E-3, p.13.
holding senior or industrial scholarships in that year – two blacksmiths, two saddlers, 
two builders, and two boys at the Government railway workshops in Auckland.¹⁰⁰⁸

However towards the end of the 1920s the apprenticeship scheme was virtually in 
abeyance. In 1926 only two boys were apprenticed, one in joinery and cabinet-
making, and the other in engineering. There were no Maori boys holding 
apprenticeships at the end of both 1928 and 1929, because according to Bird reported 
‘The altered economic conditions do not now give Maori boys much opportunity of 
learning trades’.¹⁰⁰⁹

The response to the agricultural scholarships was described as equally disappointing 
by the Department. During the war-years applications for these as well as the other 
apprenticeships had fallen off almost entirely, and after the war the demand continued 
to be negligible, this being attributed to boys finding they could earn better wages in 
employment after holding junior scholarships. In 1922 the Minister of Education was 
advised that owing to the difficulty of placing boys on suitable farms, or in finding 
places for them on government experimental farms, the agricultural scholarship 
scheme had not proved a success. It was therefore proposed to widen the provisions to 
enable scholarships to be taken up at a school or college established for the secondary 
education of Maori boys, such as Te Aute.¹⁰¹⁰

5.10.2 Nursing Training

In 1898 the Department had also introduced two nursing scholarships enabling one 
girl from Hukarere and one from St. Joseph’s who had passed their second year’s 
examination to attend Napier Hospital for one year as day-pupil trainees. Four years 
later the tenure of the scholarships was extended to two years, or three if this was 
considered desirable by the hospital authorities. In 1906 there were six nursing 
probationers on scholarships, three being day-pupils at St. Joseph’s, Hukarere and

¹⁰⁰⁸ See also the Regulations Relating to Native Schools in the Education Act 1914 for senior industrial 
scholarships or apprentices, pp.43-44.  
¹⁰⁰⁹ AJHR, 1930, E-3, p.15.  
¹⁰¹⁰ Director of Education to Minister, 10 March 1922. EW 102/39/24, Box 43, Regulations Native 
Schools, ANZ-W.
Queen Victoria and three in training at Rawene, Napier and Wellington hospitals. But in 1920 only three scholarships were held, in 1927 none, and one only in 1928 and 1930.¹⁰¹¹

David Dow describes many hospital authorities as approving of the scheme in principle but feeling ambiguous about and declining to participate in practice. In an example which he says was typical the Matron and Resident Surgeon of Thames Hospital in 1906 preferred not to allocate training places to Maori when Pakeha girls were waiting. Both agreed there should be a hospital in the King Country or ‘somewhere’ for their training but ‘Let them get a hospital of their own’.¹⁰¹²

Inspector Bird himself complained of this attitude; on the one hand the need for training Maori girls as nurses was universally recognized but on the other difficulties were encountered at every step when an effort was made to arrange for their training. Foremost among the difficulties were:

> The hospital authorities-with one or two notable exceptions, of which the Napier Hospital Trustees are the most prominent-find many objections, and some of them even in districts with a fairly large Maori population decline to give any support whatever the project.¹⁰¹³

### 5.10.3 Trade Training From the 1930s

In 1939 Ngata made a case strongly for more advanced technical education for Maori in a lengthy letter to the Minister of Education, Peter Fraser. To support it he emphasized the ability of the Maori as a ‘born mechanic’, and suggested that the obvious gap that existed for Maori in this area might be filled by a system of apprenticeships, or provision of facilities to attend existing technical schools, but the creation of a special technical school most appealed to him. This needed to be near an industrial centre, but also central to the Maori population within the area covered by

---

¹⁰¹¹ See Annual Reports of the Department of Education E-2 and E-3.
¹⁰¹³ AJHR, 1911, E-3, p.11.
the Native primary and denominational boarding schools. However nothing came of the proposal.1014

In 1940, Ball suggested that in addition to the plans to develop Native district high schools arrangements might be made to enable young Maori to attend technical schools in the cities, and that a system of apprenticeships for Maori boys should be revived. But little appears to have resulted from these suggestions either.1015

A pilot scheme to give able Native School graduates the opportunity to train for trades which various churches were involved in operated ‘on and off ‘from 1944, and Berwick suggests this was a forerunner of the later Maori Affairs department’s trade training scheme with boys being brought to town, living in hostels and having apprenticeships found for them, but she provides no further detail of this.1016

Even for the first few years after 1945 little progress appears to have been made. The Education Department’s 1949 annual report noted that a big gap still existed between school and employment for Maori boys in particular, and while opportunities for practical handicrafts such as woodwork had increased at the school level, this had not carried over into entry to skilled trades.1017

However closer liaison now began between the Education, Maori Affairs and Labour and Employment Departments to encourage more young Maori to enter occupations. One outcome of this was the establishment of hostels in Wellington and Auckland by the Department of Labour for Maori training as apprentices. Parsonage advised the Director of Education in 1952 that the full quota of 29 Maori apprentices had been achieved for the new Auckland hostel, with tribal committees taking an interest in the initiative.1018

In 1953 he reported that considerable success had been achieved in attempts to encourage more Maori boys to take up various trades, with approximately 200 now

1014 A. T. Ngata to Minister of Education, 10 February 1939. E2 1945/9b. ANZ-W. DB.
1015 Ball in Sutherland, 1940, p.303.
1016 Patricia Berwick, Impact of the Maori Affairs Trade Training Scheme, Palmerston North, 1955.
1017 AJHR, 1949, E-3, p.7.
1018 Brief review of Maori Education 1949-56. E2 1956/4b, ANZ-W.
apprenticed. But concern continued to be expressed at the lack of training opportunities for young people in some areas, such as the East Coast. (Author emphasis)\textsuperscript{1019}

A carpentry trade-training scheme for Maori youth was introduced at Seddon Memorial technical College in 1959, in association with the Maori Affairs Department, and was soon extended to other technical colleges. The first of its kind in New Zealand, the so called ‘sandwich courses’ involved periods of theory alternated with workshop tuition at a college, and work on the Department’s house construction programme as well as vacation employment with private building firms.\textsuperscript{1020}

Some policy makers persisted in the view that most Maori were ideally suited to technical training and trades, and for them this replaced the former idea that most Maori were suited to a practical type of education for a life in rural areas. In 1960 the Hunn Report advocated strongly for trade training for Maori, including raising the possibility of a new training school at Gisborne, and suggesting that ‘a sound preparation for Maori life for the majority is the learning of a skilled trade’. But Hunn acknowledged that there was still a long way to go to achieve that end. He reported that there were currently 433 Maori apprentices plus possibly ‘another 200 with European names’ which, when combined, represented 3.5 per cent of all apprentices, whereas as a proportion of the 15-20 age-group there should be 9.25 per cent or 1,730.\textsuperscript{1021}

Suggestions that many more Maori should enter skilled trades continued into the Sixties. A 1967 Department of Industries and Commerce report, \textit{The Maori in the New Zealand Economy}, described the arrival of about 80 per cent of Maori school leavers on the labour market with only two years of secondary education as ‘wasteful’, a waste it described as ‘particularly apparent in the apprenticeship area’.\textsuperscript{1022}

\textsuperscript{1019} AJHR, 1953, E-3, p.5.
\textsuperscript{1021} Report on Department of Maori Affairs, 1960, pp.29-30.
5.10.4 Trade and Apprenticeship Training: East Coast

By the late 1940s concern had increased about the need to place more young people in employment in the East Coast region, and this was reflected in such sources as the annual reports of welfare officers. In 1949 the welfare officer was working with the Labour Department to arrange suitable accommodation in Gisborne for young people seeking employment in factories, restaurants and laundries.  

The school-leaving age was raised to 15 in 1945, resulting in more Maori nationally receiving some secondary education, causing further concern within the Labour Department about the need to cater for those then entering the work force. A 1949 report on Maori school leavers revealed that in the Hawke’s Bay-East Coast District there were 369 Maori school leavers in that year, of whom an estimated 280 were assured of employment.  

The importance of giving more importance to the trade training of Maori youths was emphasized by the Maori Education and Training Committee within the Department of Maori Affairs. By 1950, 14 Maori were in apprenticeships in Gisborne in seven different trades including 4 plumbers, 5 motor mechanics, 1 carpenter, 1 surgical bootmaker, 1 electrician, 1 cabinet maker and 1 plasterer. By 1950 the East Coast north of Gisborne was accepted by Government as one of the crisis areas in terms of employment opportunities for Maori.  

In the early 1950s, employment opportunities were available in Gisborne in the Kaiti Freezing Works, wool stores and grain and produce processing plants, particularly after Watties Cannery opened its Gisborne plant in 1952. Employment opportunities

---

1025 Maori Welfare Division, Zone X1V, Annual Report, 4 April 1951. MA 36/29/5. DVJ, pp.78-80. ANZ-W.
were also available for Maori women in the local hospitals, hotels, and clothing factories as well as in the cannery.  

But during the 1950s the realisation grew that then movement to towns in search of work could create an employment problem in Gisborne. The employment needs of school leavers continued to be emphasized and this was reflected in attempts to place boys in apprenticeships. In 1953 for example what were described as applications from ‘the cream of the East Coast tribes’ were received by welfare officers, with several being placed in Gisborne motor mechanics, engineering, plastering and painting apprentice.

In 1957 the Department of Education and the Hawke’s Bay Education Board approved welfare officers visiting schools to provide career guidance to Maori students on the Coast. While some boys were placed in apprenticeships by such efforts, with four going to the New Zealand Railway Workshops in Auckland in 1958, for example, by 1959 the limited opportunities for placement in apprenticeships now existing in Gisborne had become apparent.

It was another sign of the times both of the pressure on employment opportunities and rising education levels that a 1962 report indicated that for a Maori boy to become an apprentice in Gisborne it was now necessary for him to have passed School Certificate. In 1950 there were 14 Maori apprentices in Gisborne, 18 in 1956 and 23 in 1961, but many others boys had left the Coast to enter apprenticeships elsewhere with, by 1961, 19 in Christchurch, 6 in Auckland and 3 in Wellington.

---

1028 Department of Labour Gisborne to Head Office, 15 November 1955, Employment of Maori School Leavers, L 1 30/1/28, Parts 1-4, DV J, pp35-36, ANZ-W.
CHAPTER 6: CONTRIBUTIONS BY EAST COAST MAORI TO THEIR OWN SCHOOLING

As a first step towards inducing the spirit of self-reliance, equal contributions either in money, land or labour, should be made an imperative condition of receiving Government aid.
William Rolleston, Under-Secretary, Native Department, 1865.\textsuperscript{1033}

So began another practice, particularly prevalent in the establishment of the Native Schools, “making do” with local resources-material or human.
Maxine Stephenson, “‘Making Do’: The Politics and Pragmatism of the Use of Temporary Spaces in New Zealand Schools”.\textsuperscript{1034}

Mr Bird and I were particularly struck by the interest shown by the natives in their schools. In many localities gifts of land and money had been made and the Natives are ever willing to give practical aid to the school teacher… At a number of places the Department provides only the material and the Natives do the necessary work themselves. At Hiruharama the people propose to construct a swimming bath for the pupils and to make a new road access to the property. All they asked for was the necessary material…Mr Bird assures me that this willingness to help themselves is a characteristic of the Native Race. I am sure it deserves every encouragement.
Director of Education, T. B. Strong, to Minister of Education, reporting on visit to East Coast and Bay of Plenty Native Schools, February-March 1929.\textsuperscript{1035}

6.1 Introduction

In addition to the substantial gifting of land for school sites, the Crown also expected East Coast Maori to make substantial other contributions of finance and labour to the Native Schools, far beyond anything that was expected of the Pakeha parents whose children attended Education Board schools.

\textsuperscript{1033} AJHR, 1865, E-3, pp.1-2.
\textsuperscript{1035} E 2 1927/1947. ANZ-W. DB.
The clauses of the 1867 Native Schools Act requiring Maori wishing to have a school to promise to gift some of their land to the Crown for the school site, and ‘provide a proportion of the expenses of the establishment and maintenance of a school’, and the changes made in the 1871 amendment, was discussed in Chapter Two.

The 1880 Native School Code retained the requirement that Maori wanting a school had to ‘promise, further, to make such contribution in money or in kind towards the cost of school buildings as the Minister may require’. A request for a school now had to be made by ‘at least 10 Maori’, and the offer of Maori land for a school site was increased to ‘at least two acres’ with ‘a proper title to the site’ also provided.\(^\text{1036}\)

The land could be conveyed to the Crown in different ways, but those most commonly used were made under the \textit{Native Schools Sites Act 1880}, by conveyance or public works legislation.\(^\text{1037}\) When the Native Schools code was revised on 1 January 1897 Maori were required to gift ‘at least three acres’ of land suitable for Native school purposes.\(^\text{1038}\)

A change to the regulations in the Education Act in October 1909 increased the amount of land to be gifted by Maori to ‘at least four acres of good land suitable for a school-site except in places where the circumstances do not justify so large a demand’.\(^\text{1039}\) In terms of practical operations, negotiations between Maori and the Inspector of Native Schools when he visited a community to evaluate whether a request for a school should be agreed to, determined the actual size of the site in particular locations.\(^\text{1040}\)

\(^{1036}\) AJHR, 1880, H-1F, p.1.
\(^{1037}\) Native Schools Sites Act 1880.
\(^{1038}\) Native School Code, 1897, Part 1 (1), p.3.
\(^{1039}\) For a detailed examination of the circumstances surrounding gifting by Maori for school sites see Mary Gillingham and Suzanne Woodley, ‘Northland: Gifting of Lands’, CFRT, Wellington, 2006.
\(^{1040}\) Ibid;
6.2 East Coast Native/Maori Schools: Contributions by East Coast Maori.

When East Coast Maori applied for a school, I noted the gifting of land for the site. (See Chapter 2). But I did not explore the full circumstances surrounding this aspect because a separate report on gifting, including that for school sites, is being carried out by David Alexander in ‘East Coast Public Works Issues’. My main focus in this chapter is on the various other substantial contributions made by East Coast Maori for the schooling of their children in Native/Maori Schools.

In February 1872, A. H. Russell, the Crown’s Inspector of Native Schools, reported that he had visited the East Coast and arranged for the establishment of schools. At Tolaga Bay ‘a school-house including two rooms for Schoolmaster, and the necessary school furniture to cost ₤165.10s’; at Tokomaru Bay, a school house etc ₤177 10s; at Tuparoa, a school house etc ₤177 10s; at Waiapu, a school house etc ₤177 10s.1041

In the first instance he had arranged for the whole expense to be borne by the Government from the funds accumulated under Clause 3 of the 1867 Native Schools Act, ‘but I believe few cases can arise in which one half of this expenditure should not be returned to the Government by the Natives, and I have accordingly made this a condition of a schoolhouse being erected in each of the foregoing localities’ (Author’s emphasis).1042

6.2.1 Tolaga Bay

In 1873 Russell reported that he had ‘received from the Committee, before leaving Tolaga Bay, a written agreement to bear half the necessary expense of a new school building, and certain additions to the schoolmaster’s house’.1043

---

1041 AJHR, 1872, F-5, p.10.
1042 Ibid.
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6.2.2 Tokomaru Bay

In a 1898 report on the Tokomaru Bay Native School the Inspector reported that the Chairman had drawn his attention to a new room he was building for school purposes, the cost of which would be about £90:

and that the natives in order to obtain a building for the district would subscribe a certain amount towards the purchase of the building. As the large majority of the pupils are natives-the school being really a native one, I suggest that a special application be made to the Minister of Education pointing out the special circumstances and suggesting that a grant of £120 be made so as to purchase the building, fence the former and provide proper closed accommodation and a water supply for the school.\textsuperscript{1044}

For 16 years Maori residents at Tokomaru Bay, public health officials, Head Teachers and Native School Inspectors complained about the state of the buildings at the Tokomaru Bay Native School, and pleaded with, or recommended to the Department of Education either for repairs to be carried out, or a new school built (See Chapter 2) (Author’s emphasis).

In 1924 the school burnt down. In the case of a Board School, the Board would have just built a new school. But here, extraordinarily, even although it was now 1924, the historical practice embedded in the 1867 Native School Act of Maori being required to make a contribution to their own schooling continued. The Native School Inspector, John Porteus, sent a telegram to the Hon. Apirana Ngata that he would be pleased to hear what ‘Tokomaru Maoris proposed by way of assistance in matter of new school building’.\textsuperscript{1045} Ngata responded that ‘Tokomaru Maori had decided to contribute five hundred pounds towards cost of new buildings’.\textsuperscript{1046} This was confirmed in a letter to the Director of Education from the Committee of the Mangahauini Incorporated Blocks, advising that ‘our donation is now in hand and may be paid over at any time on the assurance from your Department that the new building will be erected within a reasonable time’.\textsuperscript{1047}

\textsuperscript{1044} Inspection Report, 1\textsuperscript{st} October 1898, BAAA 1001, 653a. ANZ-A. DB.
\textsuperscript{1045} Porteous to Ngata, 22 February 1924. BAAA 1001/654b. ANZ-A. DB.
\textsuperscript{1046} Ngata to Porteous, 23\textsuperscript{rd} March, 1924. Ibid. DB.
\textsuperscript{1047} Secretary, Hutana Ihaia, to Director, 15 March 1924. Ibid. DB.
The Minister of Education replied that he recognized that a new school should be built immediately, and plans were in place to get this started. He expressed his ‘pleasure at the very liberal assistance that your committee has given’. The Director of Education subsequently advised that ‘the donation of £500 has now been paid into the Public Account’.

After the new school buildings were opened in 1925, the Senior Inspector reported that the School Committee had expended ‘a large sum of money on further improvements. They have already spent £60 in asphalting round the school. Trees are being planted and additional fencing is being erected’.

In 1924 the Minister of Education advised the Director of Education that the Hon. Mr Ngata had seen him with respect to the Waiomatatini School, explained that in the previous winter the people had spent about £150 on work in connection with the school, and requested that a grant of about £30 should now be made by the Government towards fencing. He had informed Ngata that he would authorize a special grant of £20 towards the cost (£91 had been raised by two concerts, including the production of the Japanese operetta “Princess Chrysanthemum”).

When new school buildings and a teacher’s residence were required for the Whakawhitira School in 1919, the residents guaranteed to provide £150 towards the cost of the latter. The existing school, which had been in a temporary building, was closed for 18 months on health grounds while the building proceeded, and the new school opened in 1921.

---

1048 Minister, C. J. Parr, to Secretary, 4 April 1924. Ibid. DB.
1049 Director to Under-Secretary, Public Works Department, 19 June 1924. Ibid. DB.
1050 Inspection Report, 7 September 1925. BAAA 1001/655a. ANZ-A. DB.
1051 Minister, C. J. Parr, to Director, 29 October 1924. BAAA 1001/697a. ANZ-A.
1052 Head to Director, 29 October 1923. Ibid. DB.
1053 Hon A. T. Ngata to Secretary for Education, 16 October 1919. BAAA 1001/739d. ANZ-A. DB.
In 1926 the parents at Rangitukia School spent £50 earned from concerts ‘on fencing the property which is now secure from wandering stock’.\(^{1054}\) One year later the school had a very successful concert at which £42 was raised for school purposes.\(^{1055}\)

The Crown continued to expect East Coast Maori to make significant contributions to the provision of their own schooling even after 1930, again in a manner and to an extent which seems to me extraordinary as well as inequitable and unfair compared with the free education which had been provided in education board Schools after the passing of the 1877 Education Act.

Further evidence of the very considerable financial contribution made by Tokomaru Bay Maori to their school over the years was evident in 1936. They protested vigorously when the Director of Education advised the Hawke’s Bay Education Board that in view of the Board’s proposal to erect a new Board School at Tokomaru Bay, it might be advisable for the new school to be established at Waima as a Native School, and for the Board to take over the existing Native School as a Board School, the buildings of which ‘are in good condition and of modern design’.\(^{1056}\)

Wiremu Karaka and others forwarded ‘our strong protest’ to the Minister of Education, Peter Fraser, reminding him that the land on which the school sat was ‘given by us as a site for a school to teach the Maori children. We have spent approximately £700 on this school. We deeply regret the attitude of the Education Department in ignoring us in this matter, as no information was sent to us. We read of the above proposal in the newspapers. Do not let us down and cast us off like small fish’.\(^{1057}\) The Minister replied giving an assurance that in considering various options he would ‘consult you and give your representatives every consideration before making a decision’.\(^{1058}\)

\(^{1054}\) Inspection Report, Rangitukia, 16 August 1926. BAAA 1001/1012a. ANZ-A. DB.
\(^{1055}\) Inspection Report, 28 August 1927. Ibid. DB.
\(^{1056}\) Director to Secretary, 16 December 1936. BAAA 1001/1060b. ANZ-A. DB.
\(^{1057}\) Wiremu Karaka and others to Minister, 23 December 1936. Ibid. DB.
\(^{1058}\) Minister to Karaka, 24 December 1936. Ibid. DB.
However the Chairman of the School Committee, the Rev. W. Rangi, and others, wrote again to the Minister reminding him in greater detail what their contribution had been. It had included:

- The land on which the school stood ‘given gratis to the Government for a site’ and it was sacred land.
- The sum of £500 was given by Maori to the Government to erect the school.
- Another £150 approximately had been spent on improvements to playgrounds and erection of a cookery room.

They asked that if the matter was to be settled by the removal of a school ‘we respectfully request you to remove the European School to Waima and to let ours remain where it is’.\(^{1059}\)

When Inspector D. G. Ball reviewed the situation he advised the Director that ‘Maori opposition to the suggestion was quite justified’, cited the school being built on sacred land and the other financial contributions, and recommended that no change be made, other than that a new classroom be built at the school which had now become overcrowded.\(^{1060}\) The Director accepted this and advised the Rev. Rangi accordingly.\(^{1061}\) In May 1938 the Director wrote to the Mangahauini Incorporated Block Committee that the Department ‘had occasion to notice the whole-hearted support, both financial and other-wise’ which the Committee had ‘given over a long period of years to the teachers in charge, from time to time, of the Tokomaru Bay Native School’. Apart from the Board’s generous action of donating £500 towards the rebuilding of the school in 1924, ‘the Inspectors and Teachers frequently make mention of many instances of assistance given to the school by your Committee’, and he wished to place on record the Department’s thanks to it for its efforts on behalf of the school.\(^{1062}\)

---

\(^{1059}\) Chairman to Minister, 4 January 1937. Ibid. DB.
\(^{1060}\) Ball to Director, 26 January 1937. Ibid. DB.
\(^{1061}\) Director to Rangi, 19 April 1937. Ibid. DB.
\(^{1062}\) Director to Secretary, 4 May 1938. Ibid. DB.
In August 1938, the Director of Education again thanked the Secretary of the Mangahauini Inc Blocks, this time for £50 which had been forwarded to him as a ‘contribution towards the provision of manual facilities at the school’.  

In June 1940, when a permanent water supply and septic tank system was under consideration for the school, the Director advised that the Committee had expressed its willingness to contribute £40.

### 6.2.3 Whangara

After an inspection of the Whangara Native School in 1903, Bird reported that the School Committee was ‘providing timber towards the erection of a shelter shed and are collecting funds for the purpose. (I expect the Department will be expected to subsidize the amount collected)’.  

In June 1957, the Secretary of the Whangara Maori School Committee wrote to the Department expressing the Committee’s view that for years past it had been contributing more finances to the running of the school than should have been the case. Areas she listed for which the Committee had received no funds from the Department and had paid for itself, or with the help of other parents, included:

- firewood
- fencing
- subsidies on piano, projector, radiogram, lawn-mower.
- glass, putty, timber, axe handles, mop handles, files, toilet paper, chemicals for cleaning, benzene and oil for mower, freight on Government library books (one way)
- travel to Gisborne for children who had to be taken to a doctor or hospital after accidents at school, toll calls and telegrams, junior assistant etc.

---

1063 Director to Secretary, 19 August 1938. Ibid. DB.
1064 Director to D. G. Ball, 7 June 1940. BAAA 1001/655b. ANZ-A. DB.
1065 Inspection Report, Whangara, 16 July 1903. BAAA 1001/747b. ANZ-A. DB.
1066 Secretary School Committee, Mrs C. Waide, to Maori Schools Officer, 11th June, 1957. BAAA 1001/850c. ANZ-A. DB.
She added that ‘All this has amounted to a large sum over the past number of years’, and the reason for it had been that the people had left things too much in the hands of the previous Headmaster. Getting money for the school was ‘a struggle’ and the Committee would appreciate some assistance. There was ‘no means of heating water at the school’, and the Committee would like the pupils to be able to have cocoa during the winter months; would the Department contribute with a grant if the Power Board provided a zip?  

The official reply was that, ‘it would seem that your Committee has been accepting responsibility for items which are usually supplied or paid for by the Department’. The Annual Supply list, a copy of which would be forwarded to the Head Teacher:

Generally covers all school requisites and cleaning equipment. This Department contributes towards the cost of fuel required for heating classrooms…

We also meet the cost of petrol and oil used in the motor mower and engine connected with the water supply, and we pay all accounts for freight and cartage of school equipment, library books etc. With reference to toll calls telegrams the expenditure on these is refunded regularly during the year.

In March 1965, a swimming bath was officially opened at Whangara, the result of 1000 hours of voluntary labour, and community funding of £800 towards the cost of £1550, to which a government subsidy had added £750.

6.2.4 Mangatuna

The positive contribution of the School Committee when the Mangatuna Maori School was replaced and a new school built was referred to in background notes prepared for the Minister of Education for a tour he made of East Coast schools in February 1958:

1067 Ibid;
1068 District Superintendent to Secretary, 28 June 1957. Ibid. DB.
The Committee and parents co-operate fully with the Head Teacher in all matters pertaining to the school. Their assistance in felling trees which blocked light and sunshine from the school, and cutting these for school firewood has been much appreciated. In addition they have made financial contributions to equip the school with additional equipment and amenities (infant equipment, library books and musical instruments).

When the decision was made to have an official opening the Committee and parents had contributed extensively:

Parent’s vehicles were used to carry many loads of spoil and sand from Tolaga Bay, over seven miles, for the frontage, and for both ends of the concrete area respectively. The frontage along the fence line had to be built up with soil suitable for lawn sowing … Also a large untidy hollow had to be filled in with ordinary spoil. The loads of sand from the Tolaga Bay beach were required earlier to get rid of the quagmire condition at both ends of the concrete area… Three tractors were used to help in all this work apart from the two lorries. The Committee decided that in due fairness to the vehicle owners, petrol costs would be met by the Committee. The total amount expended on petrol for this work was £15 2s. 9d.

The old tool-shed was renovated by the parents and certain plumbing materials were bought, viz., spouting, down-pipe, solder, spirits of salts and six brackets.

In a letter to the Minister of Education a local medical practitioner, Dr. D. Sinclair, described himself as having been:

in close liaison with the Mangatuna School Committee and community and I have personally been amazed at the vast expenditure of time, effort and money that has necessarily, and willingly, been given to ensure the success of the opening function and the continued success of the school itself as a teaching institution. Voluntary labour has effected vast improvements in the layout of the site and the Committee and parents too have spent hundreds of working hours in improving the grounds. I wonder if the Department would make a grant to the School Committee in recognition of the vast amount of work that has been done.

1070 Notes for the Hon. Minister of Education for his tour of East Coast schools, 13 to 20 February 1958. BAAA 1001/309a. ANZ-A.DB.
1071 Head, Mangatuna, to the District Superintendent, 5 November 1950. Ibid. DB.
1072 D. Sinclair M.B. Ch. B., to Minister, 22 October 1960. Ibid. DB.
Dr Sinclair criticised the role of the Department as controlling authority of the Maori Schools in assisting the schools in its district compared with that of the Hawke’s Bay Education Board:

There appears to be a very weak standard of liaison with the Department and the fact that the Hawke’s Bay Board had dealt with much of the siting preparation has led to a lot of confusion in the minds of the School Committee. They know that £1000 has been granted for siting and developmental needs, but they have no idea as to how it is being spent, if it is all spent, or how much remains to do what.

I feel that the Maori Schools will not be adequately administered until they have a Board of their own, on exactly the same footing as the other boards. This will not be welcomed by many, but as long as the Maori Schools continue to fulfil a need then their administrative needs should be improved by the erection of a Maori Schools Education Board.1073

At Mangatuna in 1966, the Inspector reported that:

It is pleasing to learn that the School Committee gives full support to school functions and projects and co-operates with the staff for anything that will benefit the school. The community...contributed generously to the recent educational tour ...Since the last inspection visit there have been further improvements to the school grounds including a sand- pit, the provision of multiplex apparatus, levelling of lawns and the lower playing field. Two motor mowers have been purchased. Inside amenities have also been provided including additions to the school library, a movie projector, electric floor polisher and infant number equipment. The help of the Committee in these matters is acknowledged.1074

6.2.5 Tikitiki

After Tikitiki reverted to primary school status when its secondary dept consolidated on Ngata College, an Inspector wrote that, ‘The support given to the school by an active school committee is appreciated. Since the last report a 16mm film projector,
screen and floor polisher have been added to school equipment. In addition a considerable sum has been spent on library books, infant apparatus and sports equipment. A recent educational visit to Auckland was well supported by the community.  

6.2.6 Potaka

During these years Teachers and Inspectors frequently also commented positively on the support given by parents to the Potaka Maori School, as in 1967 when an inspection report noted:

The Committee and the parents have given strong support to the Head teacher in the running of the school. Following fund raising activities, purchases during the past three years have included Vu max filmstrip projector, Bell and Howell projector, gymnastics and sports equipment, motor mower, filmstrips, chime bars, library books, and infant equipment. In addition the Committee has provided a sandpit and new basketball goal posts. Future projects being considered by the Committee include the completing of the concrete area in front of the school to make a full size tennis court and the strengthening of fences on the boundary.

6.2.7 Waipiro Bay

In 1967 the Waipiro Bay Maori School Committee contributed £374 towards the cost of school baths.

---

1076 Inspection Report, 12 September 1967 BAAA 1000/472a. ANZ-A. DB.
1077 General Manager, Hawke’s Bay Education Board, to Department, 1 June 1967. BAAA 1001/711c. ANZ-A. DB.
6.2.8 Whangara

At Whangara in 1967 the Inspector noted that since his last report, ‘much useful equipment has been obtained largely through the efforts of the Head-teacher and the School Committee. This equipment includes further fencing, a bus shelter, library and reference books, curtains, musical instruments, arithmetic apparatus, a motor mower and a wide range of physical education and gymnastic equipment. Suggestions for further ground improvements and baths maintenance are very encouraging’.

6.2.9 Other contributions

The focus in this chapter has mainly been on the role of Native/Maori School Committees in assisting in various material ways, particularly financially, to the schools. Many of them also made extremely valuable contributions to their school in other ways as well, and these should be noted. At Tikitiki in 1900 Pope reported that steps had been taken by the Committee and the Masters of Tikitiki and Rangitukia to ‘prevent the wandering of children from school to school with good effect. … Te Rua, the able and enthusiastic Chairman here for many years has not been re-elected. I am told that the new Committee is very active’.

At Tokomaru Bay in the same year, Pope reported that ‘The Chairman is the only one that can maintain a good attendance here’, although he was not so keen about his influence extending to encouraging the Teacher to give a holiday once or twice a year, the most recent example being having the school closed for the wedding of former pupils.

---

1079 Inspection Report, Tikitiki, 16 May 1900. BAAA 1001/640c. ANZ-A. DB.
1080 Inspection Report, Tokomaru, 9 May 1900. BAAA 1001/653a. ANZ-A. DB.
An inspection report on Tokomaru Bay Native School in 1896 described the school as ‘fortunate in having a chairman of energy and influence who, judging from the log book, does his duty well and intelligently’.\textsuperscript{1081}

The records on the Rangitukia Maori School in the 1940s and 1950s make regular references by Head Teachers to the valuable role of the Rev. P. Kohere on the School Committee. When he resigned, at age 77 in 1953, he was made a life member. The Kohere family also regularly provided accommodation at their home for teachers.\textsuperscript{1082}

\textsuperscript{1081} Inspection Report, 2 May 1896. The Chairman was Hone Paputene. BAAA 1001/652b. ANZ-A. DB.
\textsuperscript{1082} Kohere to Lake, 22 April 1953. BAAA 1001/1013a. ANZ-A. DB.
CHAPTER 7: LEARNING

There are still many teachers who doubt the ability of a Maori to take mathematics or history. Part of the problem seems to be in the mind of the teachers themselves when it is suggested that “Maoris thrive on practical courses” and “Maoris prefer not to enter academic forms.” New Zealand Department of Education, 1961.\textsuperscript{1083}

However there is considerable evidence that the teaching force as a whole is strongly influenced by negative stereotypes of the capabilities of Maori children.
Dr Richard Benton, 1988.\textsuperscript{1084}

7.1 Introduction

The authors of the above comments are making them about teachers of Maori children with the contemporary situation at the time of writing particularly in mind.

However based on my findings for this report I am prepared to go considerably further than their statements with regard to the situation historically. (See Chapter Five on practical education and this and the next chapter on the learning and teaching of East Coast Maori children). Those findings are that low or narrow expectations of Maori children were not limited to classroom teachers. Rather, they were embedded in the thinking of the Crown’s most senior officials responsible for Maori educational policy and practice, including Inspectors-General, Secretaries and Directors of Education, Senior Inspectors of Native/Maori schools and the other Inspectors of those schools.

\textsuperscript{1083} Submission to the Royal Commission on Education, Wellington, 1961
\textsuperscript{1084} Cited in Report of the Royal Commission on Social Policy, Wellington, 1988, p.300.
7.2 Background

The 1880 Native School Code defined a syllabus of work for only the first four standards in the Native schools and it was therefore not surprising that the examination results for 1881 and 1882 showed only a comparatively few students passing Standard 4.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No of children examined</th>
<th>1881</th>
<th>1882</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Passed S.4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Examination results in Native Schools

But in time able pupils were expected to attempt the work prescribed for Standards V and VI of the Board schools. In his annual report for 1894, Pope gave examination results for Standard 1 through to Standard VI for the first time. This extension was made explicit in the revised Native School Code, 1897.

However although progress was made in such matters as reducing the number of older pupils in the schools (the proportion of pupils over 15 declined from 7.1 per cent to 4.6 per cent between 1880 and 1888), the number of passes achieved in the proficiency examination which marked the successful completion of the full primary school course remained extremely low long after the introduction of the full standards. The year 1906, when 29 proficiency certificates were awarded to pupils in the Native schools out of a total roll of 4,174 can be taken as an illustration of this. For the majority of these successful candidates were not Maori pupils but Pakeha attending the Native schools either as the children of teachers or settlers.

A lack of detailed comparative statistics makes comparisons between the academic performance of Maori students in Native and Board schools difficult. Openshaw et al

---

1086 New Zealand Education Department, 1897.
1087 AJHR, 1907, E-2, p.2.
claim that the ‘tentative evidence’ on comparative examination performance at the
Standard VI (Proficiency Examination) level for the years 1914-1936 indicates that
Maori in Native schools ‘fared poorly in comparison with Maori taught in the public
schools’.

However no detailed evidence is provided to support this view. In 1909, 21 out of a
total of 4,434 Maori students in board schools gained proficiency, 5 fewer than in
1908. In 1917, 31 Maori students out of 4,622 attending Native schools gained
proficiency, whereas 16 out of 4,747 attending board schools did so. In 1929, out
of 7,772 Maori attending board schools, 147 received proficiency certificates, but
equivalent figures are not available for Native schools.

However a comparatively small proportion of Maori children were still reaching
Standard 6. In 1928, 3.4 percent of Maori pupils in Board schools were in S.6,
compared with 10.0 percent of Pakeha; in Native schools 3.7 per cent of Maori pupils
were in S.6.

7.3 Learning in East Coast Native/Maori Primary Schools

In 1875 the Resident Magistrate, J. H. Campbell, wrote of the school at Akuaka that it
‘exhibits a most favourable and encouraging aspect. The number of scholars keeps
steadily up to from 60 to 65, with a nearly equal number of boys and girls’. He
attributed this in large measure to the ‘very superior character’ and ‘intelligence’ of
the Maori in that area, who ‘force their children to attend school and any truant on
being caught is severely punished’. But he described the teachers, Mr and Mrs Brown,
as also being well respected by parents and pupils, and the result was that progress
made in the various branches of learning was ‘surprising’, with reading, writing,
arithmetic, ‘in which they are wonderfully adept’, and geography, being the main studies.\textsuperscript{1093}

By 1891 Pope was also reporting some very positive results in the East Coast Native schools:

Wharekahika: The school examination appears to be the event of the year; within an hour after the Inspector’s arrival every soul in the settlement is at the schoolhouse watching with keen interest each step in the proceedings. When the time comes for the announcement of the final result the excitement really deserves to be called intense.

Araroa (Kawakawa) Here also there was a very large attendance of adult Maoris; perhaps there were a hundred of them, and they all seemed to take great interest in the work from first to last. The general results are particularly good.

Rangitukia ‘This is our largest Native school’ and the result of the efforts of the Mistress was that the school ranked eighth in the list of Native schools.\textsuperscript{1094}

However in a report on Rangitukia in 1899, Pope seemed to have limited expectations in terms of the progress of students into the upper standards, complaining that the general nature of the work was ‘somewhat lowered by the necessity that appears to exist for having standards higher than the Fourth. Capital work is done, but it would be even better if the master was not compelled to scatter his fire’.\textsuperscript{1095}

He made a somewhat similar rather disparaging comment about academic progress at Waiomatatini in the same year, complaining that a large amount of work in the ‘Fifth and Sixth Standards had taken up a great deal of time. If there had been only four standards and the “preparatories” the work would have been excellent throughout’.\textsuperscript{1096}

That many Maori pupils progressed slowly through the Standards in these years, and some of the reasons for this, are well known. But it also needs to be kept in mind that the same comment can be made about the progress of many Pakeha pupils in Board

\textsuperscript{1093} J. H. Campbell R.M. to Under-Secretary Native Department, 5 March 1875. AJHR 1875, G-2, p.8.
\textsuperscript{1094} AJHR 1891, E-2, p.8.
\textsuperscript{1095} AJHR 1899, E-2, p.9.
\textsuperscript{1096} Ibid;
schools at the time. Although the problem did not manifest itself to the same extent, it was significant, one example appearing in the report of the Chairman of the Hawke’s Bay Education Board in 1887 that ‘not twenty four children in every hundred who attend school ever receive any kind of instruction of a grade higher than the fourth standard’.\footnote{AJHR, E-1, 1887, p.67.}

### 7.3.1 Low Expectations

However as I read the records on the East Coast Native Schools I began to find many examples, even after 1900, when the highest level any pupil in a school reached was S.III or S.IV. This had, of course, negative implications for their ever attaining the Proficiency Certificate, marking the successful completion of the full primary school course.

Yet comments by the Inspectors about this slow progress tended to be extremely rare. Indeed quite the contrary. Many of their reports were fulsome in their praise of the work of the teachers, despite the lack of progress into higher standards. Even as time progressed into the 1920s, examples persisted of schools where many pupils still rarely appeared to get into the upper standards, a situation which had existed in some of them for many years. And this was now well beyond the time when slow progress through the standards by pupils could be rationalised or excused on the grounds that the Native School system was in its early stage of development, or the pupils needed to come to terms with the English language and new school routines, and so progress was inevitably going to be slow.

My findings, which I outline below, show that the Crown’s Departmental Inspectors of Native Schools did not generally have high expectations of Maori students, an attitude that was inevitably passed on to classroom teachers.

The Native Schools were occasionally inspected by one of the Hawke’s Bay Education Board Inspectors, and their reports were sometimes very revealing. In his
1918 report on Hiruharama, Inspector D. Strachan commented that he would ‘like to see more pupils continuing to the higher classes. This can be expected only if they are pushed quickly forward in their earlier years.’

My research revealed that that kind of comment was generally extremely rare as far as the Native School Inspectors were concerned. At the examination of the Whareponga School in September 1925 the Inspector, J. Porteous, described English (oral) overall as, ‘Very satisfactory indeed’; (written) as ‘very fair indeed’; Reading as ‘Good’; Writing on slates ‘Good’; Spelling ‘;Good on the whole’; Arithmetic ‘Good in S.6-poor elsewhere’; Nature study and Geography ‘Satisfactory’. Yet out of a total roll of 29 only one pupil was in S.6, one in S.5 and three in S.4.

Similarly, in his Report on Tuparoa in 1926, the Inspector was extremely positive in his overall assessment of the subject teaching in the school, describing English (oral) as ‘Very good’; (written as ‘Good to very good’; Reading ‘Very good’; Writing ‘Very good’; Spelling ‘Very good’; Arithmetic ‘Good’; Nature study and geography ‘Good’. Yet the fact that not a single pupil out of the 65 enrolled was classified as having made sufficient progress to be classified in S.6 produced no comment, such as the need to lift standards further and progress more pupils to the higher standards.

At Hiruharama in 1909 no pupil was in S.6, two were in S.5, three in S.4, four in S.3 and the remaining 44 in S.2 and below. Yet the Inspector makes no comment on this, emphasizing instead and apparently with satisfaction that the ‘promotions have been made with reasonable discretion and I agree with the judgment shown in each case by the head master’.

Similarly an Inspection report on Tokomaru Native School in 1913 had a satisfied if not congratulatory tone. The instruction in the primer classes was ‘very satisfactory indeed. The highest division is well advanced. They speak out well and their English is good’. Overall the Oral English in the School was described as ‘Very good’.

---

1098 Inspection Report, Hiruharama, 30 September 1918. BAAA 1001/247a. ANZ-A. DB.
1099 Examination Report, 1 September 1925. BAAA 1001/764a. ANZ-A. DB.
1100 Inspection Report, 23 August 1926. BAAA 1001/1065a. ANZ-A. DB.
1101 Inspection Report, 11-12 August 1909. BAAA 1001/246b. ANZ-A. DB.
Reading ‘Generally very satisfactory, Spelling ‘Satisfactory’, Arithmetic Composition of numbers in Class P, ‘Very good indeed in the Std classes excepting some of it was below the mark’, Nature Study and Geography ‘A well arranged scheme’.

Yet again no comment is made about or concern shown for the fact that the average age of the pupils for the classes they are in is extremely high as shown in the following table and their rate of progress through the school extremely slow.

**Table 2: Enrolment in Tokomaru Bay Native Primary School 1913**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class</th>
<th>Number enrolled</th>
<th>Average Age</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P1</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>7.2 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S111</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S1V</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SV</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SV1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14.11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In 1915, 28 pupils were enrolled in P1, but by S.4 the number had dropped to only 4; in S.5 there were 4 pupils with an average age of 14.8, and none in S.6.

Similarly at Whareponga in 1913, Inspector Bird described the results as generally satisfactory. The instruction of the Primer Class was ‘Very good’; In the Standards English was ‘Satisfactory on the whole’; Reading ‘Very good’; Arithmetic ‘Composition of numbers very satisfactory indeed’. Yet only one pupil was in S.IV; none in S.V; three in S.4; none in S.111, and all the others 20 were in S.11 and below.

---

1102 Annual Report, Tokomaru, 18 July 1913. BAAA 1001/654a. ANZ-A. DB.

1103 Annual Report, Tokomaru, 5 August 1915. BAAA 1001/654b. ANZ-A. DB.
He made no comment regarding the need to accelerate pupils with a view to some gaining a proficiency certificate, or for the teacher to raise his expectations.\textsuperscript{1104}

The following year one pupil had reached S.3, but no pupil had progressed beyond that Standard. Yet Bird again makes no comment on this, and describes the teachers, Mr and Mrs Coughlan, as ‘both experienced in methods of teaching Maori children and as a consequence the teaching is quite satisfactory’.\textsuperscript{1105}

Much the same picture persisted in 1916. No pupil had advanced beyond S.4, in which two pupils were enrolled. Four were in S.3, and all the remaining pupils were in S.13 and below. Yet Bird again described ‘very good progress’ having been made in the methods of teaching and ‘The methods in the upper classes show commendable advance’.\textsuperscript{1106} It is reasonable to ask which ‘upper classes’ he is referring to here, as this term was usually reserved in New Zealand primary education for S.5 and S.6.

By 1919 it is getting very late in time for such slow progress to still be being demonstrated, particularly without comment, or any apparent suggestion that progress should be accelerated. Yet in that year out of 93 children enrolled at Tokomaru Bay none were in S.6, one was in S.V, six in S. IV, 12 in S.111 and the remainder in S.2 or below. Yet the Inspector again appears complacent about this, referring very positively to progress in the various subjects, e.g. oral English ‘Very good’; written English ‘Good progress throughout’, Writing ‘Good’, Spelling ‘Satisfactory’, Arithmetic as variously ‘Satisfactory’ ‘Fair’ and ‘Good’.\textsuperscript{1107}

At the examination of Whakawhitira in 1922 no student had progressed beyond S.3, but the Inspector again makes no comment on this. Instead, in his overall assessment of the work in the various subjects he judges English (oral) as ‘Very Good. This subject is well treated; Reading ‘Very Good. Intelligent reading is the rule’; Writing
‘Good’; Spelling ‘Good in all standards’; Arithmetic ‘Very good results were obtained in the standard classes’; Nature Study and Geography ‘Very satisfactory’.1108

The continued existence of this situation in the East Coast schools into the end of the 1920s, and the accompanying attitudes to it on the part of the Inspectors, strongly suggests that it was a systemic problem, one stemming from low expectations on the part of the Crown’s education officials generally, not merely one originating from the views or reporting style of any one individual Inspector. That being so it is ironic, given the tendency for officials to put the blame primarily on Maori if greater success was not being achieved, such as their tendency to emphasize ‘Maori errors’ in the language work, living conditions, poor attendance or a Maori preference for practical rather than academic study.

At Whareponga, in September 1927, there was no pupil in S.6; one in S.5; four in S.4 and the remaining 25 pupils were in classes below that. Yet in his report the Inspector, J. Porteous, makes no reference to this, writing instead with apparent satisfaction: ‘English oral- Good. A great deal of attention is given to the subject; written – Very satisfactory; Reading – Good. The pupils read with pleasing expression; Writing – Good; Spelling – Good; Arithmetic – Still a weak subject; Handwork – Satisfactory; Nature Study and Geography – A satisfactory programme; Efficiency of School – Very satisfactory indeed’.1109

At Hiruharama in 1925 there were 91 pupils in the school but only one in S.6, two in S.5 and nine in S.4. Yet the Inspector again made no comment, instead grading the subject teaching as English, oral ‘Very satisfactory’; Reading ‘Generally Good’; Writing ‘Good’; Spelling ‘Satisfactory’; Handwork ‘Very good’; Nature Study and Geography; ‘The pupils answered satisfactorily’; Efficiency of School ‘Very good’.1110

At Tokomaru Bay in 1925, out of 75 pupils enrolled, only one was in S.6, two in S.5 and five in S.4. Yet this drew no comment from the Inspector about the need for the

1108 Examination Report, Whakawhitira, 9 August 1922. BAAA 1001/739d. ANZ-A. DB.
1109 Examination Report, 5 September 1927. BAAA 1001/765a. 44/4. ANZ-A. DB.
1110 Examination Report, Hiruharama, 31 August 1925. BAAA 1001/247a. ANZ-A. DB.
teacher to push the pupils on further with their progress. Instead he describes the results of the examination in Oral English as ‘Good-the importance of the subject throughout the school is realized’; Written English ‘Good-the grammar was very fair’; Reading ‘Good’; Writing ‘Good’; Spelling ‘Good’ Arithmetic ‘The Arithmetic is well taught’; Nature Study and Geography ‘Quite Satisfactory’.

It would be incorrect, however, to describe the picture as universally bleak. Some good work was undoubtedly done by individual teachers in some of the schools, efforts which were often well supported by parents. At Whangara under Head Teacher W. Frazer, the Inspectors gave glowing reports on the work of the pupils for several successive years and commented on strong parental support for the school. In his 1907 Report, Bird recommended that the Department should write to the Chairman, Hira Paenga, congratulating him on the continued success of the school and expressing the fear of the Department that the result of the number of passes (of children through the Standards) could be that the attendance would fall off, and the people should be appealed to do their best to get substitutes so that it did not fall below 31. The following year another Inspector, John Porteous wrote that:

The children have a great interest in the school and their work. The interest of the people was manifested by the large numbers present (At the examination). Their loyalty to their school and the conception of duty they give to it caused them to adjourn a meeting over land matters in Gisborne in order that they might be present at the examination.

A year later, Bird described Oral English as ‘Exceptionally good throughout the school’; Written English as ‘Very good indeed’; Reading as ‘Very Satisfactory’; Spelling ‘Very good indeed throughout the school’. Overall ‘The school still forms a valued possession to the people who take the greatest pride in it. The teacher deserves special praise for the uniformly high degree of excellence attained and the excellent tone of the school.  

_________________________

1111 Examination Report, J. Porteous, 7 September 1925. BAAA 1001/655a .ANZ-A. DB.
1112 Inspection Report, 26 August 1907. BAAA 1001/747c. ANZ-A. DB.
1113 Inspection Report, Whangara, 18 August 1908. Ibid. DB.
1114 Inspection Report, Whangara, 1909. Ibid. DB.
Yet despite their positive comments, a closer look at where pupils actually were in the school again raised questions about the level of the expectations the Inspectors really had with respect to Maori pupils. Or the extent to which, in heaping such praise on the progress made, it was mainly the progress of the few Pakeha pupils in the Native School they were chiefly referring to. As mentioned earlier, entering S.6 and passing the Proficiency Examination marked the normal successful completion of the primary school. Yet at Whangara in 1915, under Frazer, of only two pupils in S.6, one was Pakeha, as was the only pupil in S.5 and one of only two pupils in S.4. In 1916 no pupil was in S.6, and one Maori and one European pupil were in S.5.

At Tuparoa in 1912, the only pupil in S.6 out of a total roll of 57 (two Pakeha and 54 Maori) was Pakeha. And in 1922, with 9 Pakeha and 41 Maori enrolled, three of the four pupils in S.6 were Pakeha.

Nevertheless there were also other examples of positive developments. At Mangatuna, despite serious interruptions to the classroom work from time to time caused by flooding and illness, inspection reports during the period Mr and Mrs Scammell were the teachers were generally positive. The following year the pupils were described as having responded ‘very satisfactorily to the tests applied. The teaching is educative and the supervision close and regular’.

This positive tone continued, Inspector Bird finding in 1919 that:

Discipline and order: Excellent; Tone: Excellent; Manners and general behaviour: Excellent; Cleanliness of building and offices: Buildings all scrupulously clean; Appliances, books and furniture; All in excellent condition; Gardens and grounds: Exceedingly credible; Methods of teaching; The methods are sound throughout. The children are making good progress. Their work books are creditable and the ground covered is reasonably extensive. There is a good working spirit among the children. The school is well managed and doing capital work.

---

1115 Inspection Report, Whangara, 31 May 1915. Ibid. DB.
1118 Inspection Report, 6 June 1922. Ibid. DB.
1119 Inspection report, Mangatuna, 30 July 1917. BAAA 1001/348b.ANZ-A. DB.
In 1920, a new Native School Inspector, G. M. Henderson, finally did make a positive comment about a teacher’s expectations, describing Scammell as having an ‘appreciation of the importance of getting as many children as possible into the upper standard’.  

Tikitiki in 1927 was described as a ‘well conducted’ school with ‘good methods in use. The pupils have responded very well to the teaching. The Assistants have all done good work and have been keen to further the progress of their pupils’. 

An inspection report on Waioomatatini in 1927 revealed a much more justifiable matching up of the position of pupils in the various classes, and the Inspector’s positive comments. Nine pupils, all Maori, were in S.6; 6 in S.5, and; seven in S.4. 

At Tokomaru Bay in 1928 there were four Maori girls in S.6, and two Maori boys and one Maori girl in S.5. 

Despite the negative nature of my findings regarding what appears to have been the low expectations of Inspectors during these years, it is important to note that from 1880 there were always some individual East Coast Maori pupils who succeeded well enough to go on from their primary school to one of the Maori denominational boarding schools, and the History of the East Coast Native Schools records a few of them. By 1924, amongst those who had done well from Tokomaru Bay, were: Fred Nehu, who passed his Civil Service exams; Parekura Pewhairangi, Matriculation and Solicitors’ General Knowledge; Waka Karaka, Matriculation and Civil Service; Nuia Rungarunga, Civil Service; Teotene Karauria, Buller Scholarship, both Junior and Senior, McLean Scholarship, Civil Service and Matriculation and Jurisprudence at Canterbury University; while the Rev. Canon Hakaraia Pahewa was also a former pupil. From Whangara, George Leach had gone on to Matriculate, as had Ray Frazer who was in the Public Trust Office in Wellington, and Clarence Frazer and Ponga Winiata, the latter having fallen in the war, and John Tamati who had won a McLean  

1121 Examination Report, G.M.Henderson, Mangatuna, 25 August 1920. Ibid. DB.  
1123 Inspection Report, 26 August 1927. BAAA 1001/1071b. ANZ-A. DB.  
1124 Inspection Report, 31 May 1928. BAAA 1001/1060a, 44/6. ANZ-A. DB.
Scholarship. Amongst those who had attended Waiomatatini in its earliest years Watarawi Paipa, Wi Pepere, Warihi Nepi a and Tiwana Turei had been amongst the first selected to go to Te Aute, and the school had produced two Barristers in the Hon. Apirana Turupa Ngata, MA, LLB, MP, and Henare Poananga, LLB. The Rev. Reweti Kohere, BA, and Rev. Pohipi Kohere were Rangitukia graduates, as was Pekama Kaa who had matriculated and fallen in France. And the history identifies pupils from other East Coast schools who had gone on to similar achievements by 1924.1125

After a new Senior Inspector of Native Schools, Douglas Ball, was appointed in 1929 there were positive signs of somewhat raised expectations on the part of the Inspectors with respect to East Coast Maori pupils. In his report on Rangitukia in 1929 Ball advised the Head that ‘An effort should be made to promote some of the brighter children in the Primers and lower standards more than one group or standard this year’.1126 And Ball maintained this approach, commenting with regard to the ‘Efficiency of School’ in 1930 that ‘The general standard of work must be raised’.1127

In 1931 Inspectors Ball and Fletcher praised the Head, C. Cumpsty, and staff ‘for their efforts to raise the standard of this school to a higher plane. Methods of instruction have been overhauled, and attention has been given to criticisms made on previous visits. The working spirit of the school is happy and delightful and we are gratified to be able to report that the school can now be graded very good.’1128

However in 1931 the Department circulated to all Teachers in Native Schools, including those on the East Coast, suggestions for experimental timetables aimed at considerably increasing the practical non-academic activity in the schools, such as handcraft, gardening, agriculture and woodwork. Inspector Bird concluded the memorandum, on behalf of the Director, with the modest expectation that:

The Department wishes to emphasise that the main functions of the Native Schools is unchanged, namely, to teach the Maoris as much

1125 Tokomaru Bay School Committee, History of the East Coast Native Schools, Alexander Turnbull Library, Wellington, 1924.
1126 Inspection Report, 16 August 1929. BAAA 1001/1012a, 44/6. ANZ-A. DB.
1127 Inspection Report, 28 July 1930. Ibid. DB.
1128 Inspection Report, 27 October 1931. Ibid. DB.
English as possible and sufficient Arithmetic for simple business purposes.\textsuperscript{1129}

And despite the apparent promise of Ball’s appointment, problems of low expectation on the part of teachers, leading to low standards, still persisted in some classes or schools. The Waiomatatini Log Book records a new teacher in 1936 finding the ‘infant room in a shocking state. P.1 only starting reading. Tiny tots instead of finishing First Programme, no number work-no stories. P.2 using First Programme and should be reading Third Programme. Number work very poor have to take them for number work at P.1. P.3 Reading 3\textsuperscript{rd} Programme should be reading 5\textsuperscript{th} Programme.\textsuperscript{1130}

In compiling his Annual Examination Report in December 1932 the Head Teacher at Tuparoa, W.Timms, wrote ‘Note with regard to retardation. ‘Every pupil but one both lists’, by which he meant every pupil but one in the standards, ‘is a retardate according to the scale. I believe the main reason for this is that most of the children have spent an unduly long period in the preparatory division’.\textsuperscript{1131}

And, in 1936 the Head of Horoera’s Annual Examination Report listed the work in most of the upper standards as ‘Good’ or ‘Very Good’, yet no pupil was enrolled in S.6 out of 31 in the school, and only one pupil was in S.5.\textsuperscript{1132}

Similarly at Rangitukia in 1938, no pupils were in S.6 out of a total enrolment of 144. Nine were in S.5 and eight in S.4. Yet the inspection reports on the school at this time were generally very favourable, and make no suggestions to teachers that more children should be advanced to the higher standards.\textsuperscript{1133}

\textsuperscript{1129} Bird to Head Teachers of Native Schools, 9 June 1931. BAAA 1001/141f, 44/1/66, Experimental Timetables. ANZ-A. DB.
\textsuperscript{1130} Waiomatatini Log Book, 3 November 1936. YCAK 1366/1a. ANZ-A. DB.
\textsuperscript{1131} Teacher’s Annual Examination Report, 16 December 1932. Ibid. DB.
\textsuperscript{1132} Annual Examination Report, 31 December 1936. BAAA 1001/934a, 44/6. ANZ-A. DB.
\textsuperscript{1133} Annual Classification Return, 16 December 1939. BAAA 1001/1012a, 44/6. ANZ-A. DB.
7.3.2 Increased Expectations and Progress.

However greater progress by more pupils began to be evident in some schools during the 1940s, coinciding with the steady appointment of more Maori as teachers in the schools. At Hiruharama in 1944, 38 pupils were enrolled in S.4-S.6 (8 in S.6); 33 in S.2-S.3; 19 in P.4-S.1 and 40 in P.1-P.3.1134

There were also signs that new Inspectors to the Maori School service had higher expectations than their predecessors of the level of work they wanted from both teachers and pupils. At Mangatuna in 1946 the Inspector, H.B.Holst, wrote that ‘The general standard of work needs to be raised in the senior classes, although the organisation and the plan of work which is very well prepared should result in a higher standard of achievement in future’.1135

In 1948 a new Senior Inspector of Maori Schools, W.Parsonage, and a colleague commented in a report on Rangitukia that there was ‘serious retardation in the school and measures must be taken to eliminate this as soon as possible’.1136

At Waiomatatini in 1952 the Inspector advised the Head that ‘In general a raising of levels of attainment in the standard classes is desirable and it is suggested that a close check by the head teacher of the work throughout the school be kept in order to help individual teachers in their attempts to raise standards’.1137

In a report on Forms 1 and 2 at Horoera in 1952 the Inspector, W. Goodwin, commented that there were several children in the classes who had been ‘promoted rapidly in an endeavour to overcome the serious amount of backwardness in the school. This policy has been successful in that the children are now working to capacity, and show enthusiasm for their work’.1138

---

1134 Inspection Report, 21 July 1944. AAA 1001/933b. ANZ-A. DB.
1135 Inspection Report, 1 October 1946. BAAA 1001/951b. ANZ-A. DB.
1136 Inspection Report, 27 July 1948. BAAA 1001/1012b, 44/6. ANZ-A. DB.
1138 Inspection Report, W.B.Goodwin, 12 March 1952. BAAA 1001/1013a, 44/6. ANZ-A. DB.
Higher expectations were also evident in a report on the primary division of the Tikitiki Maori District High school in 1957, the Inspector noting: ‘Stds. 2 and 3 Much still remains to be done to raise the general standard of attainment to levels commensurate with the children’s potential ability. I would stress the necessity of setting high standards of work in the basic subjects and sparing no effort in securing their achievement. Std. 4. ‘These pupils are capable of being much further extended’.  

7.4 Other Factors Affecting Learning.

7.4.1 Attendance at School

The 1877 Education Act introduced compulsory primary education but exempted Maori children from any obligation to comply either in the Board of Native Schools. It was not until the School Attendance Act 1894 was passed that Maori children from age 7 to 14 years were required to attend Native schools if they were available, but no compulsion was still brought to bear upon children living in districts where there were no such schools. It was not until 1903 that the Minister of Education published regulations compelling Maori children to enrol at a Board school if there was no Native school near at hand.  

The absence of compulsion, combined with other factors discussed below, was another hugely influential reason why many hundreds of East Coast Maori children did not attend school, or attended only irregularly, much more frequently and later than their European counterparts.

---

1139 Inspection Report, 7 November 1957. BAAA 1001/1057b. ANZ-A. DB.
7.4.2  East Coast Native/Maori Primary Schools and Attendance.

My research revealed that over the history of the East Coast Maori schools an innumerable of school hours would have been lost, with all the negative implications for learning this involved, as the result of school closures or non-attendance for a range of reasons including:

- Illness
- Teacher vacancies remaining unfilled
- Poor teaching giving children little positive inducement to attend.
- The rigidly enforced assimilation policy which contributed to the atmosphere of the typical school being an alien one for Maori children.
- The poor physical state of many of the buildings in which instruction took place.
- A sometimes very ‘laid-back’ attitude on the part of officials to whether Maori pupils attended or not.

The Department of Education’s Inspection Schedule form included a category on the ‘Number (approximately) of children of school age who might attend school but do not’, which the Inspector was required to complete It provided an indication of the significant number of Maori children still not attending school in some East Coast districts. But the Inspectors’ reports, even into the 1890s, rarely made any additional comment regarding this, in terms of speculating about the reasons for it, or suggesting that something needed to be done about it. The official attitude appeared to persist that the initiative regarding such a matter should still come from Maori.

At Tuparoa in 1889 the number recorded as not attending was 30 but no further comment was made.1141

---

1141 Inspection Schedule, 15 March 1889. BAAA 1001/1063b.ANZ-A. DB.
At Tokomaru Bay in the early 1890s, the Inspector generally wrote 30 in this category. In 1892, for example, he wrote ‘30, perhaps’. The number of children on the roll at the time was 48. No further comment was made about the need for action to enrol the non-enrolled children.1142

At Tiki Tiki in 1894 Inspector Pope entered 17 children.1143

Amongst the factors hindering the attendance of Maori pupils were:

- Poverty and the need to have older children stay at home to help keep a family going.
- Poor or inadequate location of schools requiring long distances to attend.
- Limited physical infrastructure which made access to schools difficult, including the absence of bridges across rivers, and roads which became impassable in bad weather.
- Seasonal labour demands such as shearing and harvesting which sometimes required whole families to follow work away from their home district and for the children to assist.

Several of these causes have been touched on in earlier chapters. Below I present amore detailed discussion of illness, which was one of the most serious causes of non-attendance.

At Tokomaru Bay in 1879 wet weather resulted in a ‘great deal of sickness, producing first severe colds succeeded by whooping cough and low fever…3 deaths have occurred and many are still ill with the cough which as you are aware is most distressing. Our cottage at times was more like a dispensary, 7 and 8 at a time bringing their children for medicine and advice’.1144 Later in the year the Inspector reported that ‘The very large amount of sickness brought on by want of proper food

1142 Inspection Report, Tokomaru, 27 April 1892. BAAA 1001/652b. ANZ-A. DB.
1143 Inspection Report, Tiki Tiki, 17 April 1894. BAAA 1001/640c. ANZ-A. DB.
1144 Teacher to Native Minister, 19 July 1879. BAAA 1001/652a. ANZ-A. DB.
reduces the attendance at present to almost nothing’. In October the Teacher attributed the decrease in attendance to ‘severe illness’ which had visited Tokomaru Bay and other places on the Coast; nearly every child in the Bay had been ill with whooping cough and bronchitis and there had been several deaths.

In June 1891, the Teacher at Tuparoa advised the Secretary of an outbreak of Enteric fever amongst the children, two deaths had occurred within the previous fortnight and three older boys were seriously ill, leading the Secretary to approve the closing of the school for two weeks.

In his report on Tuparoa on the 25th of April the following year the Inspector wrote that ‘the fever epidemic has been especially severe here’, with many people having died. Both Teachers had been ill and while they ‘should with due care recover, I am afraid that it will be a long time before they will be able to open school. Perhaps it will be a month’.

It is ironic, in view of the regularity with which Inspector Pope lectured Maori on the connection between their living conditions and ill-health, that on this occasion he wrote a separate ‘Note on Sanitary Condition of school house and residence at Tuparoa’, in which he pointed out that it had been suggested to him that the frequent and lengthy illness at the School was ‘owing to the unsanitary condition of the buildings and outhouses. It was suggested also that the tanks, closets etc ought to be thoroughly cleaned and that the whole establishment should be fumigated’, an idea he thought worth considering.

The Teachers at Tuparoa were also affected, with the continuing illness of one or other of them and their children meaning that the school remained closed until 1 August.

---

1145 Inspection Report, Tokomaru Bay, Captain Gudgeon, to Secretary of Education, 16 September 1879. Ibid. DB.
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At Whangara in 1903 an epidemic of measles meant only three children were attending, leading the Committee to recommend that the school be closed for a period. The Secretary of Education, George Hogben, replied that if the Teacher after consulting the Committee, thought it advisable to close he should do so, but the Department did not generally favour closing on account of measles because it was ‘impossible to isolate children outside whereas inside school they are at least warm and dry. It is of course understood that infected children or children from infected homes do not attend’. The school was not re-opened until 27 May.

At Tokomaru Bay in 1908 the Teacher reported that the school flag had been lowered for the death of another pupil, ‘this making the seventh fatality from enteric fever this season, while so far as I can gather the total cases is 29’.

In April 1911 the Teacher at Whareponga reported the deaths of two pupils from typhoid fever, and also one of the previous year’s pupils from the same cause.

An outbreak of typhoid fever led the Health Department to recommend that Hiruharama School be closed on 22 May 1911, and it was not reopened until 12 June.

At the recently opened Mangatuna Native School in 1913, the attendance ‘for the first few weeks was affected by sickness, typhoid being prevalent; subsequently an epidemic of measles and mumps kept children away’.

In 1916 Whareponga was closed for 4 consecutive school weeks because of illness, it was then reopened for four weeks, and then closed again for another 6 weeks as a result of flooding (See Chapter 2).

---
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On 9 March 1916 the Head advised the Secretary that with measles prevalent he was closing the school for a week; he subsequently advised he was closing the school for a second week, and following that, on 26 March, with ‘measles now practically in every home I will arrange to re-open school as soon as I find the children are fit to attend’. 1158

On April 3 he reported making another effort to open the school, but as only three families had turned up, and other parents had advised that their children were not yet well enough to attend, he had closed the school for another week. 1159 The school was eventually re-opened on 10 April.

At Mangatuna in 1918 an Inspector took the drastic step of recommending that ‘the school be regularly sprayed with sheep dip’ because of an outbreak of a skin infection since floods over the previous two years. One can only speculate as to whether a similar recommendation would have been made if the school had been a Board one attended by Pakeha children. 1160 However the Teacher, Mr Scammell, was rather more sympathetic, writing to the District Health Officer who requested the Hawke’s Bay Pharmacy to ‘send the necessary supply of ointment’ he had asked for. 1161

On the 6th of November attendance at Mangatuna was temporarily suspended because of an outbreak of influenza throughout the whole community. 1162 It was not until the 15th of November that the school was reopened, but because the thirteen who attended were not fit to do so, attendance was further suspended ‘till Monday next’. 1163

In December 1920 the Mangatuna Head sent a telegram to the Department that ‘More than half school away influenza those present sickening temperatures. Have closed today will reopen next week if children fit’. 1164

In 1920 Tokomaru Bay School ‘has been closed for some weeks for influenza’. 1165

1158 Scammell to Education Department, 9, 21, and 26 March, 1916. BAAA 100/348b. ANZ-A. DB.
1159 Scammell to Secretary, 3 April 1916. Ibid. DB.
1160 Examination Report, Mangatuna, 3 October 1918. BAAA 1001/307b. ANZ-A. DB.
1161 District Health Office to Director, 15 October 1918. Ibid. DB.
1162 Teacher, Managatuna, to Education Department 6 November 1918. Ibid. DB.
1163 Teacher, Managatuna, to Education Department, 15 November 1918. Ibid. DB.
1164 Teacher, Managatuna, to Education Department, 9 December 1920. Ibid. DB.
At Tikitiki the Inspector reported in 1927 that ‘The work has been much interfered with by epidemics of mumps and measles’.1166

At Horoera in 1927 a newly appointed Teacher reported that since taking up his duties the attendance had gradually been decreasing owing to the prevalence of whooping cough; ‘On 28th November measles broke out and there are now 6 families affected. The attendance from 5 to 9 December was nil’.1167

In 1931 the Head at Horoera advised the Department that District Nurse North had arrived, and during Saturday afternoon and Sunday they had together visited all the homes in the district and found that ‘all excepting one were infected with whooping cough….Nurse North thinks it would be advisable to close the school but Dr Turbott with whom Nurse communicated by telephone thinks that no good purpose would be served by so doing.

The question is, is it worthwhile holding school for five pupils, especially as we have infection at the school-house?’ He was told to close the school and reopen it at the earliest possible date, and on 4 July advised the Director that he has done so and intended re-opening on 20 July.1168

An outbreak of measles seriously affected the attendance at Tikitiki in 1933, with 58 children absent out of a role of 134, and the Head was advised by the Medical Officer of Health that closing the school would have no effect in lessening the epidemic.1169 Twelve months later the Head advised the Director that owing to the prevalence of

1165 Examination Report, Tokomaru, 23 August 1920. BAAA 1001/654b. ANZ-A. DB.
1167 Head, to Director, 15 December 1927. BAAA 1001/934a, ANZ-A. DB.
1168 Head to Director, 28 June 1931. Ibid. DB.
1169 Head to Director, 11 December 1933. BAAA 1001/ 1056a. ANZ-A. DB.
influenza during the term it would be impossible to maintain the average attendance required for the school to retain its Grade 4a status.\textsuperscript{1170}

In 1938 alone the following East Coast Schools were closed for varying periods on the specific instructions of the Medical Officer of Health due to an epidemic of measles: Anaura Bay; Whakaangangi; Tikiti; Waipro Bay; Wairongomai; Rangitukia.\textsuperscript{1171}

Teachers and their families as well as the pupils were also affected by illness which not infrequently also led to school closures. At the recently opened Mangatuna School in 1914 the Assistant Teacher, who was also the Head Teacher’s wife, had periods of absence ranging from two weeks to four months due to a recurring nervous breakdown, and was only able to work on a half-time basis during part of 1915. The Head Teacher covered for her during these absences.\textsuperscript{1172} The Head Teacher himself was absent for 12 schools days in October 1914 due to Influenza.\textsuperscript{1173}

During 1931 and 1932 attendance at Tuparoa was seriously affected by illness, including the school being closed for a week in November 1932 by order of the Health Department, due to an outbreak of diphtheria, a closure which was further extended when the Teacher’s family became ill and all four of his children were admitted to hospital.\textsuperscript{1174}

\section*{7.4.3 Other Factors Affecting Attendance}

Education officials including those in the head office of the Department, inspectors and teachers were often quick to blame Maori parents when non-attendance occurred. This was frequently either unfair or unjustified as in the following example. In his inspection report on Tokomaru Bay in September 1880, Pope wrote of the Teacher

\begin{footnotesize}
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that he ‘knows nothing about the art of teaching’, and criticised very poor results in the basic subjects.\textsuperscript{1175}

Yet two months later the same Teacher advised the Minister that ‘There are at least 50 children in this neighbourhood who could attend school were there sufficient influence and parental authority brought to bear. Many of the parents are totally indifferent as to the future of their offspring and make the school a matter of secondary consideration’.\textsuperscript{1176}

The other factors referred to at the beginning of this chapter also affected attendance. At Tuparoa in 1892 the Teacher reported a falling-off in the attendance caused by ‘many parents taking their children to assist in the shearing sheds and preparing for grass seeding’.\textsuperscript{1177}

At Tikitiki in 1879 a fall in attendance had been partly caused by the failure of the crops resulting in some of the children having to ‘seek their own food in the bush and elsewhere’.\textsuperscript{1178}

At Tokomaru Bay in 1891 heavy rain and ‘the grass seeding work” had combined to almost empty school at the examination.\textsuperscript{1179}

The Teacher at Tokomaru Bay attributed a decline in attendance in 1881 to the opening of the Land Court at Tolaga Bay, with many adults leaving to attend and taking their children with them, or sending them away to be looked after in other settlements.\textsuperscript{1180}

The Teacher at Horoera, having closed the school due to illness in 1931, advised the Director that during the closure he had visited homes distributing medicine and giving what advice he could and had found that:

\textsuperscript{1175} Inspection Report, 1 September 1880. BAAA 1001/652a. ANZ-A. DB.
\textsuperscript{1176} Teacher Tokomaru, to Minister, 5 November 1880. Ibid. DB.
\textsuperscript{1177} Head to Secretary, 16 December 1892. BAAA 1001/1063b. ANZ-A. DB.
\textsuperscript{1178} Teacher to Native Minister, 1 February 1879. BAAA 1001/ 652a. ANZ-A. DB.
\textsuperscript{1179} AJHR 1891, E-2, p.8.
\textsuperscript{1180} Teacher to Secretary, 8 October 1881. BAAA 1001/652a. ANZ-A. DB.
Some of the homes are indeed very poor and in one case I found appalling conditions. The mother and eight children living in a shanty, no bigger than 8ft x10ft-no fire place no windows-flax mats stretched on mud floor. Children are not sufficiently clad and as far as I can gather not properly fed. It appears that the store will not give the father food – he being heavily in debt. I believe the father is working off a debt in the bush.1181

When I analysed a sample of the reasons given for pupils leaving the Te Araroa Native School between 1899-1902 the results were: Left for home work; Taken away for work; Left-home work; Taken away on account of distance; Left through ill-health; Deceased; Gone to Victoria School; Gone to work; Gone to work; Left school having passed Std IV; Left school for home work; Left school for farm work; Deceased; At work; Gone to work; Gone to work; Left home work; Left ill; Left at work. Records of the Standard the pupil had reached at the point of leaving were not complete, but those available showed that no leaver had progressed further than S.4 and many had left after S.2 or S.3.1182

The distance many children had to travel to school, and roads and streams which became impassable in bad weather, were other factors which often negatively affected attendance. In August 1927 the Director wrote to the Teacher at Horoera, noting that the school had been closed on 21 April and 8, 20, and 21 June, ‘owing to storms and floods’, and drew his attention to clauses of the Regulations relating to Native Schools advising that a school should not be closed for this reason. Did he, in accordance with Clause 11, ‘afford the children the opportunity to be present at the School? Did any children, including your own, come to school on those days and did you send any of them home? Presumably your own children at any rate could have attended?1183

In 1923 Paratene Ngata, Chairman of the Waiomatatini School Committee, wrote to the Department repeating an earlier request that a part of the school ground be set aside for the horses of pupils, some of whom had to travel a distance of over three

1181 Head to Director, 15 July 1931. BAAA 1001/934a. ANZ-A. DB.
1182 BAAA 1004/9h. ANZ-A.
1183 Director to Head, 5 August 1927. BAAA 1001/934a. ANZ-A. DB.
miles. The horses were currently being kept on the side of the road. The absence of suitable ground had inflicted undue hardship on the pupils and given rise to complaints from parents against the Committee.1184 But upon receipt of an earlier similar request by the previous Chairman, the Director had replied that the grazing on the side of the old road was adequate and ‘the Department does not undertake to provide grazing facilities for horses’.1185

Legal proceedings were not infrequently initiated by Head Teachers and Departmental officials for non-attendance, and in 1935 the Head of Horoera requested the Department to take this action against some parents. However on this occasion the Director took a practical approach, pointing out that ‘in view of the absence of roads and the presence of streams it is doubtful whether legal measures could be taken to compel the attendance of any of the children…it would be useless to threaten proceedings if the threat could not be put into effect… The Department…can only hope that by the co-operation of the Committee and by making the school as attractive as possible you will be able to bring about an improvement in the attendance of the children referred to in your letter.1186

In 1943, when the Head of Horoera analysed the various causes of non-attendance at the school, he came up with the following:

1. Locality: Described as ‘the chief cause’; 24 of the 29 pupils on the roll had to ride from 2 to 4 miles to school. Twelve had rivers to cross which flooded very rapidly making them dangerous for the children to cross.

2. Health: He described an epidemic of mumps through the school in the previous term and other health difficulties.

3. Home circumstances: Harvesting, planting, farm work. ‘This small district has been badly drained of its manpower (1942) The few men not overseas or in camp are all volunteers and are waiting their call to attend camp. The farm work is falling more and more to the children’.1187

1184 Chairman to Senior Inspector, 18 August 1923. BAAA 1001/697a. ANZ-A. DB.
1185 Director to Pahoe Morete, 29 July 1921. Ibid. DB.
1186 Acting Director to Head, 4 December 1935. BAAA 1001/934a. ANZ-A. DB.
1187 September, BAAA 1001/934a, 44/6. ANZ-A. DB.
He then lists the names of pupils who are regularly absent, the number of days missed and the reasons—which are mainly a combination of illness and weather.  

Difficulties persisted in some districts well into the 1950s. Long-standing difficulties of access impeded attendance at the Waiomatatini Maori School, caused particularly by the lack of a bridge over the Mangatakawa Creek on the Ruatoria-Waiomatatini Road, which made the running of the school bus doubtful on wet days. In June 1952, 82 children travelled by bus to and from the school, with nearly fifty of them coming from the Tikapa end which was most affected, with the parents not willing to have the young children walk on wet days when the bus could not run. The Committee resolved to write to the Department and the County Council requesting a bridge.

However the Waiapu County Council replied that because of the difficulty of securing bridging materials from overseas it could give no guarantee that the bridge would be built in the coming financial year.

The Waiomatatini Maori School Log Book provides an example of how, even into the 1950s weather affected attendance:

3 July: Very wet day following severe weekend flood. Bus could not run at all owing to flooded creek. Mangatakawa, and washouts and slips on road between here and the school.
4 July: Road still blocked and bus unable to run. Miss Strongman (teacher) absent.
14 July: Heavy rain last night blocked road on Tikapa Hill and bus was unable to negotiate the hill today.
18 July: Ridiculously small attendance today. Weather very cold and wet.
19 July: Small attendance today.
20 July: Small attendance today.
2 October: No bus this morning. Mangatakawa Creek impassable.
5 October: Heavy rain throughout day. Roads impassable. No bus, no children and no school.
18 October: Roads impassable. No bus.

---

1188 Ibid;
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19 October. Bus ran again. Nearly capsized in storm water ditch at the Koheretawa Crossing.

6 November. Very heavy rain between 6 and 9 am. today following flood on Saturday caused many parents to keep children at home.

20 November. Very heavy rain. Very few children present.1191

In 1955 attendance at Mangatuna on inspection day was ‘seriously affected by inclement weather and by the hazardous nature of part of the road over which the children walk’.1192

At Potaka, also in 1955, the Head reported ‘For the last 3 weeks no trucks have been available to bring the children to school and I do not think they will be running again. This means that two families of seven children (total14) have attended once in that period…The children that do come are at the mercy of the weather and on two wet days our total roll was 6 and 5’. He reported that for the first 9 weeks of the year the average attendance of the 42 pupils enrolled had been 21.25; 27.4; 36;28. 6;35; 33.2; 21.8; 26.4; 21.2., a situation he acknowledged was ‘anything but satisfactory’.1193

On inspection day at Potaka in the following year, only 18 pupils were present out of a total roll of 42, but it was ‘appreciated that at times the conveyance service could not operate owing to the state of the roads’.1194

In 1959 the Head of Horoera reported that no pupil had attended the school on 6 October because of the flooded state of the creeks; the bus not being able to cross them and the creek close to the school was too swift and deep for the children to wade across.1195

At Horoera in 1962 H.J.Dewes, the long-serving Chairman of the School Committee and school bus driver, also owned a horse which enabled the post-primary pupils to cross the Awatere River; and he described how ‘Two children rode the horse over,
then one took the horse back until all the children were on the Te Araroa side of the river. The same procedure was adopted in the afternoons.\textsuperscript{1196}

It was mentioned earlier that Inspectors and Teachers had a tendency to blame Maori parents if their children did not attend school. Yet the evidence is that many East Coast Maori parents went to extraordinary efforts to have schools built and their children enrolled in them, often against huge odds of limited finances and extreme distances between home and school, and most Maori parents were as keen as any others to have their children attend school regularly. Chairman and other members of Maori School Committees often played an extremely valuable role from the beginning of the Native School system in helping to maintain attendance as was also pointed out earlier. In the Department’s annual report in 1899 Pope wrote that:

Any report on Tikitiki would be incomplete if it failed to make mention of the Chairman, Mr Te Rua Huihui. Although Te Rua has been singularly unfortunate in losing member after member of his family through death, he yet, in the most self-denying way, continues to work earnestly and efficiently in order to keep the Tikitiki attendance constantly up to the mark.\textsuperscript{1197}

Similarly, in a report on Hiruharama in 1904, Inspector William Bird wrote that:

Renata Apuwai one of the chief men in the kaainga has played the part of truant officer to this school for some months past. He deserves the highest commendation for his work. He is the local chairman of council and the dept. could not find a more suitable man for truant officer. I think the Dept might acknowledge his work—that is to say simply write a letter of appreciation to him.\textsuperscript{1198}

In 1932 the Chairman of the Rangitukia School Committee, Tipi Kaa, wrote to the Secretary of Justice enquiring about the validity of the Committee’s own by-law to enforce attendance. This imposed a fine of two shillings and sixpence per day for the absence of any child, but although there had been several cases of absenteeism and notice had been given in writing to the parents concerned, the Committee had never

\textsuperscript{1196} Secretary Hawke’s Bay Education Board to Maori Schools Officer, 23 March 1962. BAAA 1001/934b, 44/6. ANZ-A. DB.
\textsuperscript{1197} Pope Report on Tikitiki. AJHR 1899, E-2, p.9.
\textsuperscript{1198} Inspection Report, 30 September 1904. BAAA 1001/246a. ANZ-A. DB.
been able to collect the fine. The Chairman asked what the position would be with regard to a claim being made in court for the amount of the fines owed by ‘various defaulting parents’?\textsuperscript{1199}

The letter was forwarded to the Director of Education who replied that fines under the Committee’s by-law were not enforceable, but the Department hoped it would continue its efforts to ‘compel defaulters to send their children to school regularly, and in any really bad cases the Head-teacher should report them to the Department.\textsuperscript{1200}

\textsuperscript{1199} Chairman to Under-Secretary of Justice, 28 October 1932. BAAA 1001/1012a, 44/6.
\textsuperscript{1200} Director to Chairman, 11 October, 1932. Ibid. DB.
CHAPTER 8: TEACHING

A sort of asylum for broken down people who have tried everything else and failed—men who have spent their substance in riotous living and drunkenness—a place where such men might find an asylum and a refuge.

The Native Minister, John Sheehan, in a Parliamentary speech criticising the quality of the teachers being appointed to the Native schools.\textsuperscript{1201}

The Native School teachers consisted ‘For the most part of persons who were quite inexperienced as teachers when they took up the work, and that, besides this, they were selected on no very definite principle, except such as results from a general desire to obtain the most intelligent and trustworthy people’.

James Pope in the Education Department’s Annual Report to Parliament in 1892.\textsuperscript{1202}

He concluded that teachers could do more for Maori children of higher intelligence, average ability and less than average ability, and considered that there was a tendency by teachers to ‘give little attention to a child once the teacher has decided the child is dull’.

Report by Maori School Inspector, 1952 (Author’s emphasis).\textsuperscript{1203}

8.1 Introduction

Finding enough suitable teachers for primary schools was a fairly widespread problem generally in New Zealand education, at least prior to 1900, and particularly in rural areas. Dr John Ewing described the schools even after the passing of the 1877 Education Act, as often being in charge of men who had failed at other occupations,
and had taken on teaching as a last resort, a comment which applies particularly to the Native Schools.  

Wherever possible the Education Department appointed only married men to Native Schools, with their wives often acting as an assistant or the sewing mistress. The 1880 Native School Code laid down that ‘as a rule the duties of the teacher should not be confined to the mere school instruction of the Maori children. On the contrary, it is expected that then teachers will by their kindness, their diligence, and their probity, exercise a beneficial influence on all the natives in the district’.  

A circular forwarded to all Native School teachers in 1880 by the Education Secretary John Hislop, in 1880, on the instructions of the Minister of Education, wanted them to project an ideal of European domesticity that could be copied in that:

Besides giving due attention to the school instruction of the children, teachers will be expected to exercise a beneficial influence on the natives, old and young; to show by their own conduct that it is possible to live a useful and blameless life, and in smaller matters, by their dress, in their houses, and by their manners and habits at home and abroad, to set the Maoris an example that they may advantageously imitate.

The staffing of the Native Schools was often haphazard, particularly during the early years. with appointments ranging from teachers who would have been graded ‘Excellent’ or ‘Very Good’ on any contemporary measure, to incapable misfits. Sheehan, in making the critical comment above, regarded the poor quality of many of the teachers as the major factor impeding the progress of the schools during the first decade.  

After his appointment as organizing Inspector of Native Schools in 1880 Pop, while he regarded many of the Native teachers as having the desired attitude, acknowledged in 1882 that there were ‘undoubtedly some who should seek more congenial employment. Unless a teacher has really friendly feelings for the Natives, and takes a

---
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strong professional interest in teaching their children, his work must be extremely
dreary and irksome’. He could have added that it could hardly have been very
good for the pupils either!

A year later he commented that whereas an inadequate teacher in a Board school
could be replaced, in a Native School he could ‘easily cause the utter and final ruin of
the school, and render its re-establishment impossible’, on the grounds that:

If the natives have a master sent to them by the Government, and he
treats the children cruelly and misbehaves himself, the Maoris
conclude that, as he is probably a fair specimen of what schoolmasters
generally are, they would rather manage to rub along without one, that
education is a great mistake, and that they will have no more of it.

Pope may have been correct about this in some instances, but my own reading of the
records leads me to the view that this underestimates the role played by many Maori
school committees and parents. When confronted as they not infrequently were by
teachers of the kind described, some often took whatever fairly limited steps they
could, usually unsuccessfully, to try to have them removed and replaced, by letter
writing to officials or various forms of peaceful non-co-operation rather than
passively turning their back on the schools.

The educational historian Dr Colin McGeorge analysed the status, qualifications and
mobility of teachers in the Native schools between 1880 and 1920. He pointed out
that the majority of male teachers in education board schools entered teaching through
the pupil-teacher system, whereas those in Native schools entered as adults from a
variety of other occupations. In the 20th century they ‘were classified according to the
same general scheme as other teachers, but remained, as a group, woefully ill-
qualified by that criterion’. According to McGeorge teaching in a Native school
for much of the period he analysed was ‘commonly a cottage industry for amateurs
and their families’. He also demonstrated that assistant teachers in Native Schools

1208 AJHR 1882, E-2, p.4.
1209 AJHR 1883, E-3, pp.6-7.
1210 C. McGeorge, ‘The Mobility, Status and Qualifications of Native School Teachers 1880-1920,
were paid ‘far less than their counterparts in other schools’; in the 1890’s female assistants in Native Schools were not only paid less, on average, than assistants in education board schools ‘but actually paid less than pupil-teachers in those schools’. He speculates that possible reasons for this were the Department of Education driving ‘a hard bargain’, or its view that they were ‘de facto’ teachers and should be paid accordingly.

Inferior pay, the poor physical condition of many of the schools and teacher residences, the expectation that teachers would undertake a wide range of extracurricular activities in areas such as health, the isolation of many of the schools, exhaustion or ill-health, undoubtedly contributed to resignations. Pope’s report on one school in 1883 referred to the need for a teacher to be appointed who was ‘someone of a tougher mould-half teacher half bushman would be the man’.

In the Department of Education’s annual report to Parliament as late as 1892, Pope commented that the Native School teachers consisted ‘For the most part of persons who were quite inexperienced as teachers when they took up the work, and that, besides this, they were selected on no very definite principle, except such as results from a general desire to obtain the most intelligent and trustworthy people.

In 1905 the member of Parliament for Northern Maori, Hone Heke, suggested in Parliament that the Native School system was ‘practically a waste of money’ because the schools were not provided with certificated teachers.

Apirana Ngata also expressed concern in Parliament in 1906 that Native School teachers were insufficiently paid. He said he had noticed that despite their remote and varied role, 80 percent of them received below £100 per annum, taking into consideration the wives of teachers. He was supported by the member for the Bay of Plenty who drew an acknowledgement from the Education Minister that some of the
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teachers were, indeed, ‘miserably underpaid’, and their pay would be increased in view of the value of their work outside the classroom.\textsuperscript{1217}

The difficulties arising from the Wellington-based administrative structure referred to earlier, also affected aspects of teacher appointment, role and, where necessary, dismissal. And usually for the worse, as shall be demonstrated in the discussion of the East Coast schools below. Another source of difficulty, also accentuated by distance, was the tendency of Education Department officials not to take it seriously when the Maori members of a School Committees complained about a teacher, or expressed a wish for a particular person they favoured to be considered.

Although Pope introduced a system of in-service examinations to assist teachers improve their qualifications and grading, the lack of training of many of the teachers in Native Schools remained a serious handicap to progress for many years, and only gradually improved. By December 1931, when the Native School system had been in operation for 64 years, of the 222 adult teachers, only 63.5 were certificated, and special training of any kind for teachers in Native schools was still not considered necessary.\textsuperscript{1218}

The situation did improve during the 1930s to the point where, in 1939, 86 percent of teachers were certificated.\textsuperscript{1219}

\section{8.2 Corporal Punishment.}

Corporal punishment was used widely in primary schools in New Zealand during the 19\textsuperscript{th} and much of the 20\textsuperscript{th} century. In a circular issued to teachers in Native schools in 1880 the Education Secretary advised them that the discipline in Native Schools should be ‘mild but firm’, and ‘You should, if possible, avoid inflicting corporal punishment’ When it was administered, teachers were required to enter the name of

\textsuperscript{1218} Barrington and Beaglehole, p.151.
\textsuperscript{1219} AJHR, 1940, E-3, p.5.
the child, the reasons, and the number of strokes of strap or cane in the school’s log book.1220

Log book entries were not, however, a guarantee that all such punishments were recorded, because research has shown that in schools where physical punishment is used to enforce discipline, as it was in many of the Native (and later Maori) schools, there is a tendency to under-report its use.1221

However the Inspectors, and Pope in particular, generally encouraged teachers to follow the official advice, and those they felt were relying too heavily on corporal punishment were admonished. Nevertheless, despite this, the records show that the approach of the teachers ranged widely. Some appeared to rarely resort to corporal punishment, while for others it was almost a daily ritual. Log books record it being given for a wide range of offences, including ‘talking’ or ‘whispering’ in class, disobedience, sulking, impudence, hitting other pupils, using or writing obscene words, interfering with or bullying other pupils, fighting, theft, cheating, vandalism, cheekiness, truancy etc.

8.3 Maori as Teachers

Although the ethnicity of teachers was not recorded in the list of teachers in the Education Department’s Annual Reports to Parliament, Maori were involved in the Native Schools as teachers in a variety of capacities virtually from the beginning of the system in 1867. Records suggest that Mrs Mary Tautari was the first and longest-serving Maori to take charge of a Native School, as sole-charge at Taumarere from 1875 until her death in 1906.1222

In 1898, when the House of Representatives requested a return of the numbers of Maori in teaching, the Inspector General W.J.Habens replied that no Maori were employed in education board schools and no “pure Maori” in a native school. There

1220 Circular Memorandum for Teachers in Native Schools, 4 June 1880.
were two “half-caste” in charge of Native schools and five assistants – three “half-caste and two “between European and half-caste” 1223.

Young Maori women who had gained some further education at one of the denominational boarding schools were frequently appointed as untrained junior assistants, and some of them also eventually entered the service as teachers. There were also Maori teachers with European name such as Hilda Paul, who was appointed Head at Matehitehi in 1904 and was succeeded by her sister Julia. 1224

The Department’s annual report for 1911 recoded that three schools ‘are now in charge of teachers who are themselves members of the Maori race and the Inspectors speak highly of their efficiency’. 1225 McGeorge estimates that there were between 20 to 25 Maori teachers in Native Schools in 1915, about 8-10 percent of all staff, most of them holding the position with least the status of Junior Assistant. 1226

More Maori qualified as primary school teachers after 1940, assisted by the introduction of the Maori quota amongst entrants to training colleges. 1227 Taking the years 1949-52, for example, in 1949, 44 Maori students were admitted, in 1950 (53), 1951, (59) and 1952 (52). In addition, more Maori were admitted under the various Emergency Training Schemes: in 1949 (2), 1950 (1), 1951 (18) and 1952 (10). Maori students also now qualified for third year studentships at the colleges that provided specialised training in an area of primary education. In 1950, these included Fred Graham and August Tapsell as art specialists, Monte Daniels physical education and, in 1952, Kathleen Harrison and John Hotere as art specialists, and Ratu Mataira in physical education. 1228

A majority of these trained teachers entered the Maori schools and as a result the percentage of Maori teachers employed in the service rose significantly. By 1951, the Department estimated that there were 106 Maori teachers in Maori schools. In 21
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1228 Brief review of Maori Education by E. Parsonage, Senior Inspector of Māori Schools. E2 1956/4b. Maori Education System 1949-56. ANZ-W.
schools all the assistant teachers were Maori, and in 10 schools the whole staff was Maori. Eleven schools had Maori head-teachers. Commenting on this, the Senior Inspector of Maori Schools, W. Parsonage raised the question of whether it was in the ‘best interests of the schools for this trend towards more Maori teachers to grow. We tend to take the view’, he advised Beeby, that ‘an admixture of Maoris and Pakeha is the best- the percentage of Maori teachers not to exceed say 50 percent’. He also suggested that with the large number of Maori now training as teachers, it was probably an opportune time to take steps to encourage them to take up appointments in board schools with large enrolments of Maori pupils, to help deal with what he described as ‘the Maori problem in these schools’. To ensure that Maori teachers applied for positions in board schools, he thought it might be necessary to advertise certain positions as special positions, requiring knowledge of Maori arts, crafts and language. If this were done, there would need to be safeguards against any tendency to segregate the Maori pupils under a Maori teacher from the rest of the school. But the presence of a Maori teacher on the staff of such board schools, who could take an interest in the Maori pupils and create a closer relationship between the school and Maori parents, would he believed be valuable.\textsuperscript{1229}

8.4 Teacher Expectations

It was pointed out earlier that in 1939 Peter Fraser the Minister of Education had expressed the educational philosophy of the Labour Government in an often-quoted statement that it was:

\begin{quote}
The Government’s objective, broadly expressed, is that every person whatever his level of academic ability, whether he be rich or poor, whether he live in town or country, has a right, as a citizen, to a free education of the kind for which he is best fitted and to the fullest extent of his powers.\textsuperscript{1230}
\end{quote}

But as the earlier discussion of the Native District High Schools showed, Education Department officials responsible for Maori education were very slow to adopt this

\begin{footnotes}
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philosophy when it came to the education of Maori children. It appears to have taken at least until the early 1950s for the Crown’s education officials to begin to affirm that Maori pupils should be treated equally with Europeans when it came to expectations, and preparation for entering the full range of occupations. And with this, came a new realization of the importance of also communicating this to teachers.

Expectations and perceptions held by teachers about Maori children were referred to in an 18-page report by a Maori school Inspector, W.A.Goodwin, in 1952. He wrote that from the outstanding contribution to society by many leading Maori, it was assumed that the range of potentialities of Maori children ‘is approximately the same as that of Europeans’.

But he also pointed out that on the basis of evidence available in the Department’s reports Maori children were still passing through the primary classes at a much older age than Europeans in board schools. Doubts existed, he wrote, as to whether certain groups of Maori children were being fully extended and therefore able to make the fullest contribution to society in general and the progress of the Maori race in particular. These groups included: (a) Maori children who were average for their particular group, not due to any absence of innate ability, but because of language difficulties, later age of commencing school, more irregular attendance and ill-health; (b) the Maori child who was below average ability and who tended to be left further behind in the primary school, and; (c) the Maori child of superior ability.

Goodwin had obtained and summarised assessments by teachers of the ability of Maori children in Maori schools. He had also asked teachers what they were doing, or thought they should be doing for the exceptionally bright child, and their response had been that they favoured wider and enriched work rather than rapid acceleration through the classes, which was in line with modern educational thought. However he had not found this to be the general practice, noting that he had seldom seen ‘references to the child of higher intelligence in a scheme of work, or work planned for this group in a work book’ (Author’s emphasis).

1231 Goodwin to the Senior Inspector of Maori Schools, 1 February, 1952. ANZ-W.
He concluded that teachers could do more for Maori children of higher intelligence, average ability and less than average ability, and considered that there was a tendency by teachers to 'give little attention to a child once the teacher has decided the child is dull' (Author’s emphasis).\textsuperscript{1233}

A Bulletin for Maori Schools had become one method adopted by Parsonage, to keep teachers informed, and in a 1952 issue he felt it necessary to remind them that it was now realised there was not nearly enough land owned by Maori left to enable all those who wished to become farmers to do so.\textsuperscript{1234}

And in a departure, finally, from the views held by virtually all of his predecessors, he added that ‘in fact there is little evidence to support the impression that a larger percentage of Maori males (as compared with European males) have the aptitude or desire for farming’. He acknowledged that this fact, combined with the increasing number of Maori entering the professions, particularly teaching and nursing, and unskilled or semi-skilled occupations:

\begin{quote}
Have made it necessary to re-evaluate educational policy…There is no longer any suggestion that, with proper education and training, Maoris cannot hold their own in the full range of occupations normally performed by Europeans. Educational facilities today must be such as will enable every Maori child to develop his innate abilities to the fullest extent, so that these Maori children will be able to accept employment in the greatest diversity of occupations, in accordance with their particular skills, knowledge and aptitudes.\textsuperscript{1235}
\end{quote}

Parsonage also felt it was now necessary to also inform teachers that the way in which the terms ‘practical education’ and ‘activity methods’ had been used in the past in relation to Maori education needed to be re-examined:

\begin{quote}
In the past many have interpreted “practical” as meaning that the Maori child is basically different from Pakeha children and that the Maori child needs an education which is mainly of a manual character. Such an interpretation is doubly faulty. It is a generalisation applied to
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{1233} Ibid, p.18.
\textsuperscript{1234} Bulletin for Maori Schools, no.2, 1952. E2 1956/4b. 29/2/27. Maori Education. ANZ-W. DB.
\textsuperscript{1235} Ibid;
all Maori children, and it is too narrow an interpretation of the term “practical”. There is no scientific evidence which would warrant our assuming that Maori children do not possess the same range of innate abilities and aptitudes as the children of any other race. There is no such person as “the average Maori child”. Maori children differ one from the other just as do the children of any other race. There are Maori children who are fitted to progress and profit from a verbal or academic type of education. There are others for whom the approach must be along more concrete or practical lines.1236

It strikes me as extraordinary that it took this late in time, 1952, for the Department’s senior official responsible for Maori education to acknowledge how limited and narrow the views of most earlier officials had been.

8.5 Teachers and the East Coast

The Crown’s own official records provide many examples of unsatisfactory performance and other problems relating to teaching in East Coast Native/Maori schools, sometimes with serious consequences for pupil learning. But I feel it is also important to emphasize that many of these problems were systemic, often arising from some of the limitations of the remote Wellington-based administration of the schools. The often negative effects of this cannot be minimized. But at the individual level the records also demonstrate examples of competent teachers, and others who were capable of improving after receiving negative inspection reports, who also won both the affection and respect of the people.

In a report on the Tokomaru Bay Native School in September 1880 Pope wrote that the Teacher, J. H. Broughton, ‘knows nothing about the art of teaching’, which was reflected in the poor results achieved by the pupils.1237 In February of the following year, 12 Tokomaru Maori sent a petition to the Native Office at Gisborne for forwarding to the Education Department, asking it to ‘remove the Master at Tokomaru’, because ‘he is indolent in teaching the children. That he has set up a store and that he trades on Sundays’, and ‘We further request that ‘a good conscientious

1236 Ibid, p.4.
1237 BAAA 1001/652a. ANZ-A. DB.
person may be sent as a Master for the school'. However in another example of the remoteness from Wellington administrative problem which affected the schools, Pope suggested one month later that ‘It might be well to ask Captain Preece from the Native Office at Napier to make enquiries when he next visits the district’ (Author’s emphasis).

But in an inspection visit on 28 March 1881, Pope found very positive developments had taken place since his earlier highly critical report, with ‘greater improvement at this school than any other I have visited as far as the methods are concerned’, the suggestions he had made in his earlier report, and the petition from residents having no doubt played some part in this.

The teacher himself wrote to the Education Secretary denying all the charges, which he attributed to resentment by some people wanting to charge him for the land on which he ran his horses. The matter was subsequently investigated by Captain Preece, who confirmed that while the Teacher had sold some articles to Maori, he had not run a store, and the person who had complained had withdrawn the charge of neglect of duty, saying they had no complaint to make in that respect.

In 1887 when Broughton advised the people that he was leaving, Wi Pewhairangi wrote on their behalf that they were ‘very pouri on account of what he said…this is the only master that the people here have been satisfied with owing to his being a christian, a teetotaller, and the efficient manner in which he taught the children This is therefore to inform you that we do not desire or wish the said teacher to leave Tokomaru’.

However Broughton did leave, and a new Teacher, P. H. Clemance, was appointed, with Miss Pahewa, formerly a pupil at Hukarere, as his Assistant. The initial response of the Tokomaru people to Clemance, who was new to Native School

---
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1242 Preece to Under-Secretary, 27 October 1881. Ibid.
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teaching, was also not positive. They described the school as now being in ‘a very unsatisfactory state’, which was ‘due to the master who does not instruct the children properly in writing, he does not correct their copies…Secondly the said master does not allow the Committee to inspect the school, and thirdly he does not punish the children when they misbehave’, and they requested that ‘a more qualified teacher be appointed, adding that ‘we shall never forget the master who went to Wairoa’. 1245

When the Education Secretary asked Clemance for an explanation for the disquiet, one of the reasons he gave was that the ‘calling of a roll of over 70 names in an unfamiliar tongue took up a great deal of time, part of which should have gone to supervision of the writing’. 1246

However his inspection reports also steadily improved as he gained more experience of the work. In a March 1889 Report the Inspector, H.Kirk, wrote that ‘It is clear that the very hardest and most conscientious work has been done. The defects noted in the methods have been compensated for by painstaking attention to individuals’, and ‘the school has certainly made decided and substantial progress during the year. The relations between teacher, scholars and parents are good’. 1247

In 1893 Tokomaru residents were so pleased with another teacher, J. McGavin, that they wrote to the Education Secretary to inform him: ‘Greeting. This is to tell you how delighted the people of Tokomaru are with the master now teaching the children… The parents now can see that the children are making progress. This master too allows the children to take books to their homes to learn their lessons with. This is a request of ours that this master be permanently appointed to the charge of this school’. 1248 And in his report on the school in 1901 Pope wrote that ‘The children show much esprit de corps and love for the school’. 1249

The people at Tikitiki were also very pleased with their Native School Teacher in 1899, Pope describing how:

1245 Wi Pewhairangi and others to Mr Lewis for forwarding to the Secretary for Education, 27 September 1887. Ibid. DB.
1246 Teacher to Secretary, 26 October 1887. Ibid. DB.
1247 Inspection Report, Tokomaru, 10 March 1889. BAAA 1001/652b. ANZ-A. DB.
1248 Mokenia Romio and others to Secretary, 20 February 1893. Ibid. DB.
After the examination was over a large and enthusiastic meeting was held in the school room. The people were quite unanimous in speaking in the highest terms of Mr Bone and his family; there only fear seemed to be that it might come about after a time that Mr Bone would have to be removed as other good teachers have been removed before him. On my assuring them that it was very unlikely that the Department would wish to remove Mr Bone again their satisfaction appeared to be complete.1250

Similarly at Hiruharama, having had a teacher appointed they liked, the people did not want to lose him:

This is to acquaint you with our wishes respecting the master now in charge of our school here at Hiruharama that he be stationed here for a lengthened period, if it is possible to do so, we have had proof of his good qualities. We suffer very much through the frequent removal of the masters of this school who are not stationary here for two or three years, consequently we and our children are in a state of uncertainty as we do not become acquainted with the new masters.1251

However one aspect of the system which appears to have been unsatisfactory was the reluctance of officials to deal promptly with teachers who was proving unsatisfactory, or even demonstrating gross negligence, even when it was having very negative outcomes for the pupils. The situation which arose at Rangitukia Native School in the 1930s provides a good example of this.

In an inspection report on the Head of Rangitukia in 1933, D. G. Ball wrote that ‘After your splendid all-round work of last year, the neglect and lack of interest you have displayed this year are almost inexcusable. Your workbook is a plain indication of an almost total lack of daily preparation. In Drawing, History, Geography, and Oral English, the instructions have been of a most haphazard nature, often omitted’. And in his General report on the School, Ball added that ‘The girls’ outhouses are in a disgracefully dirty condition. The head-teacher has not been inspecting these premises daily.1252

1250 Inspection Report, Tikitiki, 19 June 1899. BAAA 1001/640c. ANZ-A. DB.
1251 Tuta Nihoniho, Makoare Tamati and 71 others to Inspector of Schools, 31 May 1899. BAAA 1001/246a. ANZ-A. DB.
1252 Inspection Report, 12 June 1933. BAAA 1001/1012a, 44/6. ANZ-A. DB.
In their next report on the school the Inspectors, Ball and Fletcher, wrote that ‘In the last report a number of unsatisfactory aspects of the work in the senior division were indicated. No notice has been taken of these criticisms and suggestions, and the head-teacher’s attitude has continued to be one of indifference and neglect. Many of the older children have left school, a striking indication of the unsatisfactory nature of the work.\textsuperscript{1253}

As a result of the negative reports the Director, T. B. Strong, now wrote to the Head pointing out their seriousness when he was leading one of the Department’s largest Native schools, and requested him to immediately revise his attitude.\textsuperscript{1254}

The Head’s next inspection report, in June 1934, was more favourable, but by November 1934 his performance had deteriorated again, with Ball writing in his general report on the school that ‘In the senior division teaching methods are generally unsuitable and the head-teacher’s attention to his duty has been lax. The standard of attainment in most subjects has been poor’. In his personal report on the Head he wrote that, ‘Time after time, quite definite and inexcusable neglect of duty has been brought to your attention. Your ready assurances that these faults will not occur again now have no value. You have the necessary knowledge of correct teaching procedure; you are aware of the irrecoverable loss to the children resulting from your conduct, but still you persist in blinding yourself to realities’.\textsuperscript{1255}

It was indeed the negative impact on the children which was the most alarming aspect of the Head’s performance, with the Annual Examination Report for 1934 showing that with 135 pupils enrolled in the school, only four were in Form 2.\textsuperscript{1256}

Ball now wrote to the Director of Education that ‘Ever since I have been visiting Rangitukia Native School, Mr Crumpty’s work has varied from poor to good or very good. He will slack for a year and then work. The quality of his reports thus alternate

\textsuperscript{1253} Inspection Report, 6 November 1933. Ibid. DB.
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\textsuperscript{1256} Examination Report, 31 December 1934. Ibid. DB.
from weak to good. On the whole, however, he is lazy, unreliable, and to permit him to continue would be an injustice to the children. Letters of reprimand have no effect, at least no lasting effect, upon him. I suggest that if a perusal of his reports over the past five years do not warrant dismissal, he be severely fined.1257

Yet when the Director did decide, finally, to act, it was to move the Head on to another school rather than dismiss him, advising him that the Department was not prepared to overlook any longer his ‘inexcusable neglect of duty’, and proposed to recommend to the Public Service Commissioner that he and his wife be transferred to a Grade 111 school at the first opportunity.1258

Even into the late 1930s, suggestions were sometimes made that people who were considered not suitable for appointment elsewhere could be appointed to a Native School. Such a circumstance arose in relation to Whakawhitira in 1938. A Pakeha teacher trainee had been so affected by the Hawke’s Bay earthquake that she did not finish her training and was therefore uncertificated. She applied to the Department for a teaching position, and it decided to have her medically examined by a Dr Anderson of Napier who was familiar with her case. He reported that she ‘has no physical disability which could reject her for teaching, but she is obviously nervously unstable. She has been working as a companion help and is tired of it and one wonders if she will not also tire of teaching. I feel the only solution would be to recommend a trial in a Native School where she is anxious to teach’. Although not prepared to recommend her appointment to a permanent position in view of her medical history, the Director had no objection to giving her a trial as assistant at Whakawhitira.1259

There was an ominous ring, in terms of prior expectations, in the comments by the recently appointed Head Teacher of the Anaura Bay Native School to the Director in 1944 when she wrote, ‘May I say I am pleasantly surprised at the natural intelligence of the children’.1260

1257 Ball to Director, 12 November 1934. Ibid. DB.
1258 Director to Head, 19 December 1934. Ibid. DB.
1259 Director to Public Service Commissioner, 23 August 1938. BAAA 1001/741c, 44/4. ANZ-A. DB.
1260 Head Teacher to Director, 20 June 1944. BAAA 1001/231a. ANZ-A. DB.
In their interviews with former pupils in the Native/Maori schools Simon and Smith identify a range of attitudes held by teachers towards Maori pupils. Some were supportive, encouraging, and interested in Maori culture, but ‘teachers who demonstrated lack of confidence in the capabilities of their Maori pupils by belittling or ridiculing them and treating them with contempt were disliked intensely. Clearly some teachers within the Native Schools service were like that’.1261

As evidence of this they present the results of interviews with former pupils, including the following one who was a pupil in several East Coast Native Schools in the 1940s:

Pakeha teacher…and he was very strict, bellowed, carried on at everyone…He was horrible in some of the ways he used to ridicule us in front of the rest of the school…Another Pakeha teacher who wasn’t very nice…called us a pack of goats…He used to despair at the end of the day…and say “oh you Maori children, you drive me mad, Maori children”. Another teacher we had when I was in Form 2 – not because he said anything but we sensed that …his heart wasn’t in us as pupils and he took the strap to us every day. And little things like being ‘called nincompoops…We wondered what a nincompoop was and we asked one of the teachers and they said it was a pregnant cat…There were stronger words used too sometimes…We had some (teachers) that…we sensed…didn’t like us…We sensed the ones that were genuine…but the teachers that we… didn’t like-we wouldn’t do anything for them.1262

A Maori pupil at Horoera in 1936 recalled that ‘The first teacher I came in contact with when going to Native Schools was a teacher from South Africa….and I think he came here with a white-black attitude and he was a mean man. He’d pull your hair and pull your ears, and he used the strap and sometimes the stick too’.1263

The Secretary of the Waiomatatini Native School Committee, Tipene Ngata, wrote to the Director in 1943 complaining about various aspects of the behaviour of the Head Teacher. These included him remarking in class that he had been reading in the papers that Maoris were being arrested and convicted for criminal acts, at which a pupil remarked ‘so are the pakehas; he turned around and thrashed the first boy he laid eyes

1261 Simon and Smith, op.cit. p.93.
1262 Simon, Smith, et. al., p.93.
1263 Ibid, p.94;
on, over the shoulders’. He referred to the Head’s impending retirement, and a petition from the parents to withhold their children from school, adding that ‘This time I will not intervene’. The Director replied that the matters referred to had been investigated by the Senior Inspector of Native Schools and as a result of his report the Head was being retired at the end of January.

Another problem which sometimes arose was that of finding accommodation for teachers. One of many examples of this problem arose when staff were being sought for the about to be opened secondary Department at Tikitiki in 1940. The Head suggested to the Department that it approach the Housing Construction Department urging the early erection of two State houses at Tikitiki, which the Department followed up, even though, if agreed to, this would only be a long-term solution. One teacher gained temporary accommodation at the hotel, requests were made to existing teachers to take new teachers as boarders, while the wives of two married male teachers were unable to accompany them to Tikitiki, and one of the teachers was forced to live in a tent. The situation was viewed by Dr Beeby as so serious that it threatened the existence of the new High School which ‘would have an adverse effect upon the welfare of the large Maori population in the locality’.

A new teacher’s residence was urgently needed at Waiomatatini by the end of the 1930s, to the point where the existing residence was uninhabitable, but approval of it was delayed by the cut-back in expenditure arising from the Depression. Unable to find affordable accommodation for his family the Head Teacher sought the Department’s approval to use the school shed as a residence until a new residence was built. The Department approved, although the Director pointed out that ‘as under the arrangement you will not have to pay accommodation the Department cannot, of course, pay you any house allowance’.

1264 Secretary to Director, 12 October 1943. BAAA 1001/1071b, 44/6. ANZ-A. DB.
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8.5.1 Maori as Teachers: East Coast Native/Maori Schools.

Maori were appointed to East Coast schools as teachers in a variety of capacities and the Inspectors generally reported very favourably on the performance of those who were appointed, and here I present some examples.

In 1936 the Director informed the Head of Whakaangiangi that the Public Service Commissioner has approved the additional assistant he had requested, and a Miss Thora McDonnell ‘a Maori girl with the Intermediate Examination’ would join the staff; ‘She has no experience as a teacher and must be regarded as in the same category as your present junior assistant. I regret that it is quite impossible to secure the services of girls with any experience for these junior positions’.1269

Also in 1936, the Inspector reported that ‘Miss Naerewa, Junior Assistant at Whakaangiangi is doing well. She is taking an interest in her work and handles her children confidently. She maintains good discipline and her workbook is regularly kept’.1270

Amongst other appointments noted were the following, but this not a definitive list

Miss E.Waitoa was the Assistant Teacher at Whangaparoa in 1908.1271

The Director advised the Head of Tuparoa in 1931 that the position of Junior Assistant would be filled by ‘a particularly promising Maori girl, Miss Naere Rangi’ who was currently at Hukarere and had ‘passed the Public Service Entrance Examination and also obtained partial matriculation’.1272 In a note on the file D. G. Ball had written that ‘Miss Rangi is studying and will be sitting the University Entrance examination this year. She is a keen worker, interested, and the Headmaster reports very favourably on her work.’1273

1269 Director to Teacher, Whakaangiangi, 2 October 1936. BAAA 1001/1077c. ANZ-A. DB.
1270 Inspection Report, 18 November 1936. Ibid. DB.
1271 Inspection Report, 12 August 1908. BAAA 1001/763b. ANZ-A. DB.
1272 Director to Head, 20 July 1931. BAAA 1001/1065a. ANZ-A. DB.
1273 Ibid., 26 August 1932. DB.
In 1932, at Rangitukia, Miss E. Waikare was described ‘one of our best junior assistants. Her manner is pleasing yet forceful. She has a good knowledge of the requirements and insists on a high standard. She is studying, taking regular criticism lessons, and we should like her to be commended for her interest in her work and for the excellent service she is rendering’.

In 1933, Mr E Nepia was occupying the position of Head of Horoera.

The Director of Education, T. B. Strong, advised Miss Catherine Christy of Nuhaka that she has been appointed Fourth Assistant at Tikitiki and described her as ‘a half-caste Maori girl dux at Nuhaka Native School in 1927. She subsequently spent three years at Hukarere College, where she was successful in passing both Intermediate and Public Service Entrance Examinations’. Then in a comment revealing the mind-set of the Country’s top education official, Strong added, ‘I will be obliged if you can do what you can to secure suitable board for Miss Christy. Although she is a half-caste I understand that the people live as Europeans, and that you need have no hesitation into introducing her into any good house’. Subsequent reports on her teaching were very positive, including her assisting at times with the upper standards, and a 1934 report described her as ‘An active, interested, conscientious teacher. Efficiency-good.’

At Tikitiki in 1936, Miss J. Yates, the Junior Assistant, was described as ‘one of our very promising young Native teachers. She is keenly interested in her work and handles her class well’.

With a roll of over 170 pupils, the Head at Tikitiki requested the appointment of an additional Assistant Teacher in 1937, and recommended the appointment of Parekoihu Taiapa, pointing out that he was the brother of Pine Taiapa, Maori carver at the Maori Arts and Craft School, who would be ‘an asset to the school’. One reason
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for the recommendation was that it would strengthen the teaching of Maori arts and crafts at the school, but from subsequent correspondence it appears that it did not proceed because in late April an additional teacher was still being sought for the school.1279

Appointments of Maori teachers became more frequent after 1940. In 1942 the Director advised the Head of Whakaangiangi that although in the short-term the appointment of Maori to junior assistantships was proving more difficult, the longer term prospects were positive:

It is going to be very difficult to fill junior assistantships this year, as a large number of vacancies have been created owing to the admission of about 20 of our best girls to Training College. In approving of so many admissions the Department was fully aware that it would mean a shortage of junior assistants with the desirable qualification of either three or four years’ post-primary education, but it was considered that it would be to the ultimate advantage of the service to have as many of these girls fully trained and certificated as soon as possible.'1280

One month earlier the Director had advised the Head that ‘Should her application for Training College be successful I have to say that the Department very much doubts whether it will be possible to appoint in her place a girl with the experience and capabilities of Miss Hine Kaika’.1281

In a report on the Junior Assistant at Potaka in 1944, Miss N.M.Norton, the Inspector described her as ‘very promising …5yrs secondary at Te Waipounamu And should have no difficulty in qualifying for Training College’.1282

In 1948, the Tikitiki Maori District High School 1948 staff included Miss D.Kohere, Miss N.Ahipene and K.Karaka, out of a total staff of seven.1283

Miss M.Korohin was a temporary Relieving Assistant at Horoera in 1955.1284

---
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At Horoera in 1959 Miss Wanoa was 'conducting a well-organised, busy classroom. Primers to S.2'.

In the 1950s Mr E Waaka, was Head Teacher at Waipiro Bay and Miss R. Ngarimu and Miss M. Kururangi were Teachers. And in 1955 Miss P. Tawhai, Mr D. Tamati, and Mrs E. Waaka, were teaching at the same school.

The qualifications of the teachers continued to steadily improve. When responding to a teacher at Potaka enquiring as to why he had not been appointed to a newly advertised position at the school in 1951, the Senior Inspector of Maori Schools, W. Parsonage, wrote that, 'The reason is that during the last eighteen months the Department has decided not to appoint uncertificated people to permanent positions in Maori Schools’, as such permanent positions would be required for the large number of trained Maori now coming out of the Training College under the Emergency and ordinary training schemes.

---
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CHAPTER 9: EDUCATION BOARD SCHOOLS AND

EAST COAST MAORI CHILDREN

All the children whose names appear above are either full-blooded Maoris or half-castes, and speak English only when they have to. The type of Maori here is poor, lazy, and altogether worthless and this is reflected in their children.
Teacher’s Annual Examination, Standard 1, Waipiro Bay Education Board School, 1932.

(It was) impossible to fail to realise the pronounced racial antipathy and prejudice that are exhibited towards the Maori. In many parts they are spoken of as dogs, and are even treated as such …determined efforts have been made to eject their children from the public schools and instances could be given of attempts to bring about segregation of the races. The Maori is elbowed out and given the cold shoulder, and instances have occurred where the parents of Maori children have been denied the right of voting at the school annual meetings held to appoint committees for public schools; they were simply bluffed and told they had no right to vote. Is it any wonder that the Maoris view with alarm proposals to hand their schools over to the boards?

Senior Inspector of Native Schools, John Porteous, to Minister of Education 18 March 1914.1288

Very little interest is taken in the Maori children attending Board schools and inspectors have stated that they take no notice of them, and would prefer to see them out of their schools. My experience of Maori children who have been attending public schools and have subsequently attended Native schools is not pleasant. I have examined them and have come to the conclusion that they have simply been neglected, and this is the general experience of our teachers also. Public school teachers have stated that they do not trouble about the Maori children, though their attendance is found useful in maintaining a required average…Native schools that have been handed over in a flourishing condition very soon show a decline as far as the Maoris are concerned.1289

1288 BAAA 1001/218d. ANZ-A. DB.
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9.1 Introduction

Note: Official usage for many years was to refer to Board schools as ‘public schools’. However Native/Maori schools were also public schools and my own preference is to use the term Board school throughout to distinguish between the two types of schools.

Maori children enrolled in a Board school if a Native school was not close by, or occasionally for some other reason, such as parents falling out with a teacher. Whereas Maori pupils enrolled in Native schools had some policies and publications designed specifically for them as Maori, those in Board schools received schooling which was usually identical in virtually every respect with that given to Pakeha pupils.

The frequency of school inspections was one example of the way in which the relative closeness of the Hawke’s Bay Education Board’s Inspectors to their schools contrasted with the Department of Education’s Maori School Inspectors having to come from Wellington to make decisions regarding and inspect East Coast Native/Maori Schools. Board Inspectors frequently made two visits to each Board School in the same year, a preliminary one in April, May or June and a second one in September, October or November. Whereas a Native/Maori school was fortunate if it received one visit each year because the Inspectors had to visit schools over the whole country from the North Cape to the Bluff.

This had negative implications for several aspects of the establishment of Native schools and the teaching and learning that went on in them, as I point out elsewhere in this report. For example it made close supervision of teacher performance or dealing with incompetent teachers more difficult, and the demands on the Native/Maori School Inspectors meant that the timing of their visits also often left a lot to be desired. One common complaint from school committees and teachers was that they sometimes turned up to inspect or examine the pupils soon after the school had opened after the summer vacation when little progress had been made by the pupils with their school work.
Another difference was that reports on Hawke’s Bay Education Board schools by the Inspectors generally tended to be brief by comparison with their counterparts in Native Schools. They confined their reports in the main to teaching and learning in the classroom and the state of the grounds, compared with the much wider school and community focus more characteristic of the Native School Inspectors. Moreover even when Maori pupils were present in a Board School it was not uncommon for them to be mentioned rarely and if all usually only very briefly.

I formed several impressions when reading reports in which East Coast Maori pupils were mentioned by the Hawk’s Bay Education Board’s Inspectors. The first was that they were often regarded as something of a nuisance who held back the Pakeha pupils. A second, linked to the first, was that there was a preoccupation with their perceived problems, of which the difficulty of mastering English was the one most frequently mentioned and was the one viewed as limiting their ability to progress into the senior standards. A rather negative and at times blaming the Maori pupils tone tended to dominate, combined with an attitude of low expectations regarding the Maori pupils, or stereotypical views about their abilities and interests. If held by the Inspectors, these would certainly have been communicated to the teachers. A third impression, confirmed periodically in the annual reports of the Board, was that the physical condition of the buildings in those Board schools where East Coast Maori children formed the majority were often markedly inferior to those in which mainly Pakeha children were enrolled.

Another aspect which stood out was the absence of constructive suggestions to teachers about how to improve perceived problems. Very often the reports identify a problem, indicate that it limits the progress of the Maori child, but that is the end of the matter. There is often little to inspire confidence that the Maori pupils are being regarded in a way that is likely to facilitate their learning and development in what is, for them, the already totally European and often alien environment of the typical Board school. More often than not the attitude seemed to be-the Maori pupils have these impediments which do not readily lend themselves to improvement, so limited success if inevitable
9.2 Board Schools and Racism

Some Maori children continued to be excluded from board schools on account of their race. The Annual Report of the Minister of Education in 1881 identified an increase in the number of Maori and half-caste children attending board schools, but pointed out that the increase could easily have been much larger if it was not for the unwillingness of many parents of both races – Maori and European – to allow their children to be taught in schools equally open to them all.1290

The Department’s 1885 report expressed regret that so few Maori children attended board schools, and then repeated verbatim the comment from the 1881 report above regarding them being ‘either withheld or virtually excluded from the public schools on account of antipathy based on difference of race.’1291

Examples of Pakeha parents objecting to their children mixing with Maori children persisted. In 1889 the Department of Education’s Annual Report to Parliament expressed concern that ‘the invincible race prejudice of the more unreasoning settlers could cause schools in which the children of the two races were educated together to fail’.1292

Twenty five years later, in 1914, the Senior Inspector of Native Schools, John Porteous, was equally forthright in a memorandum to the Minister of Education outlining insights gained by the Native school inspectors when carrying out their official duties throughout the country. It was:

Impossible to fail to realise the pronounced racial antipathy and prejudice that are exhibited towards the Maori. In many parts they are spoken of as dogs, and are even treated as such; they are regarded as cucumbers of the ground, and their rights and privileges as British subjects are trampled on and disregarded. I repeatedly hear them characterized as ‘dagos’ and ‘niggers’…determined efforts have been made to eject their children from the public schools and instances could be given of attempts to bring about segregation of the races. The
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Maori is elbowed out and given the cold shoulder, and instances have occurred where the parents of Maori children have been denied the right of voting at the school annual meetings held to appoint committees for public schools; they were simply bluff ed and told they had no right to vote. Is it any wonder that the Maoris view with alarm proposals to hand their schools over to the boards?\textsuperscript{1293}

Concerns about racial prejudice affecting the attendance of Maori children were repeated in the Department’s annual report to Parliament for 1914 and in several succeeding years. In 1914 it was reported that there had been ‘an intensification of the racial antipathy and prejudice exhibited towards the Maori in many parts of the North Island and even in some parts of the south’, and this had ‘led in some instances to attempts by board authorities to turn the Maori children out of school, which has in some places actually been accomplished’.\textsuperscript{1294}

In 1915 the Minister of Education reported that the transfer of Native schools from the Department to boards was becoming more difficult each year ‘owing to the increase of racial prejudice, European parents exhibiting strong objections to Maori children attending public schools in common with their own’.\textsuperscript{1295}

A dip in total enrolments of Maori attending board schools in 1915 and 1916 was partly attributed to their presence being ‘sometimes not desired’, the Minister of Education commenting that ‘If an anything of this nature does exist it is earnestly to be hoped that those responsible for so undesirable an attitude will speedily recognise the grave injustice to the members of the Native race that may thus arise’.\textsuperscript{1296}

Ngata was critical of the negative attitude towards Maori children held by some members of education boards, which was one of the reasons why he defended the Native schools from being taken over by boards. He claimed in Parliament in 1913 that Wanganui Education Board members took advantage of a smallpox epidemic in the neighbouring King Country to criticise Maori children with:
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'You are dirty; you have hakihaki; you have the itch; you will affect our European children; it is not desirable that you should attend our schools; it is time you had separate schools’. That is the view of the Wanganui Education Board …that was the view held by the settlers at Taumarunui some years ago; and that is the view held in some other parts of the country…. In some parts of the back-blocks there may perhaps unconsciously be drawn a colour bar…But I may point out that the settlers in some districts - at Nuhaka and other places in the Hawke’s Bay Education District - have made use of the attendance of Native children for capitation-grant purposes; but as soon as the white population is sufficient, the first pretence is taken to try and exclude the native schoolchildren from the schools…I say it is not for the Education Board in the Wanganui District, or in any other district, to say to the children, ‘You are dirty and shall be excluded from our schools’.1297

9.3 Academic Progress

In 1916 the Minister of Education suggested that if Maori pupils held their own in the junior classes in Education Board Schools it was attributable to fewer of them speaking Maori in their homes by comparison with those in the Native Schools. But he then also claimed that the reasons why very few went on to obtain a proficiency certificate at the end of the S.6 course was attributable to ‘irregularity of attendance and want of proper care in the home’:

From the reports of Inspectors of public schools it appears that in the junior classes the Maoris attending public schools generally make equal progress with their European class-mates. The fact that a much smaller percentage of these children speak Maori in their homes than in the case of native-school pupils, greatly lessens the difficulties to be overcome in educating them. In districts where the number of Maoris attending public schools is appreciable, the consensus of opinion, however, with respect to the higher classes is that the Maori pupil falls behind, the English subjects and arithmetic being particularly difficult for him. Very few Maoris remain to obtain proficiency certificates at the end of the Standard VI course. Irregularity of attendance and want of proper care in the home are given as causes contributing to the backwardness of the Native.1298

However the following year the Minister was prepared to acknowledge that another factor might be involved in that, ‘based on the reports of Inspectors of Schools in the

1298 Thirty Ninth Annual Report of the Minister of Education. AJHR, E-1, 1916, p.27.
districts where the number of Maoris attending public schools is large’, at least some fault might lie with the methods employed by teachers in Board Schools’:

It appears that the Natives suffer to some extent from the fact that methods of teaching employed, especially of teaching English, are not suited to their requirements. Better results are obtained in this subject when a combination of the look-and-say and phonic methods is adopted. Unfortunately, however, a large number of Maori pupils attend small schools staffed by inexperienced and often inefficient teachers, under which circumstances the work is backward and progress unsatisfactory. The problem of not having mastered the language thoroughly in the lower classes becomes a severe handicap to the Maori in the upper classes, making nearly all the subjects of the curriculum much more difficult for him than they would otherwise be. The result is that only a small proportion of the Maori scholars beginning in the preparatory classes in public schools reach the upper standards or do work there equally to that of the Europeans. From results obtained in Native Schools it appears that the fault does not lie in lack of intelligence on the part of the Maori pupils, but in the unsuitable methods of the earlier teaching.1299

Generally Maori pupils in board schools appear to have remained fairly anonymous in terms of official public comment or special attention. The most common reference to them by Departmental and Board officials and inspectors, and Maori and European members of Parliament, seems to have been claim and counter-claim about the superiority or inferiority of Board as compared with Native Schools for Maori pupils to be schooled in. And the related question of the merits or otherwise of the transfer policy. But reliable evidence about their academic progress is slight and somewhat contradictory.

Some board inspectors were adamant that Board Schools provided a better environment. A Board Inspector, Henry Hill, noting in 1887 that five percent of pupils in the Hawke’s Bay Board’s schools were Maori, commented:

It would appear that the Maoris do not take kindly to the purely Native schools and when the more intelligent among the Maori parents have the opportunity of sending their children to the district schools, they gladly do so… From careful observation I am convinced that that the attendance of Maori pupils is greatly to their advantage, and it is

certainly no disadvantage to the European children as some persons seem to imagine.\textsuperscript{1300}

However this kind of general comment adds little to any real understanding of progress. More useful is the work of McKenzie, who points out that the Department gazetted new examination regulations in 1891 that required inspectors to report on all children enrolled at school over the age of eight years.\textsuperscript{1301}

Reasons ranging from ‘late entry’ and ‘irregular attendance’, to ‘extreme dullness’, were given by teachers to explain the presence of overage children in their classes, these often being treated sceptically by inspectors. But McKenzie points out that ‘the one reason which was accepted without question to justify lack of school progress was that the pupil was a Maori.’ He concludes that failure by most Maori to progress in board schools to the uppers standards caused little official interest or concern. Their enrolment was considered sufficient and, once enrolled, ‘no special consideration or attention’ was regarded as ‘either necessary or desirable’.\textsuperscript{1302}

The Department’s 1920 Annual Report claimed that although more Maori children were now attending Board than Native schools, the results in the former were ‘much inferior’. Consequently, Board inspectors were recommending the establishment of separate Native schools where practicable because it was an advantage to Maori pupils to have their special needs catered for. It also claimed that Maori pupils attending board schools made ‘commendable progress’ as far as S4, although by this time their age was usually greater than Pakeha pupils, but because ‘the language difficulty’ had not been completely mastered, the work of the higher standards was, ‘for the most part beyond their reach’.\textsuperscript{1303}

Maori parents whose children attended board schools would not have felt encouraged if they had read the 1920 the annual report of the Minister of Education, when he pointed out that education Board inspectors had acknowledged ‘that it is practically

\textsuperscript{1300} AJHR, 1887, E-1b, p.16.
\textsuperscript{1302} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{1303} AJHR, 1920, E-3, p.4.
impossible for sole teachers with a number of Native children attending their schools to give the requisite special attention to the Maoris so that poor results are inevitable’.\textsuperscript{1304}

A lack of detailed comparative statistics makes comparisons between the academic performance of Maori students in Native and Board schools difficult. Openshaw, et al, claim that the ‘tentative evidence’ on comparative examination performance at the S.6 (Proficiency Examination) level for the years 1914-1936 indicates that Maori in Native schools ‘fared poorly in comparison with Maori taught in the public schools’.\textsuperscript{1305} However no detailed evidence is provided to support this view. In 1909, 21 out of a total of 4,434 Maori students in board schools gained proficiency, 5 fewer than in 1908.\textsuperscript{1306} In 1917, 31 Maori students out of 4,622 attending Native schools gained proficiency, whereas 16 out of 4,747 attending board schools did so.\textsuperscript{1307} In 1929, out of 7,772 Maori attending board schools, 147 received proficiency certificates, but equivalent figures are not available for Native schools.\textsuperscript{1308}

However a comparatively small proportion of Maori children were still reaching S.6. In 1928, 3.4 percent of Maori pupils in Board schools were in S.6, compared with 10.0 percent of Pakeha; in Native schools 3.7 per cent of Maori pupils were in S.6.\textsuperscript{1309}

In 1927 Ngata referred to only 13 Maori pupils in board schools having won free place Government scholarships amongst the 150 provided at the denominational colleges, as further evidence that for Maori students to be taught effectively in board schools the boards needed to apply the same principles of teaching and practice as operated in Native schools. He suggested that because the Department of Education was not able to adequately identify Maori pupils in board schools, the awarding of scholarships was unevenly distributed, leading to hardship in areas where Native schools were not located.\textsuperscript{1310}

\textsuperscript{1304} AJHR, E-1, 1920, p.28.
\textsuperscript{1305} Openshaw et. al., p.57.
\textsuperscript{1306} AJHR, 1910, E-3, p.23.
\textsuperscript{1308} Openshaw et al.
\textsuperscript{1309} Figures taken from the E-1 and E-3 reports of the Department, AJHR.
\textsuperscript{1310} AJHR, 1927, E-2, p.17.
However another probable reason for the low number of scholarships won by Maori in board schools which Ngata did not refer to, was that the Department and the Native school inspectors regarded students in Native schools as more justified to receive them.

9.4 The Hawke’s Bay Education Board and East Coast Maori Children in Board Schools.

Note: Native/Maori Schools sometimes became Board Schools, and vice versa and when the status of a school changed the records followed the school, either becoming part of the records of the Department of Education, in the case of a Native/Maori School, or the Hawke’s Bay Education Board in the case of a Board School. This can prove quite confusing and does not always make following up the full history of a particular school easy.

For this section I have selected as case studies three schools, Waipiro Bay, Tolaga Bay and Te Puia Springs which were at one time administered by the Hawke’s Bay Education Board and attended by East Coast Maori children.

The Department of Education’s Annual Report to Parliament in 1882 recorded that in the Hawke’s Bay Education District at the end of 1881 ‘Pure Maoris’ in the Board’s schools totalled 52 boys and 20 girls, with another 32 boys and 16 girls recorded as being of ‘mixed race’. In 1885 the number of ‘Pure Maoris’ had fallen to 19, whereas those of ‘Mixed race’ had increased to 93.

Part of the reason for this decline may have been that Maori parents in Hawke’s Bay who wanted to send their children to school, but had no Native school near by, faced ‘blatant Pakeha hostility’ when they sent them to board schools. Letters to the Hawke’s Bay Herald in 1886 predicted an outbreak of skin diseases and a lowered moral tone if too many Maori children were enrolled.

1312 AJHR, 1885, E-1, p.iv.
1313 Mathews, p.34.
1314 Ibid.
By 1907, when the Department had adopted a new method of ethnic classification of pupils, 432 ‘Children of Maori and Mixed Races’ were reported to be attending the Board’s schools.\textsuperscript{1315}

Aspects of the presence of Maori pupils in the Board’s schools were sometimes raised by the Board’s Inspectors in their reports, usually briefly. Examples of this with particular reference to Hawke’s Bay Education Board schools located north of Gisborne are discussed below.

From 1878 until his retirement in 1914, the Board’s schools were most frequently inspected by Henry Thomas Hill, B. A. FRS, who had arrived in Hawke’s Bay in July 1878 to become the first Inspector of Schools and Secretary to the Hawke’s Bay Education Board which had been created by the 1877 Education Act. Hill, like his counterparts in the Native School service such as Pope and his colleagues, spent long hours on horseback during his inspection visits. Between July and December 1878, in his first year of duty ‘he rode 2,104 miles, many of them along rough bush tracks. Streams and rivers had to be crossed in all kinds of weathers.’\textsuperscript{1316}

When comments were made by an Education Board Inspector on the presence of Maori pupils in the Hawke’s Bay Education Board’s Schools, they generally followed a ‘one-method-suits all’, European-style approach, and frequently a very laissez-faire or laid-back approach, particularly to some of the difficulties which many East Coast Maori pupils experienced in the environment of the typical Board school, including mastering English as a second language. The Inspectors’ reports sometimes hinted at the need for something more suitable to be done to assist the progress of Maori pupils. But this seldom extended to providing teachers with specific suggestions to assist their learning such as having some regard for the importance cultural background was likely to play in the learning process. This comment certainly applies to Inspector Hill, even though in some respects he was generally sympathetic to and supportive of Maori pupils, as in the example below where he complained about the conditions at

\textsuperscript{1315} AJHR, 1908, E-2, p.31.
the Waipiro Bay School and other schools where many Maori pupils were enrolled, and also in his willingness to recognize the ability of those Maori pupils who did do well in a school.

However the down-side of infrequently giving teachers specific suggestions regarding the teaching of Maori pupils was that little changed with regard to one of the aspects about their presence in the schools Inspectors frequently commented on. This was their slow progress through the Standards by comparison with Pakeha pupils. My own view, based on my reading of numerous inspection reports, is that they also often had much lower expectations of the Maori pupils in the schools than they had for Pakeha pupils.

Hill complained in the Board’s Annual Report for 1900 about the condition of some of the Board’s schools he inspected, particularly those enrolling a significant proportion of Maori pupils. He advised the Board that:

At Tiniroto and Port Awanui a raupo whare and an iron shed have done duty as school buildings, and the instruction of the children has been carried on under conditions which, I submit, ought not to be permitted anywhere. Both places are without out-offices; there are no desks for the children; and no arrangements have been made whereby water may be obtained at the school. I can only remark that the moral effects of conducting a school under conditions such as have been pointed out are disastrous, the unsuitability of the buildings, playgrounds and conditions for teaching of several schools established by the Board, including those at Waipiro, Mohaka and Omahu. These were mainly small schools, and although the children mainly belong to the Native race the Board should maintain them with some semblance of efficiency.\textsuperscript{1317}

In his report for 1901 Hill wrote of the school-buildings administered by the Board that ‘The districts where school accommodation is provided do not show any signs of over-crowding at present, except at Dannevirke where further extension is called for. Most of the buildings are in good working order.’\textsuperscript{1318}

\textsuperscript{1317} AJHR, 1900, E-1b, p.17.
\textsuperscript{1318} AJHR, 1901, E-1b, p.17.
Yet in the same report Hill was again very critical of the Board for not acting responsibly in providing adequate school buildings for those of its schools which enrolled mainly Maori pupils, referring particularly to Mohaka and Waipiro, where ‘the children are largely composed of the Native race’, and suggested that it would be preferable for the Board to close the schools, leaving the responsibility with the Department which might then provide proper buildings.1319

The following year Hill repeated his criticism of what he regarded as the Board’s negligence in relation to its school buildings in which mainly East Coast Maori pupils were being taught:

Attention has so often been drawn by me to the unsatisfactory condition of the school buildings along the East Coast, but without avail, that I am constrained to suggest to the Board the advisability of asking the Department to take over schools in Native districts mainly made up of Maori pupils.1320

In 1903 he again referred positively to the school buildings and residences under the Board’s management as being ‘mostly in good repair’, but again criticized those buildings in which many East Coast Maori children were enrolled:

A year ago attention was drawn to the want of suitable school accommodation in a number of districts along the East Coast, such as Awanui, Waipiro Bay, Tokomaru, Morere, Mohaka and Tolaga Bay. Except at the latter place, things remain as before…One does not see makeshift Native schoolhouses and residences; but these are to be met again and again in the case of schools under the control of the Board. Not only do the children suffer mentally and physically, but the teachers soon become broken down in health, owing to the isolation and privations they undergo. So bad are the conditions in some of these places that in one place I had to carry on examination wrapped in an overcoat, with the rain driving through the skeleton building.1321

In 1905 Hill wrote that ‘the schoolhouses throughout the district are in very fair order’, but he would ‘rejoice when something can be done for the benefit of the

---

1319 Ibid;
1320 AJHR, 1902, E-1b, p.17.
1321 AJHR, 1903, E-1b, pp. 21-22.
important Native settlement at Mohaka, where there are more than seventy children receiving instruction in a hired building 23ft by 16ft.1322

9.4.1 Waipiro Bay

In 1892 the Hawke’s Bay Education Board approved the opening of a new school at Waipiro Bay, south of Ruatoria, with an enrolment of 13 pupils. The school was held in a building owned by Mr J. N. Williams and on the basis of their names and comments in the Inspection reports for the first few years none of the pupils enrolled appear to have been Maori.1323

However by 1896 this had changed markedly, Inspector, Henry Hill reporting that all the 26 pupils now enrolled ‘belong to the Native race there being no pupils attending belonging to the Europeans who reside in the township’.1324

His report also emphasized the role he believed the school should play in the socializing of the Maori children according to European custom, drawing attention to several matters which he claimed required ‘special attention’. These included:

Manners The children should be trained in the formal courtesies such as are recognised in European communities. When spoken to the Natives should be trained to stand; the children should be accustomed to enter school and to leave it in marching order and when arranged they should be bid ‘good morning’ or ‘good afternoon’ as may be, and the same course should be followed in all other formalities… Disciplinary exercises should be frequent and talking as is the native custom should be disallowed.1325

Hill criticized the accommodation for the increasing number of pupils, describing the existing room as:

too small for the present attendance and more desk accommodation is wanted. The room should be painted inside and the ventilation should

1322 AJHR, 1905, E-1b, p.17.
1323 ABDJ W3568/52b Part 1. ANZ-W.
1324 Inspection Report, 13 April 1896. Ibid. DB.
1325 Ibid;
be improved. It appears that more pupils are expected shortly as the Aku Aku Native School has been closed. The Office (name given for the toilet – sometimes called the out-office) which is the same for boys and girls is filthy. I have had occasion to draw attention to this in a previous report. A proper water supply should be provided so that the needful work can be undertaken.¹³²⁶

In terms of the academic progress he noted that ‘This is practically a new school as there are no pupils attending among the recently admitted who are capable of doing more than Standard 1 work, and I have authorized the Mistress to press on certain pupils in the requirements of Standard 2.’¹³²⁷

In the following year, 1897, when 28 of the 29 pupils enrolled in this Education Board School were Maori, the Inspector was again very critical of the accommodation, describing the school as ‘badly overcrowded and the low room makes the air absolutely poisonous. Candle boxes are in use for the accommodation of preparatory pupils and the desks are insufficient … I have again to draw attention to the unsatisfactory condition of the closet. It is dirty in the extreme and quite unfit for use. There is at present no water supply.’¹³²⁸

With regard to academic progress, twelve of the pupils were in P.1, 4 in S.1, 5 in S.2, 6 in S.3 and 2 in S.4. The Inspector described the Teacher, Miss Rose Lindsay, as only having been in charge since May, ‘but already her influence is being felt by the senior pupils and there is every promise that the school will be successful in her hands’. The two S.5 pupils had been allowed to pass ‘on a lower basis than is the case for European pupils but it is for this year only and the Mistress thinks she will be able to prepare the extra work during the coming year. The S.3 pupils are doing well.’¹³²⁹

In 1898 the Inspector found that although Miss Lindsay had carried on her work ‘under unusual difficulties’, the results throughout were ‘very commendable’ and ‘with a couple of exceptions in S.4 all the pupils are strong and the style of the work—such as writing, figures, drawing and exercise books are highly satisfactory

¹³²⁶ Ibid;
¹³²⁷ Ibid;
¹³²⁸ Inspection Report, Waipiro Bay, 15 October 1897. Ibid. DB.
¹³²⁹ Ibid;
throughout… I was much pleased with the intelligent answering of the pupils who display great spirit and earnestness in their work. Altogether the school has passed a credible examination’.\(^{1330}\)

However the Inspector’s own low expectations regarding the academic progress of the Maori pupils was soon evident, and was revealed in his 1899 report:

> The large majority of the pupils are natives…Those examined in standards give evidence of good and careful training …Several of the native children in the senior class are unable to meet the requirements, but much of their work is of good quality and it appears to me better for them to widen their knowledge in elementary work rather than proceed to a higher standard.\(^{1331}\)

Despite the Inspector’s regular negative reports on the inadequate accommodation and conditions, no action continued to be taken by the Board. I find it hard to believe that the Hawke’s Bay Education Board would have tolerated the continuation of such conditions if mainly Pakeha pupils had been enrolled.

In 1901 the Inspector reported that ‘The school is carried on under conditions that hardly admit of effective classification and organization…nothing effective can be carried on without proper school buildings’.

The result had been that ‘The school has suffered so much during the year …that in only a single case is promotion to the next class possible’, and his report revealed that out of 33 pupils enrolled 20 were in the primers, only one in S.6, none in S.5, four in S.4, three in S. 2 and 5 in S.1.\(^{1332}\)

In his examination report seven months later Hill pointed out that ‘the majority of the pupils are natives and very young and the school difficulties have been unusually great…now that a school site of over 2 acres has been reserved in the proposed township it is of the utmost moment to the children that a school building be erected

\(^{1330}\) Inspection Report, 1 October 1898. Ibid. DB.
\(^{1331}\) Inspection Report, Waipiro Bay, 14 October 1899. ABDJ W3568/52b Part 1. ANZ-W. DB.
\(^{1332}\) Inspection Report, 28 March 1901. Ibid. DB.
as soon as possible. The children are well behaved and work with plenty of ardour\textsuperscript{1333}. But by October 1903 a new school had still not been built, the Inspector commenting that ‘something should be done as soon as the new school building is opened to improve the condition of the school’ which was ‘far from strong. Of the 48 pupils belonging only nineteen are in standards and these are by no means strong in the pass requirements… The Preparatory classes are extremely backward’\textsuperscript{1334}.

From this point on, I list extracts from further Inspection reports on Waipiro Bay. The extent to which the comments made reflect the mind-set of the Hawke’s Bay Education Board’s Inspectors towards the presence of East Coast Maori children in this Education Board School should be noted.

I noticed that the pupils of European parents are acquiring a Maori accent. Very great care should be exercised to check the growth of this defect\textsuperscript{1335}.

Preparatory Classes. The work of these classes is hampered by the Maori difficulty, a large percentage of the pupils being Maori children with little or no knowledge of English\textsuperscript{1336}.

Composition. The difficulty in dealing with the native element appears here\textsuperscript{1337}.

The numbers in the lower classes are high but most of the children are natives\textsuperscript{1338}.

Reading: Considering the large number of native children the subject is very well taught.

Composition. The difficulty in dealing with the native element appears here. Nothing but persistent correction until an essay reasonably free from error is arrived at should be accepted\textsuperscript{1339}.

\textsuperscript{1333} Examination Report, Waipiro Bay, 16 October 1901. Ibid. DB.
\textsuperscript{1334} Examination Report, 26 October 1903. Ibid. DB.
\textsuperscript{1335} Inspection Report, Waipiro Bay, 25 February 1909. ABDJ W3568/52c Pt 2. ANZ-W. DB.
\textsuperscript{1336} Inspection Report, Waipiro Bay, 26 October 1909. Ibid;
\textsuperscript{1337} Inspection Report, Waipiro Bay, 20 July 1915. Ibid;
\textsuperscript{1338} Inspection Report, 2-3 March 1914. Ibid;
\textsuperscript{1339} Inspection Report, 20 July 1915. Ibid;
Preparatory Division. The high average age is due to the fact that, with the exception of six, the whole are Maoris.\textsuperscript{1340}

Some amendments are required in the primer classes there being no provision for nature study. A scheme should be drawn suitable for natives. (Even here, when the Inspector suggests some variation in the standard approach, the initiative is left entirely to the Teacher, with no further specific suggestions from the Inspector).\textsuperscript{1341}

In his 1912 report the Inspector again commented critically on the standard of the accommodation, describing the teaching as having been carried on ‘under serious difficulties in the matter of accommodation. The large proportion of native children require a separate room for instruction and have mainly been taught in the shed under trying conditions’.\textsuperscript{1342}

In 1913, 74 Maori pupils were enrolled in the Waipiro Bay Board School out of a total enrolment of 99. In the Primers 43 out of 52 pupils were Maori; in S.3, 4 out of 7; S.4, 5 out of 9; S.5, 5 out of 7; S.6, 1 out of 3.\textsuperscript{1343}

The Inspector noted that, ‘A school of this kind with a large percentage of natives on the roll necessarily calls for special treatment of the English subjects, and it is quite to be expected that weakness appears in the lower classes with, however, a progressive facility in the use of language that indicates careful tuition’.\textsuperscript{1344}

However after an examination of the school three months later Inspector Hill adopted a much more positive tone with regard the progress being made:

Teaching: The teaching is bright and intelligent … Miss Ellis renders effective help with games such as the natives appreciate and are highly beneficial as language lessons taught by means of real enjoyment… Throughout the school there is a fine tone and I was particularly impressed by…the ability of the natives to hold their own in their studies… This is a successful school doing really good work among the Europeans and Natives of the East Coast.\textsuperscript{1345}

\textsuperscript{1340} Inspection report, 7 December 1914. Ibid;
\textsuperscript{1341} Ibid;
\textsuperscript{1342} Inspection Report, 16 September 1912. Ibid;
\textsuperscript{1343} Return of Maori Scholars belonging to the School at the end of December 1913. Ibid;
\textsuperscript{1344} Inspection Report, 9 December 1913. Ibid;
\textsuperscript{1345} Inspection Report, 16 March 1915. Ibid;
In 1916 William Bird, who had been appointed Organizing Inspector of Native Schools in 1901, was appointed as Senior Inspector to the Hawke’s Bay Education Board. This was the result of a reorganization of the inspectorate stemming from the Education Act 1914, which led to Board Inspectors being transferred to the Education Department, and was intended to have all inspectors inspect both Native and Board Schools. The change was short-lived, with the Department returning at the end of 1918 to the previous arrangement of separate inspectors for Native and Board Schools.\textsuperscript{1346}

However during the short period Bird spent with the Hawke’s Bay Board he inspected the schools and, after the previous 14 years he had spent as an Inspector of Native Schools, some of his observations were interesting. For example when he inspected the Waipiro Bay Board School in July 1916, his report adopted a much more critical tone when it came to the progress Maori children were making than many of those preceding it. He was critical, for example, of the slow progress of many of the pupils through the Standards, an aspect that had hardly been commented on earlier by other Inspectors. He noted that some children in Primer 2 had been at the school from 3½ to 4½ years; in S.1 from 4½ to 6¾ years, the average age in this class being 10 years, which ‘surely points to the need of more rapid methods in the lower divisions’.\textsuperscript{1347}

Bird regarded the timetable as giving ‘too much time to drawing and singing’, and showing ‘no provision for English for Classes P to S.2, whereas a ‘definite place for language should be provided.’ The infant classes required ‘a vigorous use of phonics and look and say methods, according to the plan demonstrated’, and this was ‘absolutely essential the present method being quite obsolete’. The reading in S.3 and 4 he described as ‘colourless – mere repetition of words and no comprehension was taught… Oral English is an important branch of the curriculum’. And he was critical that a private school, conducted by the wife of the vicar, took away some of the European children, as it was not a registered school, and as the instruction was of ‘doubtful regularity and efficiency the Board should take action without further delay’.\textsuperscript{1348}

\textsuperscript{1347} Inspection Report, W. Bird, 4 July 1916. ABDJ W3568/52c Pt2. ANZ-W. DB.
\textsuperscript{1348} Ibid;
When Bird inspected the school again in August his criticisms continued. He described English in the Preparatory class as ‘largely deficient’ and English composition in the Standard classes as ‘generally weak even up to Std 6.’ In a comment that was even more revealing in terms of the Hawke’s Bay Board’s oversight of a Board School enrolling mainly Maori children, he wrote that he understood that ‘no instruction has been given to the pupils during the past month the teacher being absent in Auckland. School hours, I am informed, are from 10 to 12 daily. It is quite improbable that such a school would be recognized by the Department and I do not think that the arrangement should be countenanced by the Board’. 1349

The Head Teacher’s own low expectations were evident when he held the annual examination in November, and wrote that while the Preparatory division had suffered through a change of teacher and method it was ‘satisfactorily taught’. 1350

A 1918 inspection report revealed the continued slow progress of pupils through the Standards, with 21 in the Preparatory classes, 10 in S.1, 8 in S.2, 13 in S.3, 6 in S.4, 2 in S.5 and 2 in S.6. 1351 It is reasonable to assume that the two pupils in S.6, the only ones who presented for Competency or Proficiency in 1918, were Pakeha, based on their names of Mavis Hobcroft and Jane Woodford, and this was common. 1352

In 1919 the school was again inspected by William Bird. His report is noteworthy again for viewing the results being achieved with less complacency than was apparent in many earlier inspection reports by the Hawke’s Bay Education Board’s Inspector, and also for the more detailed directions he gave the teachers for making improvements:

Organization: To be noted a considerable amount of retardation in the lower classes some Maori pupils having been from six to seven years at school and still no higher than Std 2. There are similar cases in the

1349 Inspection Report, 14 August 1916. Ibid;
1350 Annual Examination, 20 November 1916. Ibid;
1351 Inspection Report, 9 September 1918. Ibid;
1352 Annual Examination, December 1918. Ibid;
higher classes. This arises in my opinion from the failure of the foundation work in English and, to a less extent, in number.

Schemes of Work etc: A scheme in English language is essential in the lowest classes and should, failing something better, follow the plan of the Departmental pamphlet forwarded some time ago but which has not unfortunately been made use of.\(^{1353}\)

Yet in November of the same year the Head Teacher, H. L. Ellis, continued to demonstrate complacency, describing the Preparatory classes as ‘very good, every child entered within the past eighteen months is promoted’ \(^{1354}\).

Another Hawke’s Bay Education Board Inspector, A. Stevenson, was also generally complimentary about progress in his 1920 report, describing the Preparatory classes as ‘good generally… Number is good. Reading and Recitation are very satisfactory. Writing and Drawing are good and the composition promises well’. In Standards, 1 and 2 he described Reading as ‘good’ and recitation ‘satisfactory’, although Spelling was ‘weak’ and Arithmetic ‘from weak to good’. In Standard 4 Reading, Writing, Grammar and Drawing were ‘satisfactory’, Handwork was ‘good’ as was Arithmetic and Geography, but Spelling was ‘weak’. In Standard 6 ‘The whole of the English subjects are satisfactory’ but there was room for ‘considerable improvement in Composition and Grammar’. \(^{1355}\)

When Bird made another inspection visit twelve months later, in September 1921, the general tone of his report again stood in marked contrast with those of previous Board Inspectors and the Head Teacher, being much more critical of the progress being made. At this time, 24 pupils attending the School were classified as Maori out of a total roll of 45. \(^{1356}\)

Bird reported that the pupils in the lower classes ‘did not show much progress in Reading and Number’ and the Timetable for these classes showed ‘no Composition’. In the upper classes, Reading was described as ‘Fair’, but Comprehension was ‘weak

\(^{1353}\) Inspection Report, 30 May 1919. ABDJ W3568/52c Pt 2. ANZ-W. DB.
\(^{1354}\) Annual Examination Report, 24 November 1919. Ibid;
\(^{1355}\) Inspection Report, 24 September 1920. Ibid;
\(^{1356}\) Return of Maori Scholars Belonging to the School, New Zealand Education Department, 1921. Ibid;
with one or two exceptions’; Spelling was ‘very weak’ in Std.3, Arithmetic in Std.4 ‘except in two cases is poor. The textbook in history is not a satisfactory one for the purpose… Grammar is weak’; ‘I find in Stds. 2 and 1 pupils classified in the lower class for Arithmetic. This should not be necessary’. However he found Writing and the general presentation of the work in the lower classes ‘much improved’ and the Drawing and Handwork ‘satisfactory’.\footnote{1357}

But the Head Teacher’s own assessment, made less than three months later, again stood in marked contrast with that of Bird. In the Lower preparatory Division he found ‘Number work and Writing good’; in the Upper preparatory ‘Number work very satisfactory. Writing good. Spelling grasped. Phonics understood’.\footnote{1358}

One year later a new Head Teacher, Richard Ward, maintained a similar complacent if not triumphal tone, describing the preparatory Division as being ‘In a very fine working condition. Miss Latham has worked wonders in the short time she has been in charge. All work is excellent and deserves the highest credit’.\footnote{1359}

The view of the school as a European socializing and assimilating agency was evident in the comment of an Education Board Inspector, now D. A. Strachan, in 1922, when he reported that, ‘The tidy rooms, and the attractive appearance of the pupils combined with their pleasant address give evidence that the school is functioning well as a civilizing agent’.\footnote{1360}

In 1924 the Inspector thought that ‘The large number of children of native extraction makes a high standard of attainment in English and good speech difficult of attainment. The results achieved therefore are very pleasing’.\footnote{1361}

At this time the enrolment of Maori pupils was still increasing having reached over half of all enrolments, and the Head Teacher’s own descriptions of the work in the

\begin{footnotes}
\footnote{1357}{Inspection Report, 28 September 1921. Ibid;}
\footnote{1358}{Teacher’s Annual Examination Report, 10 December 1921. Ibid;}
\footnote{1359}{Teacher’s Annual Examination, 7 December 1922. Ibid;}
\footnote{1360}{Inspection Report, 25 October 1922. ABDJ W 3568/52c Part 2. ANZ-W. DB.}
\footnote{1361}{Inspection Report, 14 November 1924. Ibid. DB.}
\end{footnotes}
Preparatory division of the school were glowing. For example in 1924 he described the Division as ‘Good in everything’. 1362

In 1925 he wrote that ‘in spite of large numbers of new pupils joining during the year Miss Cameron has maintained a remarkably high state of efficiency in all subjects with this division’.1363

Yet despite this he still engaged in some negative labelling of some of the children. For example in the Teacher’s Annual Examination Report in December 1929 he was required to include grounds for retaining pupils over 8 years of age in the Preparatory Division, and his list on which every pupil was Maori included:

- Subnormal;
- Attended about four different schools;
- Intelligence below average but not subnormal;
- Home long distance from school;
- Broken attendance;
- Lives along the beach track impassable in bad weather;
- Ill-health;
- Had no schooling at all until 8 years of age;
- Recent arrival from native school;
- Majority of retardates have arrived this year from neighbouring native schools.1364

In 1926 the Head Teacher reported that in the Preparatory Division ‘20 out of 27 are retarded’.1365

The Head, H. T. Jensen’s, low expectations of the Maori children seems to have been fairly fixed and was reflected in comments such as, ‘The fact that the Maori children have a very poor knowledge of English –and sometimes none at all on entering school, mitigates against the progress that could be expected in a school of white children’.1366

His negative labelling of many Maori pupils was again evident in his examination report for 1932. In S.1 he described individual students as:

1362 Inspection Report, 10 December 1924. Ibid;
1363 Teacher’s Annual Examination Report. 9 December 1925. Ibid;
1364 Teacher’s Annual Examination Report, 20 December 1929. ABDJ W 3568/52c Part 2. ANZ-W. DB.
1365 Teacher’s Annual Examination Report, 1 December 1926. Ibid;
1366 Teacher’s Annual Examination Report, 18 December 1931. Ibid;
Very poor att. (sickness) – dull, Below av. intelligence; Began when 7.3 months; Poor att. Dull; Extremely dull; Attended many schools; Dull; Sub-normal; Much sickness-dull; Much sickness – dull; Poor attendance; Very broken att. (sickness); Dull – extremely; Very dull; Poor attendance and dull; Broken attendance; Extremely dull; Could not speak one word of English on entering school.1367

He concluded this section of his examination report with the comment that:

All the children whose names appear above are either full-blooded Maoris or half-castes, and speak English only when they have to. The type of Maori here is poor, lazy, and altogether worthless and this is reflected in their children.1368

It could be claimed that this Head is an individual, not one of the Crown’s officials responsible for policy-making. But the fact remains that this comment and all the others listed is produced in a document that was certainly read by one of the Inspectors on their periodic visits. Yet, despite this the Head makes such comments and continues to make them, with no apparent reservation or thought that he might be reprimanded.

In the Preparatory Division in 1932 he described ‘Good work’ having been done, ‘though, as the great majority (85%) are Maoris, many of whom cannot speak English when they come to school, progress is naturally slow’.1369

In 1933 he reported that ‘out of a roll number of 96, 83 are Maoris. Considering that many of these Maoris know no English when they enter school, and that several families have really very dull children, I consider that very good progress has been made’.1370

In 1934 the Head lists no fewer than 40 pupils from Primer 2 to Standard 2 as backward in their progress for a variety of reasons, including mental ‘dullness’,

1367 Teacher’s Annual Examination, 20 December 1932. Ibid; 1368 Ibid; 1369 Teacher’s Annual Examination, 16 December, 1932. Ibid; 1370 Teacher’s Annual Examination, 20 December 1933. Ibid;
‘language difficulties’, ‘late start’, ‘change of school’, ‘illness’, making the concluding comment that, ‘All retardates except one are Maori children’.  

Even in the 1930s complaints continued to be made about the conditions for learning in those Hawke’s Bay Education Board schools which enrolled many Maori children. In 1935 the Head of the Waipiro Bay Board School, still H.Jensen, complained again as he had been doing for several years about the partitioning of the Infant room from the Standard room merely by a curtain, describing the Infant Teacher, Miss McPherson, as having done ‘excellent work with a purely native class and under the most difficult conditions’.  

The destructive combination of racist attitudes and low expectations also remained evident, the Head adding that ‘The lack of English infants is a severe handicap. Added to that the type of Maori in this district is not very intelligent’ (Author’s emphasis).  

However the arrival of a new Head Teacher, A. Duff, in 1937, brought a marked change of attitude, one of the most significant aspects of which was a much more positive view of Maori children and higher expectations for them. Given that it was now 1937, that could be regarded as an overdue development.  

In his very first report the new Head described and classified several of the pupils in a way that had never happened in the school previously, and indeed was so rare as to be virtually non-existent in any school, Board or Native, enrolling Maori children: ‘Class S.3-F.11: Very brilliant scholar. Maori; Maori. Bright; Maori. Brilliant; Maori. Brilliant at craft and drawing; Bright. Maori-4 names listed; Brilliant. Maori’.  

---

1371 Teacher’s Annual Examination Report, Bay 19 December 1934. Ibid;  
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The positive effect of this new attitude was evident in an inspection report in 1939, the Inspector noting that ‘In past years the lack of response was noted, but this has been changed and pupils now speak confidently on selected topics’.  

### 9.5 Practical Education

Earlier in this report I identified the enthusiasm of Education Department officials for providing instruction of a practical kind, particularly for pupils in the Native/Maori primary schools, Maori District High Schools and Maori denominational boarding schools. This enthusiasm sometimes extended to Board Schools if a significant number of the pupils were Maori. On a visit to the East Coast District in June 1938, the Minister of Education, Peter Fraser, visited the Waipiro Bay Education Board School. Upon finding that the children were ‘practically all Maoris’, he asked whether they received any training in Woodwork, Cookery etc, and after being informed that they did not expressed the view that ‘although this was a public (i.e.Board) school there was no reason why provision similar to that in native schools for instruction in Crafts, Cookery, etc should not be made, also the provision of shower baths etc’. As a result, the Board Secretary had submitted an application for a grant of £885 and a plan for a Crafts building at the school.  

In 1938 Waipiro Bay remained a Board School under the Hawke’s Bay Education Board, but all of the 86 children attending except five were Maori and a large number of parents signed a petition to the Minister of Education asking that the school be made a Native School. However the Board decided that it was not agreeable to a change, giving no reasons for its position. The Director then advised the Minister that although it was the ‘almost unanimous wish of the parents to have their children educated in a Native School’ there was nothing that could be done as the law stood.

---

1375 Inspection Report, 29 November 1939. Ibid;
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But nine months later a further appeal was made by the Maori residents of Waipiro Bay for the school to become a Native School, this time to the Acting Minister of Native Affairs, the main reason given being that the people could not afford to send their children to a high school, and if the school was a Native one it might increase their chances of attending Te Aute, Hukarere or one of the other Maori colleges.\textsuperscript{1380} The request was referred to the Minister of Education who repeated that it was not possible to take any action because the Hawke’s Bay Education Board would not agree to the suggested change.\textsuperscript{1381}

However on 3 April a large number of parents petitioned the Minister again for a change on the grounds that there were only 3 European and 80 Maori children at the school, the Maori children were not obtaining the advantages of secondary education, the books and requisites were not available to the children as they were in the Native Schools, and they were not receiving the practical education common in the Native Schools.\textsuperscript{1382} The Hawke’s Bay Board now agreed, reluctantly, not to stand in the way of the transfer to Departmental control, although it re-stated its belief that all Native Schools should be under the Board’s control.\textsuperscript{1383}

\subsection*{9.5.1 Tolaga Bay Board School}

In 1891 the Education Board School at Tolaga Bay, situated approximately half-way between Gisborne and Tokomaru Bay, enrolled 61 pupils, and in his report that year the Board’s Inspector, H. Hill, described the school as ‘frequented mainly by Maoris who are very backward and constitute the preparatory class with few exceptions’. Here again, as at Waipiro Bay, in a Board School enrolling mainly Maori pupils, the accommodation was unsatisfactory, with severe overcrowding meaning although fifty three pupils were present at the examination, the room is only suited for the accommodation of thirty-five pupils.\textsuperscript{1384}

\begin{flushleft}
\textsuperscript{1380} Mrs James McIlroy to Savage, 6 February 1939. Ibid;
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In 1892 Inspector Hill described most of the pupils in the preparatory class as ‘Maoris who have made comparatively little progress in Reading. Writing and Drawing are much better’.  

Here, as was also often apparent in his reports on the Waipiro Bay Board School, he identifies a problem but seems content to let it persist rather than suggesting to the Teacher ways it might be ameliorated.

In 1893 the accommodation remained inadequate, with Hill suggesting that ‘the effective work of the school would be improved were the room now used as a shed better lighted and a floor fixed’.  

In the same report he made no acknowledgment of the fact that the Maori children entered the school speaking their own language, and usually with little English, merely pointing out that in ‘the lower classes I noticed that some of the native children failed to say their words clearly and distinctly. Expression, modulation, and the correct sounding of each word should be demanded from every child’. Nevertheless, he regarded the Preparatory children as ‘making fair progress and several of them should be good standard pupils next year’.

Inspector Hill frequently commented on the need for better attendance by the Maori pupils. However, it needs to be remembered that it was not until the School Attendance Act of 1894 that the Crown required Maori children from 7 to 14 years of age to attend a Native School if one was available, but no compulsion was brought to bear upon Maori children living in districts where there were no Native schools. This stood in marked contrast to the 1877 Education Act, which introduced compulsory schooling for Pakeha primary age children, but exempted Maori children from that obligation. It was not until 1903 that the Minister of Education published regulations

---

1385 Inspection Report, Tolaga Bay 3 November 1892. Ibid;
1386 Inspection Report, 28 October 1893. Ibid;
1387 Ibid;
requiring Maori children to enrol at a Board School if no Native School was nearby.\textsuperscript{1388}

In his 1893 inspection of Tolaga Bay, Hill reported ‘Four failures out of the 24 standard pupils examined’, and noted that ‘three of them are native children who have made little more than half attendance during the year and for whose backwardness the Master cannot be held responsible’. But he left it at that, making no suggestion that the reasons for the poor attendance by the Maori pupils might be enquired into by the Head with a view to remediying it.\textsuperscript{1389}

At Tolaga Bay the following year, he reported that ‘The natives have ceased to attend although there are numbers residing on the opposite side of the river’, but suggested that ‘The appointment of an active committee with one or two natives would create interest in educational matters’. However no suggestions are made regarding making the methods or environment of this Board School more attractive to the Maori pupils as an inducement to attend regularly.\textsuperscript{1390}

In a second report on the school, in October 1894 he found that it had ’suffered sadly from whooping cough and bad weather during a large portion of the school year. These following on the measles have lessened the attendance, several children having fallen a prey to disease and the natives have mostly ceased attendance at the school… I trust the committee will endeavour to increase the attendance by directing the attention of the natives to the necessity of sending their children to school’. He commented that the ‘irregular attendance’ of the Maori children made teaching a difficult task as soon as they reached the standard work, and he suggested it would be sensible to enforce attendance as Maori children ‘learn without difficulty when they attend with fair regularity’.\textsuperscript{1391}

In 1895 the Inspector reported, positively, that in Standards 3-4 it was ‘pleasing to find so many native children acquitting themselves so well in these standards’, and he

\textsuperscript{1388} UNESCO, \textit{Compulsory Education in New Zealand}, Wellington 1954, p.61.
\textsuperscript{1389} Inspection Report, Tolaga Bay, 6 November 1893. ABDJ W3568/45b, pt.1. ANZ-W. DB.
\textsuperscript{1390} Inspection Report, Tolaga Bay, 8 March 1894. Ibid;
\textsuperscript{1391} Inspection Report, 3 October 1894. Ibid;
was generally ‘pleased to find such a good tone apparent in the working of this school. The children—both Native and European—appear exceedingly happy and it is manifest that much good work is being done’.1392

In April 1896 he praised the teacher for encouraging games, suggesting that the Maori children particularly appreciated these because ‘it brings them into contact with the European children’, and, in a comment that was extremely rare given the assimilation policies of the time, suggested that ‘native games should also be encouraged’. It is a suggestion that it is hard to imagine being made by one of the Native School Inspectors at this time.1393

In a second inspection of the school, in September, he again praised the teachers for having forty out of the 52 children enrolled presented for examination in the standards, adding that: ‘Most of the children belong to the native race but they are able to keep up fairly well with the European children. Pehi Temple Std. V deserves special mention here as being by far the best pupil in his standard’.1394

But praise was then followed by criticism, with his finding that the pupils examined in Std. IV had been ‘unable to attack with success the Arithmetic and most of the other work was of poor quality… As in Std. IV there is only one failure in Std. III. This class will need special care in Reading and Spelling and Dictation as these subjects in Std. IV showed too much weakness’.1395

This is another example of one the typical aspects of Hill’s reports when, as here, most pupils are Maori. He is critical of the standard achieved, but goes no further than to suggest to the Teacher the need for ‘special care’ in improving matters; no detailed directions as to how this might be achieved are given.

In his report the following year Hill returned to a familiar theme; the inadequacy of the accommodation provided by the Hawke’s Bay Board particularly when, as here at

1392 Inspection Report, 24 October 1895. Ibid;
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Tolaga Bay, a significant percentage of the pupils were Maori. In 1897 he found that ‘The desk accommodation is insufficient for the wants of the school and it would be well if arrangements could be made to place the lean-to in a fit state for use as a classroom for the instruction of the native children who fill up the preparatory classes’. 1396

In 1898 he directed the Teacher, ominously, to lower his expectations for the Maori children, and not to expect the same standard of work from them as was expected of the European pupils, despite an acknowledgment that they were intelligent:

The majority of the pupils are of the native race and it is very difficult to prepare them in the same work as that demanded from European pupils. The result is that defects appear which I propose to remedy by requiring composition from native pupils a standard below the actual class in which they are prepared but the work must be properly prepared for that Standard. Although there is an absence of finish in much of the work the intelligence of the pupils is very marked. 1397

In 1899 he again criticized the state of the accommodation, about which the Board had done nothing since his previous criticism two years earlier. He found that ‘The overcrowded state of the school is a serious drawback to the instruction of the Preparatory pupils. It is impossible for the instruction to be carried on with any hope of success until proper accommodation has been provided’. And in another section of his Report he commented that ‘The work is carried on under difficult conditions the accommodation being altogether insufficient for the requirements of this school’. 1398

Yet despite the unsatisfactory physical conditions, he described the instruction of the Maori and European pupils as successful, with regular attendance which had been ‘admirably contributed to by Mr Temple, a Maori member of the School Committee’. 1399

In 1900 Hill returned again to the unsuitability of the accommodation for effective teaching and learning he found in this Board school enrolling a significant number of
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1396 Inspection Report, 14 October 1897. Ibid;
1397 Inspection Report, 29 September 1898. ABDJ W3568/45b Pt. 2 ANZ-W.
1398 Inspection Report, 12 and 13 October 1899. Ibid;
1399 Ibid;
Maori pupils. He found that ‘The presence of so many native children who are mostly in the Preparatory classes makes the school difficult to work. At present the Mistress who should take Std 1 and the preparatory classes cannot do so there being no suitable accommodation. The 40 Preparatory cannot be put in the small room…Further school provision is essential for this school’.  

By 1901 when 90 pupils were enrolled the Inspector’s criticism of the Board’s failure to do anything about the accommodation became more strident, with an acknowledgment that some children were missing out on school altogether because of the over-crowding not being remedied:

The need for accommodation is so evident that it is quite useless directing attention to the case any further as year after year it has been pointed out that something was necessary for this district.

The children attend with commendable regularity particularly the natives and something should be done without delay….when further accommodation is provided I anticipate at least an attendance of 100 children.

Hill’s increasing exasperation at the Hawke’s Bay Education Board’s failure to take action with respect the accommodation was again evident in October, when he wrote that ‘The Preparatory pupils are very backward but nothing else is to be expected under present conditions. No attention is paid to increasing the accommodation and the children cannot be taught with any hope of success at present’.  

So grave did he regard the accommodation problem that he attached a ‘Supplementary report to above’, again indicating that it was mainly Maori children in the Preparatory classes who were being most disadvantaged:

This school is so overcrowded that the standard work cannot be prepared with any prospect of success. Progress of a kind is made but the efficiency of the Standards is falling in a marked degree and something should be done to alter what is at present an unsatisfactory state of affairs. No teaching can be effective under present

\[1400\] Inspection Report, 20 October 1900. Ibid;
\[1401\] Inspection Report, 21 March 1901. Ibid;
\[1402\] Inspection Report, 14 October 1901. Ibid;
arrangements …Standards VI, V and IV are in the same room as the Preparatory pupils who are mostly natives and know but few words of English, and who need much disciplinary training to bring them even into working order. Although the results are by no means what they should be, I attach no blame to the staff as they cannot succeed under present working conditions.  

He continued his criticism of the accommodation in his following year’s report, in the course of which he demonstrated a willingness, perhaps relatively new-found, to actually praise the ‘diligence’ of the Maori pupils and the good progress several of them had made by progressing into higher classes:

The room called a class room by way of courtesy is so crowded that a proper arrangement of classes for instruction is impossible… Considering the difficulties under which this school has been working for so many wearisome months the progress is very commendable… The Reading is hardly up to requirements but even this is of fair quality considering that the children are made up mostly of the native race. The school so soon as accommodation is provided will be sure to do well, as the native children are diligent workers and quite a number of them are in the two highest classes.

His report the following year continued what appeared to be a relatively new found appreciation of the ability of Maori pupils:

It was a pleasure to spend a few hours at work among so many native pupils. It is one of the schools where natives are successfully trained and I was much fortified to find that the school had 13 pupils in Std 6, and six of them are native boys. This is unusual and shows what is possible. I took the class in a first lesson on Present Worth and was surprised and delighted to find how quickly the native lads grasped the underlying principle and were able to solve questions for themselves in less than half an hour.

The same positive tone continued in a second inspection report later in the year; ‘I have never before had a class containing so many S.6 pupils belonging to the native race. It is a credit to the school.’

Attached to his report was the work of the higher class, which demonstrates aspects of the curriculum of the typical Board
School at this time. This included, in history, an exclusive focus on overseas events with matching dates and ‘Remarkable Characters’, e.g the Battle of the Nile 1798, Lord Nelson; Indian Mutiny 1856, General Havelock; Boer War 1899, Lord Roberts, and the use of the English Royal Readers and other texts.\footnote{1407}

Hill continued his positive reports on the work at the school and pupils, finding in 1904 that it ‘continues to do very good work. The native pupils are intelligent and they make good progress under the present staff. The lad Temple should apply for a scholarship (Native)’.\footnote{1408}

The idea that that more practical education was needed, particularly in a school enrolling so many Maori children, became more evident in his reports. In 1904, according to the ethnic classification in use at the time, the school enrolled ‘46 Maori 46 Mixed Race and 27 White pupils’. In 1905 he suggested that ‘It would be well to establish a workshop for the senior boys and dress-making might be attempted for the benefit of the girls’.\footnote{1409} And the following year he wrote that he would like to see a start made with a garden for the children.\footnote{1410}

The positive view Hill had appeared to have formed of progress continued in his 1905 inspection report:

\begin{quote}
Stds. 6,5,4,3: The children showed good intelligence. I was much pleased with the answering in a lesson on Nature Study. The Native children equally with the European appear much interested in their studies.

Stds. 2, 1 and Preparatory Classes: The children are mostly of native descent. They are well behaved and well disciplined and the methods employed by the Mistress are producing good results.\footnote{1411}
\end{quote}

However another Hawke’s Bay Education Board Inspector, J Smith, inspected the school in 1909 and 1910 and took a less positive view of progress. In 1909 he...
reported: 'Preparatory Classes. All these classes are doing very satisfactory work. Though the work is hampered by the fact that most of the Maori pupils who are enrolled have to learn English before their studies commence'.

In 1910 Smith described the Spelling as ‘defective, but at this stage the difficulty of training Maori children has not been overcome’.

Hill returned as Inspector in 1911, and described the school as a growing one with more than half the pupils belonging to the Maori race. It had suffered, like other schools along the coast, from a change in the Assistant Teacher, with the new Assistant, a Miss Martyn, having only been ‘working three weeks in her department of 75 pupils and she has not therefore been able to overtake the backward pupils of the Preparatory classes. But already her good influence is being felt’.

Having one Assistant Teacher responsible for 75 pupils in the Preparatory Division, including a significant number of Maori children entering school speaking Maori as their first language, seems to me extraordinary in 1911, but the Inspector makes no comment on this.

However, he did comment on it in the following year, pointing out that more than half the pupils were in the Preparatory Class, ‘which arises from causes that cannot be avoided at present. The majority of children belong to the native race and for so many pupils more help is necessary’.

The view of the school as a socializing agency was evident in the Inspector’s report in 1915, when he described the Teachers as having ‘high ideals of duty and the natives are trained in habits of neatness, cleanliness and duty in each department and class’.
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In June 1916 William Bird inspected the Tolaga Bay Board School for the first time, and here also there is a definite change in the nature of some of his comments from those of earlier Inspector’s reports. No doubt with his past lengthy experience of examining Maori pupils, he has the presence of a large number in this Board School very much in mind. In particular he gives much fuller and more specific advice to the teachers not just on what improvements he regards are needed, but how to go about achieving these with specific teaching methods:

Oral English must find a definite place and should follow the lines indicated in my lesson given to S1. The timetable should provide for at least three hours per week in the lower classes (P1-2-3-S1) and the morning talk on definite topics should never be omitted… Reading should be taught to the infant classes by means of Look and Say combined with phonic method… Oral work should always precede written work in arithmetic… The class books are those in general use in the district (I am pleased to see that the headmaster does not require the pupils to get geography in English books). \[1417\]

When another Board Inspector, D. Strachan, returned in 1918 he noted that fairly drastic measures were sometimes followed by the teacher on the grounds of promoting health, pointing out that ‘the school is regularly sprayed with sheep dip and I understand the results commend the practice’. \[1418\]

On the basis of their names, all 11 pupils presented as Candidates for Certificates of Proficiency or Competency in 1918 were Pakeha. Yet it is evident from enrolments that many Maori children were still pupils; although the roll is steadily becoming more Pakeha; in 1919, 55 out of 155 pupils enrolled were described as Maori. \[1419\]

Bird inspected the school again in 1919, and again his very specific advice to the Teachers by comparison with some of his predecessors was evident. He advised the Teacher that:

These lower classes want a thorough grounding in the sounds of the consonants and the use of the alphabet and oral spelling in reading should be entirely given up. Some concrete objects should be provided

\[1417\] Inspection Report, 30 June 1916. Ibid;
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for number work: cotton reels for example placed on nails driven into a board will serve admirably.\textsuperscript{1420}

The attitude that having Maori pupils in the school presented something of an impediment to progress was again evident in a 1920 inspection report, the Inspector writing that: ‘Standard 1 and 2; (The Teacher) is greatly handicapped by having quite a number of pupils, many of them natives, much too old for the Standards. From their reading I should think that the earlier work has been inferior, or the pupils have been over-promoted’.\textsuperscript{1421}

Beginning in the 1920s the inspection reports on the School generally become much briefer, and the presence of Maori pupils is hardly ever referred to, apart from being recorded in statistical returns of pupil enrolment.

A report in 1932 demonstrated that Board Schools in rural areas were being encouraged to include more practical work in their curriculum, although this may have received greater emphasis here at Tolaga Bay where Maori pupils were enrolled. At Tolaga Bay in 1932 the Inspector noted ‘with approval that the instruction in agriculture is becoming more and more practical and that it has a definite relation to the life of the community. Plot work is extensive and pupils have been enabled through the courtesy of local farmers to study the cultivation of important crops’. However this aspect was never emphasized in Board Schools to the extent that it was now being encouraged in the Native Schools.\textsuperscript{1422}

\section*{9.5.2 Te Puia Springs Board School}

For some years after 1908 there do not appear to have been any Maori pupils in this small school, located between Tokomaru and Waipiro Bays, but in 1920 on the basis of the names on the roll there were 4, in 1921 six out of a total roll of twelve, in 1923 a majority were Maori (12 out of 17), but in 1927 there were six out of twenty.

\begin{footnotes}
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The presence of the Maori pupils was rarely commented on in inspection reports by Inspectors or Examination reports by the Head Teacher. But when it was they tended to be referred to as having difficulties of one kind or another, as something of a problem, or as rather a drawback to the progress of the Pakeha students. What stands out for me here again is how the identification of difficulties is seldom if ever accompanied by specific suggestions from Inspectors, or reflection by Head Teachers, on what might be done to improve the learning process for the Maori students to facilitate their achievement.

In 1923 Standard Three was the highest class any of the Maori pupils (2), had reached.\textsuperscript{1423}

In 1927 the Head Teacher wrote that in the Preparatory Division, ‘Three of the pupils are Maoris and find some difficulty with language work. Owing to the frequent movement of the parents the attendance is often erratic’.\textsuperscript{1424}

In the Preparatory Division in 1928 ‘Four out of the seven children are Maoris and at the beginning of the year had practically no knowledge of English’.\textsuperscript{1425}

In 1931 in the Preparatory Division ‘The progress in this division is very good’ except that ‘A few Maori children are very slow’.\textsuperscript{1426}

For several years after 1930 no reference to Maori pupils appeared, but in 1936 the Head Teacher reported that ‘Preparatory Division. Mostly Maori children. Work has been hampered by much sickness. Speech improving although still weak. Many children have made great progress seeing they could not speak a word of English at beginning of school year’.\textsuperscript{1427}
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\textsuperscript{1427} Teacher’s Annual Examination Report, 31 December 1936. Ibid;
In 1938 an Inspector reported that ‘With so many Maori pupils good oral expression is difficult’.  

1428 Inspection Report, 28 November 1938. Ibid;
Accounts by Maori pupils of their experiences in Board schools are fairly rare, but Joseph Naden has described aspects of his attendance at the Tokomaru Bay Board School from 1943 to 1950. He estimates that of the 120 pupils enrolled no more than 25 would have been Pakeha, meaning it was hardly a typical Board School at this time. \(^\text{1429}\)

Naden recalls having three Principals, two of whom he described as showing little interest in the history and culture of the majority of the pupils, but one who did so. He recalls that:

Social Studies lessons about “The Maori” were based on *Our Nation’s Story* and I came away with the distinct impression that the Maori was the villain in the ‘Maori Wars’! I remember hating Te Kooti and Te Rauparaha and liking Tamati Waka Nene. It was the information from *Our Nation’s Story* I believe that aroused these feelings in me. \(^\text{1430}\)

His other memories of the school were somewhat mixed. He recalls the Infant Mistress as being a ‘very good teacher, kindly towards me and a pianist who would have us standing around the piano singing’, and one of the Principals as ‘the best teacher I ever had at primary school; he would take the pupils into the bush and teach us to recognise native trees and the uses Maori put them to. He would tell us about the birds and insects that had their habitat there’ and ‘we all cried when he left’. \(^\text{1431}\)

However in his first year of school another Principal caught him:

With a shirt filled with ngutu kaka or red kowhai flowers whose nectar I had just acquired a liking for. When he asked me whether I had picked the flowers and I said I hadn’t he flew into a rage and screamed at me for lying. I did not know what a lie was. I was five years old. He pushed me out of his room into the nearby staff room, showed me his

---


\(^{1430}\) Ibid;

\(^{1431}\) Ibid, p.10;
strap, which was cut from an old machine endless belt and had rows of metal through it, and told me to hold my hands out. He then gave me six of the most excruciatingly painful whacks I have ever experienced, all the while raging at me for telling lies.\textsuperscript{1432}

\textsuperscript{1432} Ibid, p.10;
CHAPTER 10: DEVELOPMENTS FROM 1970

Fifty-six percent of East Coast residents had no formal school qualifications. Only two percent of East Coast residents had University Bursary (compared with 5.6 percent of the total New Zealand population), 10 percent had Sixth Form Certificate or University Entrance (compared with 16 percent of the total population) and 19 percent had passes in one or more subjects in School Certificate… One per cent of the residents of the East Coast had a university degree compared with 5.5 percent of the total population. Education Review Office, 1997.1433

Most schools at the time of their ERO Review did not even have systems for monitoring student achievement. Education Review Office, 1997.1434

It is clear that students on the East Coast are not being educated satisfactorily. Education Review Office, 1997.1435

The education system in New Zealand is operating unsuccessfullly because too many Maori children are not reaching an acceptable standard of education. For some reason they do not or cannot take full advantage of it. Their language is not adequately protected and their scholastic achievements fall far short of what they should be. The promises of the Treaty of Waitangi of equality in education as in all other human rights are undeniable. Judged by the system’s own standards Maori children are not being successfully taught, and for that reason alone, quite apart from a duty to protect the Maori language, the education system is being operated in breach of the Treaty. Waitangi Tribunal, 1986.1436

1434 Ibid, p.21;
1435 Ibid, p.17;
1436
10.1 Early childhood education

10.1.1 Historical background

While most Maori lived in rural areas very few attended kindergartens, and even in the 1920s no kindergartens existed outside the four main centres. After World War Two and with urbanisation several Maori women trained as kindergarten teachers and a few Maori children began to attend kindergarten. But May concludes from her comprehensive study of early childhood education in New Zealand that apart from Maori children attending the Auckland Kindergarten in the 1950s ‘Kindergarten Association and Department of Education records…contain no mention of the Maori preschool child until the 1960s when a flurry of interest began’. However in 1955 aspects of kindergartens for Maori children were certainly discussed at a meeting of the ‘Maori Education Campaign Executive’ which included representatives from the Departments of Education and Maori Affairs. Rangi Royal pointed out that efforts had been made to start kindergartens in Maori communities and while he advocated more encouragement being given to Maori parents to send their children to ‘Pakeha kindergartens in European communities’ it was also ‘most desirable to encourage the establishment of Maori kindergartens in Maori communities’.  

---

1436 ‘Finding of the Waitangi Tribunal relating to Te Reo Maori and a Claim lodged by Huirangi Waikerepuru and Ngai Kaiwhakapumau ite Reo Incorporated Society (The Wellington Board of Maori Language), Wellington, 1986.
1438 Ibid;
1439 Minutes of meeting, 2 August, 1955. EW2490 57/1/3 Part 1, Box 279. ANZ-W. DB.
Pre-school education for Maori also began to be discussed at meetings of the Committee on Maori Education in the latter half of the 1950s. In October 1957 Miss Gallagher, the Education Department’s Supervisor of pre-School Education, gave a presentation to the Committee in which she attributed any difficulties with Maori children attending pre-schools as all being on the Maori side, including ‘lack of interest’, ‘shyness’ or unfamiliarity with the potential benefits, before concluding that ‘the benefit to the Maori child from attendance at pre-school centres would need careful research before it could be established that they would benefit from full participation’.1440

Within the Department of Education and the main early childhood organizations doubts appear to have existed about the wisdom of having any separate (i.e., “segregated”) initiatives by Maori to develop early childhood centres. Unless any prospective group affiliated with the play-centre of kindergarten associations they could not receive funding.1441

However at a Conference of the Maori University Students’ Association in 1959 James Ritchie recommended that ‘experimental projects be set up to determine the best technique for Maori pre-school education (which) would go far to oversee the difficulties Maori children faced in their first year at school’ by preparing them better for it.1442

In 1960 the Report of the Acting Secretary of Maori Affairs (J. K. Hunn) concluded that, ‘Kindergartens and play-centres are needed in Maori areas’.1443

The opening of two early childhood centres in mainly Maori communities on the Whanganui River at Kaiwaiki and Putiki in 1960 was a reflection of growing interest in more Maori involvement, and there was growing interest also within the department of Education.1444

However it was the Maori Women’s Welfare League which was most active at this time with early childhood education regularly discussed at its conferences and its members actively pushing for centres to be established. In that sense, while ‘Pakeha agendas were a backdrop to the pre-school initiatives, Maori community activism was at the forefront’.  

In her study of Maori mothers and pre-school education Geraldine McDonald wrote that:

> just as there were persons and groups anxious to promote pre-school education (generally) there were also Maori communities anxious to establish their own. One of the striking things about the early 1960s is the number of school committees, parent-teacher associations and Maori Women’s Welfare League Branches that were making plans for pre-school groups’.  

As an example of the developments, by 1962 10 East Coast pre-school centres were linked to (although not fully affiliated with) the Play Centre Association.

Early childhood education also now became a more prominent topic for discussion at meetings of the Committee on Maori Education. At its meeting in November 1961 Hunn suggested that kindergarten and play-centre organisations did not always cater for the needs of the Maori community, and said he agreed with Mr Bradley, an Education Department representative present, that alternatives should be investigated.

An important development occurred in 1961 when the Maori Education Foundation (MEF) decided to broaden its focus to include a major drive to encourage more Maori parents to enrol their children in pre-school centres. In 1963 the Foundation appointed Lex Grey, formerly of the Auckland Play Centre Association, as its Pre-School Officer and he was to prove an energetic and inspirational figure in his work for it until 1967. The Foundation’s preferred model was play-centres because their

1445 Ibid;  
1447 May, 2001, p.80.  
1448 Minutes of the Committee, 7 November 1961. EW2490 57/1/3 Part 1, Box 279. ANZ-W. DB.
emphasis on parental involvement and voluntary character was viewed as likely to be well received by Maori particularly in rural areas.¹⁴⁴⁹ By 1967, 17 play centre groups had been established on the East Coast.¹⁴⁵⁰

The Department of Educations Annual Report in 1965 pointed out that:

> Many Maori parents have shown new willingness to make use of existing pre-school facilities and over 80 new groups have been formed in predominantly Maori communities. Most of these have been fostered by the Maori Education Foundation through its pre-school officer…Hundreds of Maori mothers have showed sustained interest in training courses and have shared in the day-to-day supervision of newly formed groups.¹⁴⁵¹

By 1965, 1,541 Maori children were attending play-centres and 660 kindergartens, making a total of 2,201, out of a total figure nationally of 27,482 at recognised centres. By the end of 1966, the total number of Maori enrolments had risen to 2,631. Most were attending in rural areas and small towns; in Auckland with a large Maori population and established early childhood organisations only 130 Maori children attended play-centres and 220 kindergartens, suggesting the need for the organisations to change their approach if reluctance by Maori to enroll their children was to be overcome.¹⁴⁵²

After Grey’s resignation from the MEF the Department of Education began to give more attention itself to the pre-school area including appointing more staff, and in 1967 the New Zealand Educational Institute representing primary school teachers called for more emphasis to be placed on the pre-school education of Maori children including provision of it to be expanded.¹⁴⁵³

While Grey’s contribution cannot be overlooked, Mrs Miria Pewhairangi, who was released on loan to the Foundation from the Department of Education as acting Pre-School Officer, has described the 1960s as a decade of Maori ‘self-assertion’ and:

¹⁴⁵² May, 2001, p.87.
¹⁴⁵³ Ibid;
By and large Lex Grey’s skills masked the contribution made by Maori individuals, communities and organisations. In particular Maori Women’s Welfare League groups throughout the country and Maori Affairs welfare officers… spent many hours beyond the normal call of duty on ‘paving the way’ for Lex Grey and providing groups with continuous follow-up and support.\footnote{1454}

She attributes the success of many of the early Maori centres to their being organised around Maori values, with te reo Maori often being used and in the late 1960s many Maori women with expertise in pres-school education coming to the fore.

The first Maori Pre-School Planning Conference sponsored by the New Zealand Maori Council and the MWWL was held in 1968. Maori delegates acknowledged that while playcentres were sometimes beyond the reach of many Maori mothers ‘educationally socially and financial’ there were ‘Maori values that were more important and easier to impart in the informal atmosphere of family pre-school groups. They did not want to compete with Pakeha mothers who knew “what was best” without consulting them’.\footnote{1455}

In 1970 it was reported that more than 3,000 Maori children were now enrolled at recognised play-centres and kindergartens, some 400 others were attending one of the family groups sponsored by the Maori Education Foundation, and a further 100 had been admitted to primary schools as under-age pupils. It was estimated that a little over 20 percent of Maori children aged three and four were now participating in some form of organised pre-school education, a proportion still well below that for eligible non-Maori children, which the Department of Education attributed to the proportion of Maori children still living in small communities in rural and newly developed urban areas. Officials claimed that in such areas buildings suitable for play-centres were rare and it was difficult to raise adequate funds to qualify for a subsidy towards a kindergarten. However they suggested that this difficulty was now being overcome by a recently approved extension of Government financial assistance that would facilitate the provision of accommodation for pre-school education in areas of high

\footnote{1454} Ibid., p.82; 
\footnote{1455} May, 2001, p.88.
priority, where at least 30 percent of the pre-school population consisted of Maori and Pacific Island children.\textsuperscript{1456}

The growth of Maori enrolment in some form of organised pre-school education since then is reflected in the fact that in 2005 the number of Maori children reported to have participated in early childhood education on entry to school was 89.9 percent, which was up from 86.5 percent in 2002. However this was still behind the Pakeha percentage of 97.7, and it is also a matter for concern that the attendance rates for Maori pre-schoolers consistently fall behind most children.\textsuperscript{1457}

Research also shows that affordability can remain a barrier to participation for low-income whanau.\textsuperscript{1458}

From 2007 parents of children who are aged three and four will be entitled to fully subsidised early childhood education for 20 hours per week from teacher-led services. But concern has been expressed that many early childhood education centres will not be able to offer the 20 hours free service, one view being that ‘What is most concerning is that those in poorer communities are again most likely to suffer. Because services must be teacher-led it is rural communities and poorer communities that will miss out’.\textsuperscript{1459}

\subsection*{10.1.2 Te Kohanga Reo}

Te kohanga reo, the ‘language nursery’ or ‘language nest’, are pre-school institutions which emphasize Maori language development for pre-school children within a Maori language and cultural environment. They were a movement inspired and initiated by Maori and arose primarily from a wish to ensure the maintenance of spoken Maori,

\textsuperscript{1456} AJHR, 1970, E-1, p.28.
\textsuperscript{1458} Ibid;
which the Maori language survey overseen by Dr Richard Benton in the 1970s had showed faced the possibility of extinction.\textsuperscript{1460}

The language surveys during the 1970s included communities on the East Coast, and revealed a somewhat similar picture of language loss to that identified elsewhere, which undoubtedly contributed to concern and the feeling that something more needed to be done to reverse the trend. For example a survey of ‘The Maori Language in Te Araroa and Vicinity’ revealed that while 92 percent of people aged 45 and over were ‘fluent speakers of Maori’ this had fallen to 36 percent for those between 2 and 14 years; most school-age children knew ‘different amounts of Maori from a little to a lot. However, less than a tenth of them spoke the language well’, and ‘Parents and local elders have said how worried they were because fewer people used Maori in the home and community’.\textsuperscript{1461}

At Rangitukia, while 100 percent of those over 45 were described as fluent speakers, this had fallen to 26 percent between 15–24 and 3 percent for those between 2-14, the survey revealing that ‘more and more people have no knowledge of Maori with three quarters of the fluent speakers over the age of 25.\textsuperscript{1462} And a somewhat similar pattern was also revealed from surveys at Tokomaru Bay, Te Araroa, Tolaga Bay and Whangara.\textsuperscript{1463}

In addition to immersing children in a Maori language speaking environment te kohanga reo also aim to provide a cultural dimension (tikanga Maori) as part of this process and include a spiritual dimension (taha wairua). Empowering whanau to be responsible for the organisation and administration of the te kohanga reo became an important part of their philosophy.

A hui whakatauira, or Maori Leader Conference, in 1980 recognised the urgency implicit in Benton’s findings and provided a major stimulus to the creation of kohanga.

\textsuperscript{1461} NZCER, \textit{Survey of language Use in Maori Households and Communities}, Wellington, pp.2-4.
\textsuperscript{1462} NZCER, \textit{The Maori Language in Rangitukia}, pp.2-4
\textsuperscript{1463} Ibid;
The Kohanga Reo National Trust Board was established in 1982 and oversees and administers kohanga nationwide. It was registered as a charitable trust in 1983 with the aim of managing the kaupapa (philosophy) of the development of kohanga reo, and promoting a partnership between the people and Government departments, in particular the Department of Maori Affairs which was the initial controlling authority of kohanga.\textsuperscript{1464}

The Department of Maori Affairs was very supportive and this included not unduly imposing its own compliance requirements on kohanga. They flourished, particularly during the first ten years, with a huge amount of support from kaumatua and the next generation of Maori speakers, much of it of a voluntary nature, which was critical to their success. In these respects the success of kohanga was the success of the people rather than that of the Crown and its agents.

However, in 1990 responsibility for Kohanga Reo was transferred from the Department of Maori Affairs to the newly created Ministry of Education, a move which according to the Kohanga Reo National Trust:

\begin{quote}
put greater emphasis on more regulatory controls for Kohanga Reo. This change had huge implications at the grass roots level. Kohanga Reo had to come to terms with the regulatory environment and compliances of the early childhood sector and a mainstream department, whilst maintaining the unique kaupapa of the Kohanga Reo movement. Such a system of measurement often came at a heavy cost to our kaupapa.\textsuperscript{1465}
\end{quote}

It may not be widely understood in the wider community that kohanga peaked in terms of numbers after the first 10-15 years, but there has been a gradual decline ever since, from over 800 to 500 kohanga, and in numbers of children enrolled from 16,000 to just over 10,000. From my reading and talking with people it seems probable that this decline has been attributable, at least in part, to the huge compliance requirements placed on kohanga by the Crown.

\textsuperscript{1464} Te Kohanga National Trust, ‘About Us’, 2007, p.1. See also Alison Jones, Graham and Linda Smith et.al., 1990.
\textsuperscript{1465} Te Kohanga Reo National Trust, 2003, p.1.
As was pointed out earlier, to qualify for the 20 hours per week of free early childhood education to be offered by the Government from 2007 centres must be teacher-led. Those that are whanau led will not qualify. The negative implications of this for many kohanga reo was raised by Dr Pita Sharples in November 2006 when he pointed out that of the 2715 early childhood centres approved for the 20 free hours only one appeared to be a kohanga. He described this as:

not only in direct contradiction to the tikanga and whakapapa pertaining to kohanga reo—it is also in breach of the Government’s own statement of Desirable Objectives and Practices. Our whanau, hapu and iwi have always seen the growth of kohanga reo as providing a vital foundation for the growth and revitalisation of te reo Maori. The decision to undermine kohanga reo by denying them the twenty hours free funding will have enormous implications for the viability of kohanga reo, and indeed kura kaupapa Maori.1466

10.1.3 Early Childhood Education: East Coast

The 1997 Education Review Office Report which focussed on Tolaga Bay to Hick’s Bay revealed that in that area there were 22 early childhood centres including 19 kohanga reo, two playcentres, one “developing” but unlicensed play-centre, and no kindergartens or full-day child-care centres. The total enrolment in the 22 centres was 297 children. This meant about 46 percent of all children under five on the East Coast were enrolled in these centres, compared with 54 percent of all New Zealand children aged 0 to 5 years attending such centres. ERO pointed out that the participation rate in early childhood education of children from this part of the Coast was therefore below the national average, with over half of new entrants to East Coast schools having not attended any early childhood centre, and ‘When these children enter school they need time to develop the skills of their peers who have had pre-school experience’.1467

The findings in the 1997 ERO Report overall were of sufficient concern for the first Iwi-Ministry of Education partnership to be formed with Te Rununga o Ngati Porou

in 1998 as Whaia te iti Kahurangi, with the contracting of Gardner Parata Ltd to address the issues raised. This led to the development of a strategic plan beginning with a focus on governance and management, frameworks and systems, leading on to professional development as a major focus in 2000 and the introduction of ICT equipment in 2001.

The New Zealand Council for Educational Research was contracted to undertake an evaluation of the progress and impact of the initiatives, and in the final of five reports in 2003 it drew attention to what would need to be a matter of continuing concern in the early childhood area. This was that:

> It seems that many Ngati Porou East Coast children-possibly around 40-50 percent- are starting school without the habits and knowledge which would allow them to make a flying start on their learning. Four kohanga reo whanua identified issues which also concerned them in terms of children’s learning, primarily the quality of te reo Maori they could provide, and the level of whanau participation.\(^{1468}\)

In a later section school principals were asked to identify the skills and attitudes they thought tamariki needed to have when they started school and they came up with five main themes:

- able to follow routines, listening skills, look after themselves (including hygiene).
- able to hold a pencil or crayon, or write their own name.
- some knowledge of letters, words; able to count.
- Te reo (for kura) and
- A desire or hunger to learn, how to ask good questions.

The researchers found that: ‘Only one principal thought that almost all the school’s new entrants had the things that were important for a child starting school. Eleven of the principals estimated the proportion to be around 50-60 percent of their new entrants. Three thought it was very low, less than 20 percent’.\(^{1469}\)

---


\(^{1469}\) Ibid., p.73.
10.1.4 Te Kohanga Reo: East Coast.

General comment

One of the characteristics of the Maori primary schools is that many of them were in existence for a very long time, some for close to 100 years. One result of this is that they have a huge database of official records associated with them at Archives New Zealand Auckland and Wellington.

Many kohanga reo have now also been in existence for a considerable period of time. Nevertheless the amount of official information available on them is considerably less than that for the Maori primary schools. And this comment applies even more to the more recent institutions of kura kaupapapa Maori and wananga. This poses some limitations for the researcher which do not exist with regard to the Maori schools. With regard to the East Coast it meant that I needed to rely considerably, and much more than I would have preferred, on the reports of the Educational Office as the single most important source.

I believe another factor may also operate here related to the relative newness of institutions, which is that the people actually involved in getting them running and then maintaining them, or teaching in them at the ‘chalk-face’ during the early years, often just do not have the time or energy to stand back and write descriptive or analytical articles about trends and issues relating to them. And if the number of such institutions is also comparatively small, it is likely that it will take longer for a literature about them to grow in the relevant journals. I found this to be particularly the case with regard to wananga, but the same also comment applies to some extent to the other East Coast institutions referred to below. With regard to wananga generally, I have drawn on the writing that is available, such as that by Professors Linda and Graham Smith, Professor Hirini Mead, Professor Whatarangi Winiata and others to describe the general situation. But a literature search of Te Whare Wananga o Ngati Porou, for example, revealed only one item of the kind referred to, this being the 2006
Quality Audit of it by the New Zealand Qualifications Authority (NZQA). Where I have been able to locate relevant information I have used it. But this factor has necessarily limited the scope of the analysis I have been able to make for this section of the report.

In 2007 there were two kohanga reo in Hicks Bay, two in Te Araroa, two in Tikitiki, three in Tokomaru Bay, two in Tolaga Bay and nine in Gisborne.\textsuperscript{1470}

To bring the discussion up to date I decided to obtain and analyse Education Review Office Reports on a sample of five of these. Where an earlier report, e.g. 2000 or 2001, and a later report, e.g. 2005-2007, was available on the same institution, I selected it to provide some basis for comparison, but two reports were not available on each of the kohanga selected in every instance. Copies of each of the ERO Reports discussed, and also those for East Coast kura which will be discussed later, will be made available in the Document Bank.

ERO reports often begin by identifying what the reviewers regard as positive aspects of the institution, and every one of the reports on the East Coast Kohanga in my sample did identify some positive aspects. When the ERO officer feels that there are areas where further developments or improvements are needed, the Report then moves on to discuss these. Later ERO reports sometimes give the whanau an opportunity to choose a focus area of its own for review.

I formed the general impression that it was not uncommon for an ERO report to give high praise to the efforts whanau and teachers were making in providing instruction in te reo Maori and other Maori cultural aspects, but then follow this with a frequent tendency to criticise, often strongly, what the Reviewers felt was a failure in some kohanga to meet aspects of compliance requirements in areas such as governance, training, meeting early childhood regulations, developing personnel policies, health and safety procedures, financial management policies, long-term plans, assessment of progress by the tamariki and so on. This did make me wonder whether there might be a danger in some instances of the original purpose of kohanga, of immersion in the

\textsuperscript{1470} Information supplied to the writer by Ngahuia Ngata.
te reo Maori and the other aspects of culture becoming reduced or even strangled by the demands of compliance. But whether that is in fact so, and if it is what needs to be done about it, would be a matter for the whanau themselves to decide.

10.1.5 Te Whanau Pani Te Kohanga Reo

The kohanga was established in 1989 and is based in the rural area of Hick’s Bay, quite close to Te Araroa. The ‘values and traditions of Tuwhakairora hapu and the iwi of Ngati Porou are an integral part of children’s learning and whanau practices’. 1471

At the time of the December 2000 ERO Report the enrolment was nine, comprising five under two year olds and four over two year olds, seven girls and two boys. The Report was very positive about several aspects of activity including:

- forward planning, a long-term overview existed laying out specific topics to be covered during the term. This was complemented by unit plans relating to specific learning objectives, skills, activities and resources, with weekly planning reinforcing the unit plans.
- assessment systems and practices were in place, with an overview of curriculum delivery and assessment documented.
- a variety of strategies was used to monitor children’s learning and development, with an emphasis on the progress of each individual child’s social, physical and emotional development.
- relationships between children, kaiako, kaiawhina and whanau were described as excellent, with expectations for child behaviour clearly understood by the whanau, and clear policies in place in relation to child behaviour management and prohibition on the use of force.
- the learning programme was regularly reviewed and evaluated.
- the Maori language programme was enriching for the children.
- effective organizational systems were in place in management areas.
- financial policies and systems were in place.

1471 ERO Report, 2006, pp.9-10. DB.
• a positive beginning had been made with self-review.
• personnel policies were in place to provide guidelines which reflect good employer principles.
• the whanau had sought professional development to improve their understanding of safety requirements.
• performance management systems met requirements.

The main suggestions for improvements made by the ERO reviewers included:

• the whanau should consider documenting its policies and procedures for planning, assessment and evaluation to ensure that present practices are maintained.
• while a positive beginning had been made with self-review, the process now needed to be planned with a systematic outline of areas for review, and self-review findings should inform planning.
• a formalized programme of professional development and training should be documented, and the whanau should continue its efforts to provide professional development and continue to extend their knowledge and keep up to date with changes in organization and management.
• the kaiako had not yet been appraised but the whanau was aware that this needed to happen immediately. 1472

In 2006 when ERO visited and reported again the number of children enrolled had increased to 11, six of whom were under two years old. 1473 The reviewers again identified several ‘Areas of good performance’, including the strong commitment by the whanau to support the learning of the children, their collective management and decision-making and development of management policies and procedures. Job descriptions and guidelines to assist the committee with its roles and responsibilities had been developed, as had a comprehensive programme involving both short and long-term plans based on specific kaupapa, learning outcomes and activities that

1472 Ibid, pp.10-11;  
1473 ERO Report, November, 2006. DB.
supported the children’s learning. The children enrolled ‘experience well-planned learning programmes that promote learning about Maori values and beliefs’. 1474

In a section ‘Areas for Improvement’ the Reviewers suggested that kaimahi needed to broaden their practices to gain a better understanding of all areas of children’s development, be more consistent in carrying out assessments and be more involved in observing the children at play and/or planning for the interests and strengths of each child. Quite a strong emphasis was placed on the need to ensure planning met the needs and abilities of individual children. 1475

The reviewers felt that while the whanau had informally identified its aims and aspirations for the future of the kohanga, including the retention of te reo Maori and promoting the knowledge and cultural practices of Tuwhakairora and Ngati Porou, these and also future goals for other areas of the kohanga’s operations still needed to be documented. 1476

While recognizing that the whanau had a basic understanding of the value and importance of internal review, and internal review was evident in aspects of health and safety, the charter and policies, the reviewers felt that several other areas of the kohanga’s operation required further examination. These included staff appraisals, evaluation of learning programmes, and grounds and buildings checks. The reviewers concluded that ‘Internal review is not well developed in the kohanga’. 1477

In selecting an area of their own for a focus review the whanau chose Mana Whenua, which it defined as the marae, whakapapa, Tangaroa and food. Developments in this area were again evaluated by the reviewers under the two headings ‘Areas of good performance’ and ‘Areas for improvement’. Under the former, they identified a strong sense of belonging; Kaimahi encouraged children to celebrate their whanau, hapu and iwi links, they recited their pepeha ‘with confidence on a daily basis’, sang waiata and

1474 Ibid, p.11; 1475 Ibid, p.12; 1476 Ibid; 1477 Ibid;
himene relating to their hapu and iwi, and were provided with ‘several opportunities where they can learn about their Ngati Poroutanga’.  

The opportunities provided for the children to learn about their roles as tangata whenua, and their familiarity with protocols relating to powhiri, manaaki manuhiri and caring for kuia and kaumatua. also drew praise from the reviewers. The extent of Kuia participation in kohanga activities as an integral part of children’s learning also drew favourable comment. Kaimahi were described as ‘confident speakers of te reo Maori and provide good language models throughout the day’. Kaupapa activities were also praised as enabling children to learn concepts about Tane, Mahuta, Tangaroa and Papatuanuki.

10.1.6 Hinerupe Te Kohanga Reo

Located in the township of Te Araroa the kohanga is also beside the sea and the Awatere River runs close by. The children belong to Hinerupe hapu and Ngati Porou is the iwi.

In a year 2000 Report the ERO reviewers described a number of positive features of the kohanga’s activity. Staff provided a ‘Welcoming and caring environment’ for the 24 children enrolled, suitable curriculum activities were planned which acknowledged and incorporated the individual and group needs and interests of the children. Whanau management had provided suitable directions for the kohanga’s operations, with the charter, policies and procedures providing ‘a sound framework for many areas. Systematically organized and well-kept record keeping and administration procedures were in place. A high level of parent participation was described as a feature, with parents ‘active in all aspects of kohanga administration and decision–making’; and having ‘a high level of commitment towards learning alongside the children’. Staff were described as professionally well-informed and up to date with current educational trends and issues.

1478 Ibid, p.13;
1479 Ibid;
1480 ERO Report, 2000, p.11. DB.
However the reviewers also identified several actions which were needed for the kohanga to comply with regulations and meet agreed accountabilities. These included:

- Updating the charter in consultation with staff and parents.
- Develop policies, objectives and procedures demonstrating how the kohanga would meet the requirements of Te Korowai 1995 and the Early Childhood Centres Regulations 1998.
- Develop and implement personnel policies for the appointment of competent staff, professional development for management and staff, equal employment opportunities, staff appraisals and the principles of being a good employer.
- Develop procedures to ensure staff health and safety in employment.
- Develop and implement financial management policies which include budgeting to ensure that policies and objectives are met.\footnote{ibid, p.12;}

In February 2006 ERO reviewers visited the kohanga again and produced their report in June of that year. In their identification of ‘Areas of good performance’ the reviewers referred to the efforts of the whanau and kaimahi to seek opportunities to improve and develop their professional practice and knowledge of the kohanga kaupapa. They found a comprehensive programme plan in place to guide the kaupapa learning of the children, with an annual plan, term plans, units and weekly plans that linked to each other. Kaimahi met daily to discuss the programme and to plan activities for the next day, and the whanau had regular input into planning activities for the kaupapa and selecting it.\footnote{ERO, 2006, p.13. DB.}

The reviewers identified a strong commitment by whanau members to supporting the kohanga, reflected in several parents attending it daily and in other ways. There was regular monitoring of children’s learning and development levels, including the kaiako collecting samples of their work which were annotated, dated and stored, and observations of children’s activities were recorded. The reviewers also identified the
existence of regular reviewing by kaimahi on the usefulness of activities in the learning programme, including meeting daily to evaluate the day’s programme.1483

Moving to ‘Areas for improvement the reviewers identified the following:

- Paid employees should enroll in TKRNTB qualification courses.
- More effective assessment of children’s progress should be introduced to assist in the identification of children’s individual learning and developmental needs. Planning was needed to cater for children’s individual needs based on assessment data. Formal discussion of how and where aspects could be improved for children in the learning programme were required.
- Formal processes were needed to inform whanau about their children’s progress, because although there was informal discussion about their progress ‘Parents do not receive good quality information about their children’s learning and development at kohanga’.
- Further development was required in the area of personnel management for the whanau to meet its responsibilities as a good employer; while an appraisal system was in place ‘appraisals have not been carried out’.
- A long-term plan was needed to guide future improvements in the kohanga.
- Further work was required to develop a complete set of policies relating to health and safety matters.
- Greater opportunities needed to be provided children for independent choice and learning.

Given the opportunity of choosing a focus area of its own the whanau chose Mana Reo, and here the review team found:

- A strong commitment by whanau members to improving their te reo Maori ability, particularly te reo Maori of Ngati Porou, reflected in a range of expectations and activities identified by the Reviewers.

1483 Ibid;
• A variety of strategies used to increase children’s exposure to and development of te reo Maori, with it being the only language used in the kohanga.

• A learning programme which provided children with a range of experiences to enhance their learning of te reo Maori.

• Children participate in many experiences outside the immediate kohanga environment, and their surrounding physical environment provides a valuable learning resource. The ‘Children learn about who they are as children of Hinerupe hapu and Ngati Porou iwi. They are provided with opportunities to explore the sea, the beaches and the sea around them’.

• The children interacted well with other children and adults, were familiar with well-established routines in the kohanga and ‘appear happy and confident in the kohanga environment’.1484

10.1.7 Hiruharama Te Kohanga Reo

The kohanga as a rural one based at Hiruharama Marae near Ruatoria. In 2000 the kohanga was licensed for 30 children, and had a roll number of 15.

In a 2000 Report the ERO Reviewers were positive about virtually every aspect of the kohanga’s operation. Their Report identified:

Curriculum Management

• Clearly defined and well-documented curriculum management processes, including a long term plan outlining the various interest areas children will study for each term, and detailed monthly unit plans demonstrating clear links to the long-term plan.

• Several effective assessment tools were in place to monitor children’s progress and to guide planning, with regular assessments completed at the end of each unit and checklists covering children’s social, emotional, physical, intellectual and Maori language needs completed throughout the term.

1484 Ibid, p.15:
A Maori language programme which ‘successfully promoted Ngati Poroutanga and te reo and follows a planned approach’.

Several strategies were in place to promote early literacy and numeracy skills.\textsuperscript{1485}

The Performance of the Managing Body

- Following the appointment of an administrator many effective systems and practices established. Personnel, health and safety, property matters and policies reorganised into individual files making management and review of these systems more effective and accessible. Review of the charter document in consultation with the whanau.

- Sound financial management. Clear documentation and systematic filing of all financial records.

Personnel Management

- Good employer practices were identified, including comprehensive policies and procedures for equal employment opportunities, appointments, staff appraisals, professional development, and staff health. The Reviewers described the result of this as the existence of ‘Good employer-employer relations’. The education and personal growth of the teachers had been positively influenced by opportunities for professional development.

Only one area was identified in the Review where action was required for compliance, this being the need for the management to ratify the financial management policy and procedures and submit a copy to the Education Review Office.

This extremely positive review concluded that the children at the Kohanga:

\begin{quote}
Enjoy high quality learning experiences and care in an environment that prides itself on promoting Ngati Poroutanga and te reo. Teachers are professional and have put a lot of effort in teacher education and training. Consequently a sound framework has been established for
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{1485} ERO Report, 2000. DB.
planning and evaluating programmes and monitoring children’s progress. The kohanga is effectively managed...The challenge for the whanau is to sustain and improve its performance’.\footnote{1486}

In 2006 the Kohanga was reviewed again, with the roll having increased by one to 15 since 2000. ‘Areas of good performance’ identified included:

- Active involvement by the whanau in the children’s learning and management of the Kohanga.
- The delivery of learning programmes to the children was assisted by kaupapa plans helping to guide kaimahi. These plans, based on atua Maori, reflected the principles of Te Whariki and the mana strands. Curriculum guidelines provided by the Te Kohanga Reo National Trust were followed, and both long and short-term planning clearly identified learning objectives, activities and outcomes. The children participated in well-planned learning programmes with a focus on Maori values and beliefs.\footnote{1487}

In ‘Areas for improvement’ the Report identified:

- The need for a documented long-term plan to guide the whanau in achieving its goals for the future.
- Further knowledge was required about the process of self-review and how to use review information. Kaimahi appraisals, formal evaluation of learning programmes and review of financial management practices were also still required. In the latter area over-spending and exceeding the budget had led to no allocation for the purchase of children’s resources in 2005 and only minimal expenditure in 2006. In this respect the Reviewers described ‘poor financial planning’ as impacting on children’s learning’.
- A consistent approach needed to be developed in monitoring and assessing children’s progress and development, as was an approach which emphasized observing and planning for the interests and strengths of each individual child.

\footnote{1486}{Ibid, p.14;}
\footnote{1487}{ERO Report, 2006. DB.}
In the area of health and safety a statement relating to the protection of any person reporting abuse needed to be developed.1488

The whanau chose Mana Atua as the focus area for the review, defining this in terms of nga atua Maori, children’s well-being, karakia and the marae. In identifying areas of good performance the Report’s findings were over-whelmingly positive, noting the following aspects:

Manu Atua.
The children were provided with experiences to learn about nga atua Maori. Karakia and himene were practiced on a daily basis and helped the children to learn about Io. Kaupapa-based topics assisted the children to learn about the spiritual and natural worlds, and they had a good understanding of the whakapapa of nga atua and their roles and responsibilities.

Interactions.
Kaimahi were described as welcoming and relating to the children in positive ways, praising and encouraging their efforts and as models providing values which encouraged respect, aroha and manaakitanga. Parents played a ‘vital role in the kohanga by providing extra adult support for children each day’.

Learning environment.
Creative use was made of the physical environment to support the children’s learning about atua Maori. This included whakairo, kowhaiwhai and tukutuku being placed around the whare that the children used as a playroom. Another significant aspect which was used to develop the children’s sense of belonging and knowledge of atua Maori and ancestors was the marae area.

The programme.
The joint skills of the Kaimahi were utilised to deliver kaupapa learning programmes to the children, enabling them to learn about Maori values and beliefs. Opportunities

1488 Ibid;
for the children to ‘make choices experiment and explore’ were provided with a range of activities.

Te reo Maori.
This was ‘used consistently throughout the day’ and kaimahi and whanau were ‘committed to ensuring that te reo Maori is the predominant language of communication’. Its learning was supported by waiata, karakia and himene.  

Areas for improvement.
The Report identified only one area where it was felt there was room for improvement and this related to learning resources and furniture. While it acknowledged that there was a range of well-maintained resources to support the children’s learning and development, it suggested that these should be more accessible to the children, currently being placed on tables that were too high for them to see or reach. Moreover a lack of tables and chairs in some learning areas meant that children sat on carpet pieces to complete their activities. In relation to this, the absence of a budget for the purchase of resources and furniture was viewed as having some negative effect on the children’s learning.

10.1.8 Whakarua Te Kohanga Reo

Located in Ruatoria, the Kohanga had fifteen children enrolled in 2000, eleven boys and four girls. In a 2000 Report ERO Reviewers found:

Curriculum Management and Implementation.
Curriculum management by the four staff, three of whom were fluent speakers of Maori, was described as effectively guiding the delivery of the programme, with both long and short-term plans documenting clearly the themes and activities the children would follow each term. The involvement of parents in planning was encouraged, and evaluations and assessments of the programme assisted the staff with it and monitoring the children’s progress. Learning activities suitable for the various age

\[1489\] Ibid, p.13;
\[1490\] Ibid, p.14;
groups were provided and staff used their time effectively in interacting with the children.\textsuperscript{1491}

However the Reviewers did find that the children’s progress records were not available at the Kohanga at the time of the review and discussions with the licensee and kaiako led them to the view that more training in observation and assessment techniques could assist the staff in catering for the individual needs of each child. They also felt that more challenges could be provided in the outdoor area to enable the children to problem solve, experiment and explore. Parents were described as ‘committed to the special character of the Kohanga, this being demonstrated through the large number of parents who assisted at it, the use of te reo Maori both at it and in homes and the high attendance rate at monthly meetings’.\textsuperscript{1492}

Personnel Management.

The Reviewers described a comprehensive performance appraisal policy having been developed, providing a means for promoting and supporting staff performance at a high level, and the whanau was committed to providing professional development to improve staff performance.\textsuperscript{1493}

Operation and administration.

The Reviewers found that the Kohanga’s charter, policies and procedures provided:

\begin{quote}
a sound framework for managing the kohanga operations. The whanau has developed a philosophy statement which incorporates Ngati Porou values and the national goals for kohanga reo. Several new policies and procedures have been developed to incorporate the goals from Te Korowai and Te Whariki. A programme of internal review has been implemented. The whanau has developed a draft strategic plan for the next five years which reflects its priorities. The whanau governs the kohanga in a sound, professional manner.\textsuperscript{1494}
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{1491} ERO Report, p.8, 2000. DB.  
\textsuperscript{1492} Ibid;  
\textsuperscript{1493} Ibid;  
\textsuperscript{1494} Ibid, p.9;
After a visit in October 2006 ERO published another report in February 2007. This described the roll of the Kohanga as having risen to 19 with ten girls and nine boys enrolled.\textsuperscript{1495}

Amongst ‘Areas of good performance’ the Reviewers identified:

Whanau management.
The kohanga was described as well-managed for the tamariki with whanau members actively engaged in its operation and management and policies and procedures regularly reviewed in consultation with parents.

Programme planning
This was described as well-established, developed in consultation with kaimahi, kaumatua and parents, reflecting Te Whariki and the good understanding the whanau had of kaupapa based learning experiences for the children’s development.

Reporting children’s progress.
The assessment practices being used were described as good, with a range of approached being used to record and report information on individual children’s development, and parents having the ability to access this information and so be informed about the progress their children were making.\textsuperscript{1496}

Setting goals and directions.
The Reviewers identified several long-term goals which had been established focusing on the long-term viability of the Kohanga and the education and care of its children. Amongst these were developing the ability of staff, increasing whanau involvement and ‘strengthening Ngati Porouanga with a commitment to promoting te reo Maori me ona tikanga for adults and children’.\textsuperscript{1497}

Amongst ‘Areas for improvement’ the Reviewers identified:

\textsuperscript{1495} ERO Report, 2007, p.9.
\textsuperscript{1496} Ibid, p.11;
\textsuperscript{1497} Ibid, p.12;
Further development of assessment.
While efforts to record and report on the general progress of tamariki were acknowledged the Reviewers felt much of this was general, and identified a need for the kaimahi to create comprehensive information about specific areas of their progress and development. It was also recommended that recording of this be regular and that assessment guidelines be established.

Kaimahi appraisal.
The whanau had acknowledged that appraisal was an area where there was room for improvement, with a need for it to be clearly defined and implemented, and the kohanga whanau was working to establish this.

Further development of strategic planning and self review.
The Reviewers described the whanau as being aware of the need to ‘decide on specific time frames, areas of responsibility, who will be involved, projected costs and expected outcomes’, and commented that ‘While there are some aspects of review occurring for some areas of operation, there is no planned, systematic approach to reviewing all areas of the operation’.\footnote{Ibid;}

The whanau chose as its own focus area for review Matua Atua, which it defined as,’developing children’s sense of who they are and their knowledge of their ancestral and cultural heritage. te reo Maori and tikanga are essential components of this’.\footnote{Ibid;}

Amongst the positive features of this aspect identified were the following:

Ancestral and cultural heritage.
The children were given an opportunity to learn about their connections to their environment, whanau, iwi and hapu connections. Ngati Poroutanga was ‘supported, promoted and celebrated’, with the children participating in marae activities and learning about aspects of kawa and tikanga, and familiar with several karakia and

\footnote{Ibid;}
\footnote{Ibid;}
waiata referring to their ancestral heritage. Regular visits were made by kaumataua to participate and give guidance and support to the whanau.\textsuperscript{1500}

Children’s well-being.

The children were described as ‘well cared for at the kohanga by the whanau’, with a collective approach being followed to ensure that the learning environment was safe and supportive, and ‘caring and supportive’ interactions between children and adults. Well-established routines and organized activities were in place and there were well maintained indoor and outdoor facilities.\textsuperscript{1501}

Te reo Maori me nga tikanga.

The Reviewers found that the children were ‘immersed in a te reo Maori learning environment’, which included being ‘exposed to high quality te reo Maori spoken at the kohanga’. Tikanga Maori was supported ‘promoted and celebrated through mihi whakatua, karakia, waiata, manaakitanga and marae activities that children participate in’.\textsuperscript{1502}

Learning experiences.

Learning programmes of good quality were described as being in place which parents contributed to the development of. The kohanga was well resourced to support children in their development of numeracy and literacy and ‘Kaimahi use successful questioning techniques to challenge children’s thinking and enhance interactions’. Easily accessible computers were used in the daily learning programme and children were able to choose activities and resources that interested them.

Areas for improvement.

The Reviewers identified two areas where they thought there was room for improvement. The first of these was the maintenance of records, and their report indicated that the whanau acknowledged the need to improve recording practices for administering medicines and recording accidents, including notification to parents. The second related to the sleeping and learning area where, while the Reviewers

\textsuperscript{1500} Ibid;  
\textsuperscript{1501} Ibid, p.14;  
\textsuperscript{1502} Ibid;
acknowledged that the whanau took all reasonable steps to provide a designated time for children to have undisturbed rest, the facilities at the kohanga provided only one indoor space which restricted opportunities for children who chose not to sleep but wanted to use the indoor resources while others were resting.\textsuperscript{1503}

\section*{10.1.9 Te Kohanga Re o Marotiri}

This is a rural marae-based kohanga located in Tokomaru Bay, the iwi being Nagati Porou. A 2006 ERO Review described most parents and kaimahi as being new to the kohanga since the beginning of the year, and therefore 'still learning about their roles and responsibilities, the kohanga kaupapa and kaupapa management'. The Reviewers made many suggestions for further development but given the recent establishment of the kohanga it did not seem reasonable to discuss these here. However the full ERO Report is attached with my report.\textsuperscript{1504}

\section*{10.2 East Coast Mainstream Primary Schools From 1970}

\subsection*{10.2.1 Learning and Teaching}

From 1969 the East Coast Maori primary schools and Maori district high schools, which had previously been administered by the Department of Education, came under the administration of the Hawke’s Bay Education Board. But difficulties affecting learning and teaching persisted in several of them even into the 1980s.

At the Wharekahika School an inspection report noted in 1987 that while both teachers enjoyed very good relationships with the children:

\begin{quote}
The standards are depressed in junior reading and language. There is a need for constant and closer monitoring of children’s work. Teacher planning is far too generalised and is one of the reasons for lack of achievement. There is an urgent need for an increase in the range and
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{1503} Ibid;
\textsuperscript{1504} ERO Report, 2006, p.8. DB.
quality of learning experience provided for the children. This was particularly noticeable in the junior room. Three or four children in the senior room would benefit from a programme in reading and/or maths that would extend them academically.\textsuperscript{1505}

At Whakaangiangi where the current Principal was due to retire at the end of the year the programme in place was described as having ‘little if any motivation or stimulation’, being mainly a written programme with one word answers; the textbooks for language and arithmetic were mainly Australian and dated; the junior programme which ‘should be an exciting’ one but ‘was actually very pedestrian’; the Reading Recovery programme had ‘really turned into a reading-vocab exercise’ and while children benefited from a well balanced curriculum ‘This balance has yet to be achieved at Whakaangiangi… All in all, a most disappointing Report visit’.\textsuperscript{1506}

In a report on the Hiruharama School in 1985:

It became obvious during the course of the inspection that there are a number of areas of real concern with regard to standards of progress and achievement, planning, preparation and evaluation of programmes, identification of children who are experiencing serious learning difficulties and specific measures to assist these children.

Concerns

Standards of progress and achievement gave greatest cause for concern, particularly in basic subjects. It was found that significant numbers of children were performing well below potential in reading, written language and mathematics. More detailed school surveys in these three subjects are required to identify and list those children most seriously at risk so that priorities for assistance can be established.

Planning, preparation and evaluation were found to be minimal in several instances.\textsuperscript{1507}

At the Mangatuna School the old problem of low expectations persisted even in 1985 with an inspection report noting that ‘Expectations of senior pupils work can be

\textsuperscript{1505} Inspection Report, Wharekahika, 28 May 1987. ABDJ 3556 Box 96. ANZ-W. DB.
\textsuperscript{1506} Inspection Report, Whakaangiangi, 18 October 1987. ABFI 3556 Box 96. ANZ-W. DB.
\textsuperscript{1507} Inspection Report Hiruharama, 27-28 April 1983. Ibid. DB.
considerably increased Here it will be necessary to take time to collect samples of work at the various levels to help raise standards.\textsuperscript{1508}

A particularly heavy emphasis on practical education was obviously still thought appropriate for Maori pupils. In 1984 the Principal of the Waipiro Bay School sought approval for the involvement of the pupils in an ‘Environmental Improvement Scheme’ to develop an adjacent piece of school ground into small garden plots and cultivate examples of horticulture... I would envisage that late term 2 would be the time for pupil involvement allowing 1½ hours per week for the remainder of the year. This would allocate approximately 28 school hours translated to 450 (approx) pupil hours’. While there was some discussion amongst officials regarding whether this exceeded reasonable bounds with regard to the amount of practical activity it was finally approved.\textsuperscript{1509}

However it is important to emphasize that solid progress was identified at some schools. At Waipiro Bay ‘Careful testing of pupils’ was described as being aimed at matching their reading ability to appropriate materials and ‘Both senior and junior rooms have a wide variety of resources and equipment...The coverage of the curriculum is adequate...The recent purchase of new books and the emphasis on reading stories to the children is noteworthy....Book entries, written and pictorial displays seen were neat and attractive...The teaching procedures seen were soundly based’.\textsuperscript{1510}

At the Whangara School in 1989 an inspection report made the kind of comment that from an East Coast parent and pupil perspective had often been lacking in earlier reports on the schools. This was that ‘the staff (in consultation with community and other resource persons) give careful consideration to establishing a policy, programmes and practices which recognise the 40-plus percent Maori roll and the

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{1508} Report on Managatuna, 18 March 1985. ABDJ W3568 146. ANZ-W. DB.
\textsuperscript{1509} Principal to General Manager, Hawke’s Bay Education Board, 4 May 1984. ABDJ W3568 164. ANZ-W. DB.
\textsuperscript{1510} Inspection Report, Waipiro Bay School, 4 November 1980. ABDJ Acc W3568 164. ANZ-W. DB.
\end{flushright}
needs, aspirations and potential contribution of these children from the time they leave Te Kohanga Reo.\textsuperscript{1511}

A very positive report on Tikitiki in 1987 coincided with the school’s Centennial celebrations. The report highlighted the change in the school:

From a flourishing district high school of some 300 pupils the roll has reduced to a mere 35 this latter figure reflects a 42\% drop since the last report was written in 1982. This in turn reflected national trends, economic downturn faced by districts and urban drift. These and other factors produced a decline in overall morale But the arrival of a new principal has been the catalyst for a significant reversal....No praise can be too high for what he has achieved in such a short time. The significantly improved school morale. Vastly improved teaching conditions. Workable attractive classroom environments. The purchase of some highly sophisticated teaching aids. Much improved official records etc. The staff are now in a strong position to turn their attention to lifting standards of academic performance.\textsuperscript{1512}

The Mangatuna School also received a very favourable inspection report in 1985. This identified the following aspects as ‘Worthy of commendation’: the setting of annual objectives; satisfactory school tone; excellent development of community relationships; strong efforts to bring in a Maori dimension to the total programme; the confidence and competence of children in the junior room; pleasing standards of work in the junior school. However there was one area which still remained a matter for concern, that hardy perennial of low expectations, because with regard to ‘Standards of Work: Expectations of senior pupils’ the comment was made that ‘work can be considerably increased’.\textsuperscript{1513}

Various matters relating to teachers sometimes continued to cause concern. In 1980 the Teacher at the Te Puia Springs School complained that in an area where there was a definite need there was inadequate Education Board housing for teachers, which was ‘a major factor deterring teachers from accepting positions here.’ The school had been able to arrange accommodation for a relieving teacher with the

\textsuperscript{1511} Inspection Report Whangara School 27 February 1989. ABFI Acc 3556, Box 96, ANZ-W. DB
\textsuperscript{1512} Inspection Report, Tikitiki School, 19 October 1987. Ibid;
\textsuperscript{1513} Inspection Report, Mangatuna School, 18 March 1985. ABFI 3556 Box 96. ANZ-W. DB.
Waiapu Hospital Board but it was inadequate to ‘allow the full independence of a
mature person’. 1514

At the Waipiro Bay School in 1976 an urgent need for teacher accommodation was
described as having become critical. The Teacher filling the Year One position had:

been living in Shearer’s quarters, without all the basic amenities for
months…. The Dental Nurse “home based” at the School has lived in a
beach house this year and has moved out each weekend and stayed in
Gisborne to allow the owners to use the quarters…the Assistant is
camping in an old house made available by a recent death. She has no
toilet in the house-nor any outdoor one-no bath, shower, basin, nor
running hot water in the house. Previously during 1975, your
Principal’s residence at Waipiro Bay had to be used by two young
unmarried relievers, a male and female, as no other accommodation
was available.1515

Despite this the General Manager replied that the school was ‘favourably placed
compared to many others in our district in having two residences, on at Te Puia and
one at Tuhue available for staff. It is impossible to provide housing or flats for all
staff members as you have requested’.1516

The Secretary of the Te Puia Springs School Committee wrote to the Minister of
Education in 1988 protesting at an increase in Teacher house rentals ‘in the vicinity of
120%’, which was causing the Committee ‘great concern’ because ‘in rural areas
there had to be some incentives to attract quality teaching staff and the existing
reasonable rentals were such and incentive. Incentives, ‘Perhaps the only one.’ If it
was removed rural schools would experience even greater difficulty with recruitment
and retention of good teachers. He also pointed out that when Tomorrow’s Schools
was implemented, which was imminent, the new Boards of Trustees would have
responsibility for appointing teachers but ‘employing good teachers in such areas as
ours will be an almost impossible task if we are unable to offer any incentives to
compensate for isolation and higher cost of living’. The Committee was ‘concerned
for our children and believe that one of the basic rights of our children was to help prepare them for the opportunity to obtain a good education future (but) in order to provide this we must be able to attract good teachers.\textsuperscript{1517}

10.1.2 Contribution to Primary Schooling by East Coast Maori.

The extensive contribution of money and labour that East Coast Maori had always made to their own schooling continued after 1970, in spite of the fact that the average income was lower and the unemployment rate higher in the region than in New Zealand generally.\textsuperscript{1518}

The following are examples of this continuing contribution to schooling.

- Over $1,000 of local money has been spent on a variety of equipment since the last E12/1 general school inspection.\textsuperscript{1519}

- The School Committee is to be commended for their continuing interest and support. To date, a new Para swimming pool has been installed at a cost of $10,000. Moneys have been raised through rodeos, raffles and the selling of livestock. Shrubs have been purchased for the school, and firewood has been donated by other members of the community. Other monies raised by the community have been set aside by the principal to purchase additional Mathematics and Language equipment.\textsuperscript{1520}

- My Committee is operating under the following beliefs:

\textsuperscript{1517} Secretary Te Puia Springs School Committee to Minister of Education, 25 October 1988. ABDJ W3568 160. ANZ-W. DB.
\textsuperscript{1519} Inspection Report, Tolaga Bay School, 14 October, 1974. AAZY Acc W3901, ANZ-W. DB.
\textsuperscript{1520} Report on Mangatuna School, 11 June 1981. ABDJ W3568/146. ANZ-W. DB.
That the $520.00 (Cleaning) and $237.12 (Groundwork) can be spent on purchasing other items because we (the community) do both the above jobs for no payment.\(^{1521}\)

- The Board secretary confirms this but advises that ‘you should note that the payments made for cleaning toilets are deducted from the $520 grant when the transfer is made to your special account. If you purchase items such as stationary for the pupils the accounts should be marked so that we charge correctly.’\(^{1522}\)

- Since 1986 over $17,000 of locally-raised funds has been spent on a variety of equipment for the school. This includes a photocopier, computer hardware, audio equipment, musical instruments, a mower and library books. A further $3000 was spent on a school trip to Rotorua and Auckland. The school plans further upgrading this year-fencing and shelter-relocating a former school to provide a library and museum—considerable expenditure on books—playground equipment. Improvements achieved have been made possible because of community support and hard work.\(^{1523}\)

- Local efforts has provided a new mower, a radio gramaphone, tapes, maths equipment, reading material, developmental apparatus and various items of sports equipment.\(^{1524}\)

- We the undersigned pupils of the Waipiro Bay School have carried out the cleaning duties at the school during 1972 and are agreeable that any wages payable to us for the work be treated as a donation to the school committee’s special account. (Followed by 21 signatures, 11 of whom are recognisable as Maori. This was repeated in subsequent years although in 1980 parents were being rostered to do the school cleaning as a source of funds.)\(^{1525}\)

\(^{1521}\) Principal, Waipiro Bay School, to General Manager, Hawke’s Bay Education Board, 3 March 1978. Ibid.

\(^{1522}\) Board Secretary to Principal, 9 March 1978. Ibid.

\(^{1523}\) Inspection Report, Whangara School, 27 February 1989. ABFI Acc 3556 Box 96. ANZ-W. DB.

\(^{1524}\) Inspection Report, Whakaangiangi School, 28 October 1970. ABDJ Acc W3568 165. ANZ-W. DB.

\(^{1525}\) Inspection Report, 4 November 1980. ABDJ W3568/164. ANZ-W. DB.
10.3 The 1997 ERO Report on East Coast Education

The Education Review Office was created in 1988 as part of Tomorrow’s Schools. A major aim of its creation as a separate agency was to provide greater assurance that an objective view of the achievements or lack of achievement of schools and their students was achieved that was independent of other agencies such as the Ministry of Education.

The 1997 ERO Report on East Coast education, Improving Schooling on the East Coast, represented in many ways a damning indictment of the quality of many aspects of education on the Coast. Given that at last 92 percent of the students in schools on the Coast at the time were Maori, the question to be asked in reading the Report is whether any of its findings might be regarded as an example of negligence, inequity or lack of fairness on the part of Government or its agencies, such as the Ministry of Education, in terms of the provision of education for East Coast Maori.

The ERO Report was sufficiently important and relevant to my own Brief to justify close description and analysis of it. The Report identified several factors which are relevant both to the earlier chapters of my Report and the discussion which follows. They included:

- the high proportion of the adult population with no formal school qualifications.
- the limited individual earnings of adults of working age.
- comparatively low economic status and the limited access of many of its people to income-earning opportunities.
- limited economic capability and vulnerability to major investment and business activity decisions taken by companies and government agencies.
- relative isolation from major urban centres.

The Report drew the following conclusions from an analysis of ERO reports on East Coast schools during the preceding four years:
• Schools in the area include a few that are performing satisfactorily and many that are performing poorly. Good quality performance is rarely sustained and is directly influenced by the performance of the principal.

• The best aspects of mainstream school performance were in the provision of student support and their focus on tikanga Maori. Strong community involvement was a feature of many of the schools in the region and community expectations may have been a factor contributing to these aspects of school performance.

• Most schools also performed reasonably satisfactorily in terms of board administration, financial management and asset management.

• The poorest aspect of performance was curriculum management. A high percentage of reports indicated that schools did not provide a balanced curriculum and/or did not have systems for monitoring student achievement.

• The next poorest aspect was staff management.

The Report pointed out that recruitment and retention of staff was a major issue for all the schools in the area. ERO reports on almost half the schools specifically mentioned that there were difficulties in attracting staff to the school and/or difficulty in accessing support services because of the school’s remote location. It acknowledged that these factors may have contributed to the relatively poor performance of schools in curriculum and personnel management, and ‘In particular high staff turnover has the potential to compound poor curriculum management as there may be an absence of systems to provide continuity in curriculum delivery and assess student achievement’. 1526

10.3.1 Issues Impacting on School Performance

Elaborating, the ERO Report identified five major issues which it said impacted on the performance of East Coast schools. The first of these was economies of scale. While most schools were some distance from the largest centre, Gisborne, they were

1526 Ibid, pp.9-10.
not particularly isolated from one another. Yet the Report claimed that little advantage was taken of potential economies of scale in the area. Local districts had ‘strong parochial bonds and the local school is an important and in many cases historical focus of the community’. The communities did not regard amalgamation of boards positively and at this point it had not been actively considered. The Report found ‘little evidence of schools considering other ways in which they could cooperate for greater efficiency’, and while the schools could cooperate more in such areas as the pooling of resources they did not do so.\(^{1527}\)

The second issue, which was identified as a ‘major impediment to good quality schooling on the East Coast’, was remoteness. The supply of teachers in particular was affected by the distance from large population centres and there was a limited number of teachers who applied for positions because there were ‘increased personal and financial costs for those who choose to teach in remote areas’. Remoteness was also viewed as likely to impact on the length of time teachers stayed on the Coast, on the quality of teachers because boards were likely to have a smaller number of applicants from which to appoint high quality teachers, and on teachers’ ability to maintain and increase their teaching skills through access to professional advice and training. Another factor remoteness was seen as contributing to was the increased cost of the large number of services currently available to schools in main centres ranging from in-service training, accessing specialist education services and attending conferences.\(^{1528}\)

The supply of teachers was regarded as so important that the Report devoted a separate section to it. It pointed out that the number of applicants for advertised vacancies in East Coast schools was usually very few and ‘commonly no more than one applicant for a position’. It suggested that this could lead to pressure on board to appoint the single applicant ‘even if inappropriate, untrained or incompetent’, and this sometimes resulted in poorly performing teachers. The Report concluded that even ‘sole applicants for principal positions have been appointed with little teaching and no management experience’. It pointed out that in kura or schools offering bilingual or

\(^{1527}\) Ibid, p.12;  
\(^{1528}\) Ibid, pp.11-12;
immersion classes applicants for teaching positions needed to be able to teach the New Zealand curriculum in te reo Maori, but ‘few of the teachers who applied for these positions had all the competencies to do this well’, and ‘the priority placed by boards and whanau on fluency in te reo Maori can outweigh the need for curriculum expertise’. The Report concluded that retention of teachers was as difficult as recruitment, pointing out that ‘a “long-standing principal” in East Coast terms is one who has been in the position for five years’.\footnote{1529}

A fourth issue highlighted in the Report was ‘Principal and Teacher Training’. A recently developed Polytechnic teacher training programme which a focus on recruiting and training teachers locally was seen as having potential, although the Report regarded it as too early to evaluate its success in terms of improving the quantity and quality of the teachers recruited to East Coast schools. But it identified the current situation as one where even when boards were able to employ well-trained teachers they needed to provide ongoing training for them to develop and up-grade their skills. As much of that available was offered in Gisborne or further away it was not easily accessible to East Coast teachers. Moreover because about three quarters of the East Coast schools had three or fewer full-time teachers the possibility of seeking advice from other professionals from within their own or even neighbouring schools was limited. Teaching principals working in remote rural areas were seen as have particular training needs which it was not often easy to meet.\footnote{1530}

A fifth area identified as impacting on school performance was ‘Board of Trustee Performance’. The Report pointed out that the small size of most communities limited the number of people available to serve on the board of trustees and therefore the range of skills available to the board, and in the past training opportunities for trustees on the Coast had been limited. However the Report pointed out that a current Ministry of Education contract for the delivery of training locally was ‘regarded by East Coast boards as a long overdue improvement likely to increase their skills and be beneficial to their operation’. But it also pointed out that trustees had already expressed concern that ‘it will neither be sufficient nor ongoing’ (Author’s emphasis).\footnote{1531}

\footnote{1529} Ibid, p.13;  
\footnote{1530} Ibid, p.15;  
\footnote{1531} Ibid, p.16;
10.3.2 Improving School Performance

The Report concluded that ‘it is clear students on the East Coast are not being educated satisfactorily’, it had identified factors contributing to this and:

In the opinion of ERO these factors are beyond the capability of individual schools to address satisfactorily without effective external intervention. Small remote schools will continue to try to provide a high quality education and most will fail.1532

The Report identified several developments which it described as ‘urgently required’ to meet the situation. The first of these was a strategic education development plan which ‘must clearly identify the direction of East Coast schooling over the next five years’, with individual school strategic plans needing to contribute to the overall plan. This would include, as a first step, each board of trustees taking a much more strategic view of the operation of its own school or kura in relation to other schools on the Coast. Schools that enrolled secondary students would need to include in their plans their analysis of the educational needs of their students ‘in terms of the specialist secondary instruction both required and desired’. The Report stated that ‘the improvement of educational outcomes for all students enrolled in these schools’ would be the focus of the overall strategic plan, with ‘each school’s individual plan contributing to these desired outcomes’.1533

According to the Report another necessary development related to ‘Structural Arrangements for Schooling’. It identified the existing Tomorrow’s Schools governance and management model for schools ‘not being successfully implemented’ on the East Coast. The model was described as one based on the idea that each school would be well managed, particularly with respect to performance in the areas of curriculum and staff, by a locally elected board of trustees. But the Report concluded that meeting this expectation on their own was beyond many boards in the small remote communities on the Coast, both in terms of support for the governance role

1532 Ibid, p.17;
1533 Ibid, pp.17-18;
and having adequate numbers of people with the appropriate expertise to draw on. Despite this, it had been found that boards generally appeared unwilling to amalgamate or share resources, particularly their teaching resources The report recommended that:

The Government intervene directly in the current arrangements for the delivery of education on the East Coast to require specific structural changes to be implemented by boards of trustees over the next twelve months.\textsuperscript{1534}

It identified the changes needed as (1) the combining of boards so that a single board serviced more than one school; (2) the appointment of administrators shared between schools to free principals for professional teaching duties and (3) the sharing of curriculum expertise across schools through the movement of appropriate teachers between schools.\textsuperscript{1535}

The Report also identified ‘Student Achievement in East Coast Schools’ as one of the areas necessary for improved school performance. It reviewed national data on the achievement of Maori students nationally, including several areas such as literacy scores and achievements in mathematics and science where Maori students under-performed in relation to others and concluded that:

These findings have significant ramifications for students currently enrolled in East Coast Schools. Little valid and reliable information about the performance of students is available from the schools themselves. \textit{Indeed most schools at the time of their ERO review did not even have systems for monitoring student achievement.} It is very likely, therefore, that these students have poorly developed literacy and numeracy skills in comparison with other, especially non-Maori students in other parts of New Zealand’ (Author’s emphasis).\textsuperscript{1536}

But the Report pointed out that preliminary to any assessment of improved performance baseline information would need to be provided about current levels of student achievement in literacy and numeracy in each school. It therefore recommended that ‘Government immediately undertake a testing programme of all

\textsuperscript{1534} Ibid, p.19;  
\textsuperscript{1535} Ibid, p.20;  
\textsuperscript{1536} Ibid, p.21;
the students in East Coast schools’ to determine this, and pointed out that for kura the testing material would need to be provided in te reo Maori.1537

In the areas of ‘Principal and Teacher In-Service Training’ the report also made several suggestions building on its earlier discussion of the problems it had identified, including principals and teachers studying teaching and management practices in another school out of the area, bringing an expert into the district to provide in-depth curriculum support for a number of teachers in different schools over a period of time and ‘providing a critical colleague for the professional support of principals’.1538

10.4 Mainstream Primary Schools: East Coast

At the time of the 1997 ERO Report there were 12 full mainstream primary schools between the Tolaga Bay and Hick’s Bay regions, with 12 of the schools classified as decile 1, the lowest socio-economic rating, three as decile 2 and three as decile 3.1539

To bring the situation relating to mainstream primary schools up to date, and identify whether and in what ways progress had been achieved since the 1997 ERO Report, I selected the most recent Education Review Office Reports on four mainstream primary schools to provide a sample of recent developments.

10.4.1 Hiruharama School

A full primary (Year 1 to 8) school with a decile rating of 1 situated near Rutaoria which in 2006 had 98 students enrolled, 97 of whom were Maori and one Pacific. The ERO report drew attention to considerable progress having been made since an earlier (2003) Report in the use of assessment to review progress and achievement, and in 2005 teachers had introduced effective teaching strategies resulting in considerable improvement in reading achievement for Year 3 to 8 students.1540

1537 Ibid, p.22;
1538 Ibid, pp.23-24;
1540 ERO Report 2006, pp.1-2. DB.
In the area ‘Student Progress and Achievement’ the Reviewers were very positive, identifying mainly areas of good performance. These included:

- Carefully considered teaching strategies which effectively engaged the students in reading and writing, provided access to a wide range of literary resources selected to match their interests and overall most of the students were ‘highly engaged in learning’.
- Most of the teachers were increasing their use of assessment to plan targeted programmes.
- The students successfully understood the aim of each lesson and many were clear about what they needed to do to improve.
- The teachers worked collaboratively to use assessment to improve student achievement.
- Students interacted confidently with their peers, teachers and adult volunteers.

Suggested areas for improvement included:

- Establishing clear processes to collect, review and monitor junior students’ literacy achievement.
- School reading guidelines and strategies needed to be reviewed to match current practice and determine which components of a reading programme should be implemented at each different year level.
- In writing development the students engaged in varies writing programmes in different classes making it difficult for some to adjust when they moved to a new class.

Areas of good performance in ‘Developing a Learning Community’ included:

- A sound culture of continuous school improvement including Board members actively discussing student achievement information and being well informed on the process of assessment and what the results meant for students.
Feedback to parents on assessment and achievement contributed to reporting improvements.

- Whanau were described as ‘highly interested in and well informed of new teaching strategies and programmes’, many having completed a computer course to assist them with the use of computers in the home.
- Students, whanau and teachers were described as successfully working together to set long term learning goals.
- And other areas of good performance identified included the sharing of student achievement and progress with whanau, strong community involvement in learning and ‘Practices to engage whanau are immersed across the school’.1541

Three areas were identified where it was suggested improvements could be made included the provision of a wider range of achievement information to trustees and the community, the extension of regular formal short-term goal setting and opportunities for reflection to a wider range of classes than just the senior ones, and strengthening the links between appraisal goals, charter targets and classroom observations.1542

10.4.2 Whangara School

This full primary school with a decile rating of 8 is situated 35 kilometres north east of Gisborne and in 2006 had a roll of 44 all of whom were Maori.1543

ERO and the Board of Trustees had agreed on the focus areas of literacy-reading and education in the environment for the Review. In the area of literacy-reading the Review pointed out that raising student achievement in reading had been a board focus since the previous ERO report. Results from 2005 indicated that most students made significant gains in reading throughout the year. Assessment data had revealed that at the beginning of the year only ten percent of students read at or above their chronological age level, and poor comprehension and vocabulary levels and poor

---

1541 Ibid, pp.3-6;
1542 Ibid, p.6;
1543 ERO Report, 2006. DB.
achievement in reading particularly in the junior area of the school were revealed. However achievement information collected by the end of 2005 demonstrated considerable improvements with approximately 60 percent of students now reading at or above their chronological age.\textsuperscript{1544}

Areas of good performance identified included:

- Teachers using a range of effective literacy practices.
- Sound monitoring of student learning.
- Students who were enthusiastic and motivated learners in all aspects of school reading programmes.
- Provision of learning environments by teachers that successfully enabled students to focus on reading.
- Students demonstrating a clear understanding of the focus and purpose of their learning.
- Staff sharing useful achievement information with the board and parents.

The Reviewers identified only one area where they felt there was room for improvement, this being the need for further development in ‘sharing assessment criteria with students and strengthening feedback to all students across the school’.\textsuperscript{1545}

In the second area of the review, ‘Education in the Environment’, the Reviewers pointed out that since the previous review the board and staff had given high priority to the development of programmes that actively engaged the students with the outdoor environment, including outdoor education in the local and wider area, and environmental education about local features. Areas of good performance identified in the review included:

- Trustees and staff carefully managed the outdoor programme to ensure student welfare was protected.

\textsuperscript{1544} Ibid, p.3;\textsuperscript{1545} Ibid, p.4;
• Personnel with expertise in specific aspects of the programme successfully guided students in learning programmes.
• Students developed a range of specialist skills, attitudes and knowledge through the outdoor programme.
• School management actively included the community with parents kept well informed and invited to participate.
• Teacher planning integrated the environmental contexts with appropriate sections of the curriculum, with students learning aspects of science, health and physical education, social studies and technology, and reading and writing activities were often related to the current area of study.
• Teachers enhanced learning through a range of high quality ICT tools and techniques, and used video cameras to record skill development and participation by students.

The Reviewers identified two areas where they felt improvements could be made, these being assessment, where there was a need to further enhance current assessments by clarifying links to students’ stated learning outcomes, and self review, where it was felt that the link between assessment information from special programmes and self review needed to be made clear.\textsuperscript{1546}

\textbf{10.4.3 Te Puia Springs School}

This full primary school with a decile rating of 2 had an enrolment of 17 Maori students, and special features were identified as Level 2 immersion and acting as a host school for the Resource Teacher Maori.\textsuperscript{1547}

For the Review in 2006 ERO and the Board agreed on ‘self-review’ as the focus for the review. In the area of ‘Student progress and achievement’ the Reviewers identified areas of good performance as including:

\textsuperscript{1546} Ibid, p.5;
\textsuperscript{1547} ERO Report, 2006. DB.
• The Board and staff making clear links between school strategic targets and student achievement information. Assessments were analysed and the findings used to inform new targets. As a result school operations and practices were focused on student achievement.

• Teachers analysed a range of achievement information in literacy for both individuals and groups of students and the results were then used to provide learning experiences to meet the needs of the students that had been identified and improve learning programmes.

• Students were found to be actively involved in the programme and decision-making, ‘sharing supportive, caring relationships with their teachers and peers’ which contributed to the environment in classroom being ‘conducive to learning’.

• Learning by the students was well-supported by Teacher aides who helped to create well thought out learning situations and students ‘confidently participate in a wide range of learning experiences with their peers’.

• The teachers were successful in ensuring that the learning contexts reflected the interests, prior knowledge and experiences of the students.

• An evaluation form which had recently been introduced was effective in guiding staff reflections on student progress and achievement.

• Appropriate advice had been sought by the board and management to guide the school’s financial management and review practices.

• Staff appraisal had been effectively implemented with clear links to charter goals and targets.

• The Resource Teacher Maori based at the school worked in eight neighbouring schools and ‘capably assists the Board to review the effectiveness of the service’.

Areas where the Reviewers felt there was room for further improvement included:

• Board training. They pointed out that the board was a relatively inexperienced one with most trustees new to the task in 2006. One result of this was that the principal was ‘undertaking many responsibilities that would usually be
delegated to trustees’ and further training was needed to assist them to play their role independent of the school’s management.

- Policy review. The policy review process was described as ‘currently ad hoc’ and there was a need for a properly documented system of review to be implemented.
- Curriculum review and development. A systematic approach to this still needed to be developed by the principal and staff.
- Tracking student progress. This was described as remaining ‘a challenge’ for the teachers who still needed to establish a system to highlight the significance of learning recorded.
- Assessment tool use. The Reviewers suggested that increased use of nationally referenced tools such as Assessment Tools for Student Learning ‘should raise the quality, usefulness and use of student achievement information’.

10.4.4 Potaka School

This small full primary school situated near the East Cape with a decile rating of 2 had an enrolment of 41 students in 2006, 39 Maori and 2 Pakeha.

A 2006 ERO Report pointed out that recent restructuring of schooling in the area resulted from 2005 in a considerable number of Hick’s Bay students enrolling at the School which changed the school roll and community and this followed a merger in 2001 with Waikura School. The Trustees had requested ERO in 2006 to ‘evaluate the effect on the quality of teaching and learning, including the impact of the governance role of the new board appointed last year’.

The Reviewers identified two areas ‘good performance’. The first of these they described as interactions between students and adults which were ‘generally positive and ‘affirming’, with students from’ the different communities’ maintaining ‘good peer relationships’, and being able to support each other’s learning’, and teachers effectively managing classrooms ‘to elicit and sustain student cooperation’. The
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1548 Ibid, pp.3-5;
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second was teachers using an ‘appropriate range of assessment tools to collect school-wide information on student achievement in reading, writing and junior literacy’.

However five areas were identified where it was felt that improvement was required. These included:

- Planning for multi-class and ability groups was inadequate for effective teaching and learning with no clear relationship existing between teachers’ planning and teaching. Consequently the best use was not made of the teaching day and important learning opportunities were missed. Moreover planning did not ‘detail the expected learning outcomes of lessons’ and more structure was required to provide a ‘broader range of appropriate activities to meet specific learning needs’.

- The programmes students were provided with did not ‘promote sufficient levels of achievement’. There was a failure to use assessment information adequately to meet students’ needs.

- Students were not engaged in their learning effectively enough by the teachers with opportunities to motivate and challenge them often being missed. Feedback from teachers was not specific enough to assist students with their future learning with the result that they ‘are not able to evaluate their own learning or be aware of their achievements’.

- Clear expectations were not provided consistently enough by the principal and teachers ‘to create a high quality learning environment for students’ and ‘the quality and quantity of some students’ work in all curriculum areas is not satisfactory’.

- Planning or review to improve student achievement was not engaged in by trustees who had not consulted with the ‘expanded school community about the charter and strategic plan’, and did not have ‘appropriate processes for quality assurance or to develop useful plans and actions to improve student outcomes’. The Reviewers concluded that during the course of the review they had identified ‘significant areas where the board is failing to meet its legislative obligations’. These included self review, principal appraisal,
community consultation, curriculum provision and aspects of health and safety’.  

10.5 Mainstream Secondary Schools: East Coast.

All New Zealand secondary schools are facing more complexity, with changes in qualifications, student’s needs and interest, and ways of meeting those needs. Compared to secondary schools in city areas, which are larger, with few teachers working on their own in a subject area, and which can draw on a wide range of community resources (such as libraries, museums, workplaces), and which can more easily share courses, or specialize with neighbouring schools, the Ngati Porou East Coast schools face deep obstacles in providing students with the secondary education they need for successful participation in work and society.  

As the following examples illustrate, some difficulties continued to affect secondary education on the Coast. Aspects of learning and teaching at Ngata Memorial College came in for severe criticism in a 1972 inspection report, with the General Manager of the Hawke’s Bay Education Board advising the Chairman of the College’s Management Committee that the Board was ‘surprised and gravely concerned at the findings in this report and of the stringent criticism and adverse comment on many features of the work of the school’. He suggested that this indicated ‘plainly that the school is not functioning satisfactorily’, with particular criticism being directed at the failure of Heads of the Geography, Social Studies, Mathematics and Science Departments to supervise their departments satisfactorily. The Board expected the deficiencies to be dealt with ‘urgently and adequately’ and had asked the District Senior Inspector to make a further inspection report next year after which, if improvements had not been made, ‘the Board will take steps to replace unsuitable staff’.  

However an inspection report one year later revealed that virtually no changes for the better had been made, the Inspector concluding that the results in Social Studies were
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1550 Ibid, pp.3-6;  
1552 General Manager to Chairman, 18 December 1972. ABF1 W3556/94, School files 1968-77, Ngata College. ANZ-W. DB.
‘still as poor as in 1972. Lack of any direction or leadership by HOD’; ‘Geography As for 1972. No improvement by HOD’; ‘Technical – absence of any written expression of any kind’ with the Technical subjects or examinations for the B stream pupils; the Principal and staff appeared to regard these pupils as ‘only acceptable and suitable for secondary vocational trades at the best’. Despite suggestions having been made to the Principal for several years he was;

quite inflexible in his attitude and uses, as his supporting argument that examination failure would have a damaging psychological effect on these pupils. I am convinced that this kind of failure could not possibly be worse than the effect imposed by the system currently operating. It is my firm belief that the B stream pupils should at least be given the opportunity of attempting two practical subjects for School Certificate having in mind the subjects Technical Drawing and Woodwork or Technical Drawing and Metalwork’.1553

In a report to the District Senior Inspector the Inspector advised him that issues at the College which needed to be faced up to if the pupils ‘are going to receive adequate educational opportunities’ included:

- The progress of the College appears to be geared to obtaining a uniform mediocrity rather than challenging the more able students to really achieve.
- In spite of all the high sounding policy in a statement prepared by the Principal, from my observations very few of these goals were being achieved.
- Without being disloyal to their Principal, three teachers expressed their concern at the rather limited approach being made by the College for the pupils.
- In such a small community as Ruatoria I believe it is essential that the College identifies with the local community. A Principal who is out of touch with the leaders of the community cannot possibly give the leadership of the College that it requires.
- An uneasy feeling that I got during the grading meeting was that whenever it appeared that a Maori teacher was about to get a lift in grading or promotion, the Principal appeared to negate the complimentary comments of the

1553 Inspection Notes, 19 November 1973. Ibid;
Inspectors. On two occasions particularly he was very negative about a teacher when it appeared that a promotion was coming.1554

Other familiar problems also continued, including difficulties in meeting full course offerings, slow progress with much needed buildings and making teacher appointments, and inadequate teacher accommodation. A declining roll in the Secondary Department at the Tokomaru Bay District High School in 1970, with a maximum of 26 pupils in the third term, was combined with the difficulty of mounting adequate courses, this contributing to the fact that ‘in the past four years no pupil had been able to pass the School Certificate examination or even obtain a partial pass’. This led Education Department officials to recommend to the Minister that the secondary pupils be transferred to the Tolaga Bay DHS, which some Tokomaru Bay pupils were already attending. The Minister approved provided the Hawke’s Bay Education Board and the local people did.1555

Slow action in providing much needed facilities of various kinds still sometimes impeded the effectiveness of learning and teaching. Alterations to the Tolaga Bay Area School led to a complaint to the Board regarding the disruptions to the school work by the failure of the:

Electrician, Painter, Plumber and Heating Engineer to complete work required for teaching….The situation now is that there are four seminar rooms, two resource rooms, an art room and a music room all partly furnished without the facilities they should have. No power points for electrical apparatus, no lighting, no heating, and construction materials stacked in classrooms. The disruptions commenced on the first day of this term and have been continuous since then. There have been days when teachers have had to take classes out into the playground because of lack of heating, no classroom available or no lighting. Facilities for the staff have also deteriorated. The hot water system which serves the hand- basins in the toilets and the staffroom has been discontinued for some weeks.1556

1554 Inspector to DSISS, 14th November, 1973. Ibid.
1555 Secretary, Hawke’s Bay Education Board to Parents of Pupils at Tokomaru Bay DHS, 4 August 1970. ABF1 W3544/102, 22/12. ANZ-W. DB.
1556 G. Blackman, Branch Secretary NZPPTA, to General Manager Hawke’s Bay Education Board 1st August 1977. ABDJ W3568/173, Special Grant Tolaga, 1970-1978. ANZ-W.DB.
A Teacher at the same School complained that ‘My wife and I and our three children have been obliged to live in the single teacher’s bach here in Tolaga Bay for the one year and 9 months since my appointment to the Tolaga Bay D.H.S’. 1557

And in 1981, also at the Tolaga Bay Area School, the Principal described the science laboratory as ‘still incomplete and this presents its own set of problems not the least of which is the unavailability of facilities for carrying out practical aspects of the science programme. You will appreciate that it is an essential ingredient of the science programme and acute problems are faced by external examination students at School Certificate and University Entrance level’. 1558

The absence of a school guidance counsellor for Ngata Memorial College and the Rerekohu and Tokomaru Bay District High Schools was a matter for serious concern to the Headmaster of Ngata Memorial College, Hugh Jennings. In November 1970 he drew attention to the reduction of the staff at the Vocational Guidance Centre in Napier and the Maori Welfare Office on the Coast to one officer each, shortages in the Gisborne Child Welfare staff and limited psychological services available. In appealing for a counsellor to be appointed to the College and also to be shared with the two high schools he pointed out that its 300 plus students were 98 percent Maori, came from 8 small contributing schools scattered over a 20 mile radius, 75 percent travelled by bus, local avenues of employment were limited, ‘the nearest educational, welfare, and specialist services available are in Gisborne 80 miles away and Napier 220 miles’ and the needs of the two high schools were ‘equally urgent’. 1559

The Headmaster continued to make this request but nearly two and a half years later advice from the Department was that despite there being ‘no doubt’ that ‘a special case for such an appointment does exist’, only ten guidance counsellors for the whole country had been appointed for 1973 and top priority was unable to be given to the College. 1560

1557 K. W. Silva to Mr Ercolano, Hawke’s Bay Education Board, 2 October 1978. Ibid;
1560 District Senior Inspector of Secondary Schools to General Manager, 17 November 1972. Ibid.
Another example of the difficulties facing the schools was an invitation in 1971 to attend a one day–in-service courses for teachers of Maori at Rotorua Boys High School. The Headmaster of Ngata Memorial College pointed out that it impossible for his senior Maori language teacher, other two teachers of Maori language and himself to travel approximately 600 miles and take three days to attend a four hour meeting, particularly as any reimbursement possible would not nearly cover the costs of petrol and accommodation. He asked that consideration be given either to making the course an eight hour one to justify the journey or holding another course in Gisborne for the Wairoa-Poverty Bay-East Coast area, and emphasized that ‘in view of the tremendous upsurge of interest in teaching Maori in this area, and in view of the inexperience of most of the teachers involved, the need for in-service training courses in Maori is particularly important’.  

The rather fragile basis on which the growing interest in the teaching of the Maori language was being accommodated was revealed in a letter from the Principal of Gisborne Girls’ High School to the Senior Inspector in 1973. She advised him that she had a part-time staff member, Mrs N. Pewhairangi, who had an Interpreter’s Licence III and was teaching Maori Studies to some third, fourth and fifth forms, ‘in addition to being the inspiration behind the Maori Club’. She had studied her test results and class work and found she was teaching Maori:

at an academic level and is having great success. She is a good staff member and a leader in the community and with the Maori children. As you know I would like Maori to be offered for School Certificate and University Entrance but I wonder if Mrs Pewhairangi’s qualifications would be of a sufficiently high standard for teaching Maori.  

Bedrook replied that the Interpreter’s Licence was regarded as a satisfactory qualification for teaching Maori and he could see no reason why the work being done could not be extended to include a School Certificate Class ‘and perhaps later a class at University Entrance level’. However the problem was that it was difficult for him

1561 Headmaster to District Senior Inspector, 8 July 1971. Ibid.
1562 Principal, I. A. Benbow to District Senior Inspector Secondary Schools, J. K. Bedrook, 18 June 1973. ABF1 W3556/94, School files, Gisborne Girls High School Teachers. ANZ-W. DB.
to judge at a distance whether Mrs Pewhairangi was ‘competent to handle advanced work’, and if this was her only qualification and there was a wish to employ her on as full-time basis ‘she would be regarded as a teacher with qualifications too low to grade and would need to be paid on salary J6’.\footnote{Bedrook to Principal, 20 June 1973. Ibid.}

### 10.5.1 Some Recent Developments

To bring the discussion of mainstream secondary schools up to date I selected the most recent ERO Report available at the time of writing on five full secondary schools, Ngata Memorial College, Waikohu College, Lytton High School, Gisborne Boys’ High School, Gisborne Girls’ High School, and two area schools which contain secondary departments, Tolaga Bay Area School and Te Waha O Rerekohu Area School.

#### 10.5.2 Ngata Memorial College

At the time of a 2005 ERO Review the College, which is located in Ruatoria, had a roll of 184, 97 percent of whom were Maori, and a decile rating of 1 which is given to schools which draw their students from areas of ‘lowest socio-economic advantage’ (whereas decile 10 schools draw their students from areas of greatest socio-economic advantage).\footnote{ERO Report, August, 2005. DB.}

Amongst areas of progress in the Board’s ‘Strategic Planning and Self-Review’ the reviewers noted that the acting principal in conjunction with the Board had developed a ‘robust annual plan’ which was ‘well structured and systematically identifies the key development issues facing the school’. The Board had also continued to make progress in the area of policy development.

Areas of further improvement which were needed included further work on communication systems both within and outside the school to ensure that the staff...
were fully aware of board policy and adopted this in their day-to-day practices. Several community concerns were identified as needing to be addressed, including ‘standards of student behaviour, the levels of student achievement and the leadership of the board of trustees’. Despite improvements having been made in these areas in recent years more understanding of them by the community was needed, particularly as:

The school’s community expressed the desire not to send their children away from Ruatoria but to keep them at home. The community stated their wish is to see the college provide high quality learning opportunities for the young people of Rutaoria and Ngati Porou.1565

Turning to the area of ‘Managing Student Safety Including Student Behaviour’ the Reviewers identified several areas where they felt further improvement was needed. They pointed out that:

Students, their parents and teachers raised behaviour management as a very serious safety concern and considered it as an impediment to effective student learning. There is a widespread belief within the school community that student behaviour has deteriorated in the past year. While a comprehensive behaviour management plan had been written by the acting principal it still needed to be ‘communicated clearly’ so that it could be ‘implemented consistently across the whole school’. In addition, the Reviewers identified a staff perception that ‘policy on stand-downs, suspensions, expulsions and exclusions has been changed or disestablished in the past year’. They concluded that this was not the case but recommended that the board needed to make the policy clear and disseminate it to both the school and wider community.1566

In examining ‘Effectiveness of School Management Structures’ the Reviewers identified several areas where improvements had been made relating to issues identified in a 2004 ERO Review. Leadership roles and relationships relating to the curriculum in both the junior and senior schools had been effectively reviewed and a new model adopted. Attendance registers were described as now being ‘monitored regularly and kept accurately’ and the school had ‘developed procedures to follow up daily absences to ensure student safety’. The Reviewers recommended that attendance

1565 Ibid, p.5; 1566 Ibid, p.6;
trends should be analysed and reported regularly to the board, students and parents. In
the area of the health and safety the Reviewers identified good progress having been
made with registers being maintained to record workplace hazards, staff accidents,
immunisation and medication administered to students.

Amongst areas the Reviewers identified where further improvements needed to be
made included further integration of the junior and senior school. Many positive
aspects initiated by the acting principal in this respect were identified, but the
Reviewers also pointed to ways in which further steps needed to be taken. While a
system for checking that teachers were properly registered and certificated had been
developed, a more rigorous approach to this in several areas was also required.1567

Turning to the area of ‘The Quality of Teaching, Quality Assurance and Monitoring
Systems’, the Reviewers noted that since the 2004 Report progress had been made in
introducing ways to identify students who were at risk of not achieving with the
result that teachers were ‘better placed to meet individual student learning needs’.
Improvements had also been made in the area of professional development which was
having a positive effect on teaching practice. However further work was needed by
curriculum teams in setting appropriate goals within each of the learning areas and a
‘rigorous quality assurance process is necessary to guide and strengthen curriculum
teams’ efforts to raise student achievement’. The Reviewers also identified a need to
introduce goal setting in teacher appraisal, with teachers needing to ‘reflect on their
practice in terms of how student achievement can be raised in their learning areas’.
They felt that work schemes did not ‘adequately provide an overview for the delivery
of the New Zealand curriculum at Negate College’ and further work in this respect
was needed.1568

In relation to ‘Student Assessment’ the Reviewers identified as positive developments
regular reports to the board of trustees from curriculum leaders which included
summaries of student achievement. But they pointed out that detailed analysis of
assessment results had not been completed and ‘more in-depth reporting should help

1567 Ibid, p.7;
1568 Ibid, p.9;
the board gain a clearer picture of how students are performing as well as forming a basis for appropriate decisions about resourcing learning programmes’. Other areas where a need for further improvements were noted included more effective assessment by teachers to provide students with useful feedback on their work, and ‘regular, systematic review of the content and delivery of programmes’ was ‘still lacking’.

10.5.3 Waikohu College.

This is a secondary school with a decile rating of 1 located in the Gisborne area. In 2005 it had an enrolment of 91 students, 85 Maori and six Pakeha.

At the time of the previous ERO Review in 2004 a new board of trustees was about to take office after a period of governance by a Government-appointed commissioner. The principal was in an acting capacity with the appointment of a new principal pending. During that review ‘ERO identified a number of areas requiring attention, related to governance and the quality of teaching and learning. These included the need for effective self review and for cohesive strategic directions. The quality of teaching and learning in the rumaki and science departments were also identified as issues’.

In the area of ‘The Quality of Governance and Management’ the 2005 ERO report identified several areas of progress. The first of these related to strategic direction where a new strategic plan showing ‘a cohesive approach to school wide development’ had been implemented. Raising reading levels, identifying students for learning support, and improving NCEA results had been established as strategic goals. A new board which had taken over from the commissioner was operating effectively. It had revised the charter, was supportive of the new principal’s strategic direction, had reinstituted a regular cycle of policy review and ‘carries out its governance roles appropriately and manages resources responsibly’. The college’s senior managers had also implemented what the Reviewers described as effective and regular self reviews.

1569 Ibid;
1570 ERO Report, 2005. DB.
of departments and appropriately reviewed the previous appraisal system. The principal was described as successfully providing strong leadership to the board and staff and a number of ways this was being done were identified.\textsuperscript{1571}

Areas where progress was identified in ‘The Quality of Teaching and Learning’ included meeting the varying needs of students working at different levels. This included students in the rumaki class who were described as receiving teaching appropriate to their learning needs across all curriculum areas, and in science steps had been taken bring about improvements. However the Reviewers also identified a need for science teaching to be more consistently effective to ensure that classroom relationships were positive and students were provided with clear aims for lessons so that learning opportunities were enhanced.\textsuperscript{1572}

10.5.4 Tolaga Bay Area School

This school caters for Year 1 to 13 students from Tolaga Bay, Tokomaru Bay and surrounding districts and had an enrolment of 307 students in 2006 and a decile rating of 2. It offers an alternative immersion programme (a Kuranui) for students in Years 7 to 13 which was established in partnership with Te Kura Kaupapa Maori O Mangatuna.\textsuperscript{1573}

Areas of good performance identified by the Reviewers in relation to senior secondary students included clear leadership being provided by senior managers at Tolaga Bay in ‘the ongoing review and development of National Certificate of Education (NCEA) programmes to improve senior students’ individual and school-wide success’. Analysis of results had shown ‘continual improvement each year’. The 2005 results indicated that 45 percent of Year 11 students attained the level one qualification compared to 23 percent in 2004, and similar improvements had been demonstrated by students in Years 12 and 13. However one area where the Reviewers

\textsuperscript{1571} Ibid, pp.3-4;
\textsuperscript{1572} Ibid, pp.4-5;
\textsuperscript{1573} ERO Report, 2006. DB.
felt there was room for improvement was the need for greater emphasis to be given to evaluating the impact of teaching practices on student outcomes.

Another area discussed in the Report was ‘Careers Education and Guidance’ (CEG), which schools are required to provide for all students in Year 7 and above. Here ERO identified amongst good performance at Tolaga Bay ‘the provision of CEG across all age levels’. At years 11 to 13 it reported that students received support both as individuals and as a group to assist them with identifying clear future directions. They were provided with ‘an appropriate range of work experience, training opportunities with tertiary providers and vocationally oriented subjects leading to NCEA credits’. Raising the number of students continuing at school until Years 12 or 13 was viewed as important. Significantly, and to the school’s credit, ‘ERO’s investigations found no areas for improvement’ in this aspect of its activity.1574

10.5.5 Te Waha o Rerekohu Area School

Situated in Te Araroa the school provides for students from Years 1-13. In 2006 it had a roll of 122, 99 percent of whom were Maori. Its decile rating was 2. The focus of this discussion is on the aspects of the 2006 ERO review dealing specifically with the secondary department.

In identifying areas of good performance the Reviewers described the progress made in delivering NCEA programmes as ‘notable’, with many Year 11 students achieving NCEA Level 1. 2006 was the first year students would be studying at Year 13, which the Reviewers described as ‘an important development for students in lifting achievement levels and future opportunities when they leave school’. Not only had the number of students achieving NCEA increased, but there had also been an increase in the breadth and number of interest courses which had contributed to improved retention rates for senior students. An improvement in the ‘monitoring and tracking of student achievement’ contributed to improvements in the achievement of national qualifications and student retention. Moreover NCER results were being used

1574 Ibid, pp.8-9;
as the basis for self-review of the curriculum, with the principal collecting teacher evaluations of NCER courses and developing ways of analyzing the results more comprehensively.^{1575}

Moving to the area of ‘Career Education and Guidance’ the Reviewers found that special emphasis was placed on career guidance for senior secondary students to prepare them for the transition to employment or further study. An important aspect of this was consultation with the community which assisted the board and senior managers to obtain a clearer view of the aspirations of whanau for the students. The Reviewers pointed out that resources such as the Secondary Tertiary Alignment Resource (STAR) allowed students to ‘pursue their interests through tertiary study in such areas as law, forestry, early childhood education, hospitality, sports leadership and automotive engineering’.

10.5.6 Gisborne Boys’ High School

At the time of a November 2006 ERO Report the school had an enrolment of 693 pupils, 64 percent of whom were Maori. It had a decile rating of 3.\textsuperscript{1576}

In the area of ‘Monitoring and Reporting Student Achievement’ the Reviewers described the NCEA results as ‘slightly behind the national average for decile 1-3 schools’, although ‘At Year 12 and 13 this deficit decreases substantially’. However, the results also demonstrated that NCEA results in level 1 literacy and numeracy requirements ‘are below schools in a similar decile band’.\textsuperscript{1577}

In identifying areas of good performance the reviewers referred to effective teaching strategies as contributing to student achievement in many classrooms. Teachers also encouraged the development of appropriate skills for learning, effective monitoring meant students and their families were informed of successes and where further support was needed, and a variety of senior classes were provided matched to

\textsuperscript{1575} ERO Report, 2006, pp.4-8. DB.
\textsuperscript{1576} ERO Report, November, 2006. DB.
\textsuperscript{1577} Ibid, p.3;
students’ interests and abilities. Students in Years 10-13 were being encouraged to develop individual learning career plans.\textsuperscript{1578}

Moving to areas where improvement was possible the Reviewers felt that while information on student achievement was gathered it could be put to more use. Examples suggested were identifying and planning programmes which were tailored to the requirements of individual students or groups of students, facilitating reflection and accountability by teachers with regards to identifying the teaching methods which were most effective, and evaluating how effective attempt to bring about improvements were. Another area where further work was needed related to literacy. The Reviewers acknowledged that the teachers had received some professional development in teaching literacy, but ‘strategies to promote students’ competence and confidence in literacy is not practiced across all departments’.\textsuperscript{1579}

The Reviewers then turned to a consideration of ‘The Achievement of Maori students’. In identifying areas of good performance they referred to a variety of initiatives which had been taken to encourage engagement by Maori students. ‘High numbers of students’ were identified as achieving NCEA credits in whakairo, and amongst positive outcomes of this was improving knowledge of cultural heritage, supporting learning and enhancing self-esteem. The steps taken by senior school managers and teachers to promote ongoing links with parents and whanau was also viewed positively.\textsuperscript{1580}

In considering areas where improvements might be made the Reviewers identified a failure on the part of the board and staff to ‘set measurable targets for improving Maori achievement.’ They recommended achievement information both at classroom level and school-wide should be more thoroughly analysed to ‘identify trends and patterns and inform subsequent planning, goal setting and resourcing’ relating to Maori students. The Reviewers agreed with a decision by the board that ‘professional development relating to the needs of Maori students is necessary’.\textsuperscript{1581}

\textsuperscript{1578} Ibid, p.4;
\textsuperscript{1579} Ibid, pp.4-5;
\textsuperscript{1580} Ibid, p.5;
\textsuperscript{1581} Ibid, p.6;
10.5.7 Gisborne Girls’ High School

At the time of the ERO Review the school had an enrolment of 876 pupils, 48 percent of whom were Maori. Its decile rating was 4.

In looking at student achievement overall the Reviewers described the students achieving ‘very well’ in NCEA compared with students in similar decile schools. They achieved results for NCEA Level 1 and Level 2 in 2003 AND 2004 which were above decile and national averages. Their achievement at NCEA Level 3 in 2004 was above decile and close to the national average.1582

The Report devoted a separate section to ‘The Achievement of Maori Students’. It identified improved retention rates as a key factor in the increased number of Maori students participating in senior level classes, which were ‘now comparable to those of all students’. More Maori students were staying to Year 13 and the percentage leaving with qualifications had risen, with ‘The number of Maori leavers who gain Year 13 qualifications’ now being ‘more than twice as high as that in other similar decile schools’. All of the senior courses linked to national qualifications and the Report pointed to ‘significant numbers of Maori students’ enrolled in courses that led to tertiary education’. In 2005 Maori students had entered for scholarship qualifications in chemistry, biology, science, mathematics with statistics and physical education.1583

Relationships between Maori students and their teachers were described as ‘supportive’ both within and outside the classroom. The Reviewers identified Maori students as reporting that ‘teachers show respect for their cultural background, have high expectations for them as learners, encouraging and challenging them to achieve’.

Board of trustees and management planning and self-review revealed a ‘strong focus on improving success for Maori students’.1584

1582 ERO Report, November 2005, p.2. DB.
1583 Ibid, p.7;
1584 Ibid;
The one area where the Reviewers felt there was room for improvement was that there could be more consistent analysis of student achievement information across the school to assist with the review of learning programmes for Maori students. Because despite the progress referred to earlier ‘a significant gap between Maori and non-Maori NCEA achievement is still apparent’. While Maori student achievement was gathered and analysed it was felt that some departments could make better use of this to identify factors contributing to successful learning. What was still lacking was enough ‘explicit strategies for improving Maori student achievement. On the one hand teachers were described as knowing their students well, but many did not collate and analyse classroom assessment information to determine whether their teaching programmes were relevant to and promoted high levels of achievement for Maori learners.\textsuperscript{1585}

10.5.8 Lytton High School

Situated in Gisborne, Litton at the time of the ERO Review had an enrolment of 829 students, 66 percent of whom were Maori, the number of Maori students having increased over the previous four years. The school’s decile rating was 2.

As part of the review the Reviewers devoted a separate section to ‘The Achievement of Maori students’, with a particular focus on the extent to which the school had ‘knowledge and strategies for promoting the achievement of Maori students’. The Report described most students as being of Rongowhakaata, Te Aitanga a Mahaki, Ngai Tamanuhiri, Ngari Kaiputahi and Ngati Porou descent. Bilingual and immersion programmes were provided for students who wished to learn through the medium of te reo Maori. Between 2003 and 2004 the number of Maori students attaining national qualifications was described as having ‘improved substantially, and ‘over time the difference between Maori and non-Maori in the percentage of students completing qualifications’ had been decreasing.\textsuperscript{1586}

\textsuperscript{1585} Ibid, p.8; 
\textsuperscript{1586} ERO Report, November 2005, p.6.
Elaborating on areas of good performance with regard to the achievement of Maori students the Reviewers commented that senior students were provided with a range of well-structured programmes, including taking dual national qualifications through NCEA and Te Waharoa (National Certificate of Maori). They also noted the students gaining from their achievements in Maori performance and oratory, such as the kapa haka group winning the national competition in 2005 and students gaining awards in Ngai Manu Korero speech competitions. Several Academies, including sport, automotive, Maori performing arts, were described as ‘providing relevant programmes to meet a range of Maori students’ aptitudes, interests and needs, with a high proportion of the staff being Maori and heads of the academies identifying strongly with Maori students and ‘providing high quality programmes and support’.  

An area where the Reviewers felt there was room for improvement was what they described as a ‘lack of engagement in learning in some junior classes’, which they acknowledged was also a concern for the school’s senior managers, and they made suggestions for professional development through the use of such resources as the Ministry of Education’s video Teachers making a Difference for Maori Students.

10.5.9 Maori Language Teaching in Secondary Schools

In 2006 the Education Review Office presented the results of ‘An Evaluation of the Quality of Maori Language Teaching in Secondary Schools: Te Tairawhiti’. This was ERO’s first evaluation of this aspect of the curriculum in East Coast, Gisborne and Wairoa secondary schools. It was requested by the secondary schools and area schools of the area, and the report pointed out that the nine schools included in the evaluation were a mixture of rural, urban, low and middle decile schools, mainly enrolling a high proportion of Maori students.

1587 Ibid, p.7;
1588 Wellington, 2006. DB.
1589 Ibid, p.1;
Despite the Reviewers identifying a ‘small number’ of teachers they described as ‘effective’, they found ‘the overall quality of te reo Maori was low’, concluding that:

Many teachers did not demonstrate the subject and pedagogical knowledge required of a second language teacher, including the ability to develop the rich and varied learning contexts suitable for students learning te reo Maori. Many students in these classrooms were not engaged in learning and consequently not achieving well. This finding raises questions about how well their initial teacher training has prepared these teachers to teach.\textsuperscript{1590}

The Reviewers also described schools as not making effective use of student achievement information in te reo Maori to assist the improvement of student learning. They identified several developments which they described as necessary to raise the overall quality of Maori language teaching in the schools described including:

- Implementing high quality assessment practices for te re Maori at classroom and school levels.
- Integrating second language teaching pedagogy across all te reo Maori classrooms.
- Increasing whanau and community involvement in and support of Maori language teaching.
- Establishing appraisal procedures for te reo Maori teachers against indicators of good quality teaching practice, including indicators of effective teaching for second language acquisition.

The Review pointed out that ERO would return to the schools within the next three years to repeat the evaluation, and expected the 2006 Report to provide useful baseline information to evaluate the result of the initiatives the schools had taken in the interim to improve the quality of their Maori language teaching.\textsuperscript{1591}

\textsuperscript{1590} Ibid;
\textsuperscript{1591} Ibid, p.2;
10.6 Tomorrow’s Schools

The Report of the Taskforce to Review Education Administration (The ‘Picot Report’) was published in April 1988. Subsequent reports dealt with the early childhood and university sectors. On its first page following an executive summary the Report stated that one of its basic assumptions was that ‘the provisions of the Treaty of Waitangi will be observed’. However it did not follow this with any guidelines regarding how this would be implemented in education. In a later section, on ‘Cultural Sensitivity’, the Report referred again to the Treaty, stating that cultural sensitivity ‘must play a greater part in the education system’ and that New Zealand had ‘a particular and general need for cultural sensitivity. Maori people have a special status under the obligations of the Treaty of Waitangi’.

Most of the Picot Report’s major recommendations relating to schools were accepted by the Labour Government and published in August 1988 as Tomorrow’s Schools: The Reform of Education Administration in New Zealand. Wellington, 1988. Tomorrow’s Schools led to some significant changes particularly in the administration and policy areas of the New Zealand education system. At the centre a new Ministry of Education focussing on policy advice replaced the formerly all-powerful Department of Education. Locally, boards of trustees replaced primary school committees and secondary school boards of governors, and were designed to give elected (or co-opted) parents new and greater responsibilities. The ten regional education boards, the main district level administrative units for primary schools since 1877, were abolished. A Review and Audit Agency (later renamed the Education Review Office (ERO)) was also established.

Tomorrow’s Schools placed a strong emphasis on equity objectives, stating that these would ‘underpin all policy related to the reform of education administration…to ensure that a new system of education administration promotes and progressively achieves greater equity for women, Maori, Pacific Island, other groups’. Ibid., p25. However significantly, even these general references to the Treaty were deleted in

---

1593 Picot, p.3.
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Tomorrow’s Schools, the Government’s white paper announcing which of the changes recommended by the Picot Report would be implemented.

Reference to the Treaty was also made subsequently in the charters which were required to be drawn up by each school. But one writer, Patricia Johnson, pointed out that just including the ‘principles’ of the Treaty in the charter was no guarantee of empowerment of Maori, the real test of this would be ‘who actually decides how the Treaty will be translated into practice at the institutional level’ and, as it currently existed, the appearance of the Treaty in the charters was therefore ‘merely a “tokenistic” gesture which has no clout’.1595

The subsequent Education Act 1989 incorporated the Tomorrow’s Schools changes in legislation, which must be binding on policy makers and implementers, and required educational institutions to observe the Treaty of Waitangi. But here again, what this might actually mean in relation to educational structures and practices for Maori, or what the actual responsibility of Government might be, was not spelt out.1596

However amongst the recommendations of the Picot and Tomorrow’s School’s Reports were several that some Maori parents and others did come to see as potentially positive. This was particularly so for those who were concerned that by 1987 the children who had been immersed in the Te Kohanga Reo for five years were ready to enter the school system. Linda Tuhiwai Smith points out that new arguments presented by Te Kohanga parents about what was now needed focussed on:

- The right to continue learning in the language (as opposed to learning the language).
- The right to attend a school which reflected in all its structures the concepts embodied in Te Kohanga Reo.

1596 Education Act 1989.
• The right to make decisions over what children should be learning, how they should learn and from whom they should learn.\textsuperscript{1597}

Children graduating from kohanga like others were required by law to enrol in a primary school, but the state school system had not responded adequately to meet their needs, with an absence of qualified teachers and appropriate resources. It has been pointed out that the Department of Education ‘responded with a range of options for these children, varying from no response at all, to advising parents to send their children to Te Kohanga Reo after school hours’.\textsuperscript{1598}

10.7 Kura Kaupapa Maori

Initiatives had already been taken by some Maori to meet this situation by developing Kura Kaupapa Maori, which up until this time existed outside the structure of state schooling. These were primary schools designed to build on the main components of Te Kohanga Reo, providing teaching in and through the Maori language, with Maori knowledge and other aspects of culture as other essential components, providing the general state school curriculum but teaching it through the medium of Maori language. The first of these, Hone Waititi Kura, had opened in 1985 and since then three other schools had been established with several others being developed.¹⁵⁹⁹

One writer suggested that the emergence of Kura Kaupapa Maori was a response not only to the wish to provide for the continuing schooling of children graduating from Te Kohanga Reo to have a Maori emphasis but also:

a passionately held belief among many Maori that the European-style school system, that has been their sole avenue to formal education for over a century within the state provided system, is not appropriate organisationally or pedagogically to the sustenance and development of a Polynesian culture.¹⁶⁰⁰

10.7.1 Kura Kaupapa Maori and Tomorrow’s Schools

The sections of Tomorrow’s Schools which interested those people interested in the further development of kura kaupapa Maori included the following:

- Opportunities will be made available to parents who wish to have their children learn or be educated in the Maori language. Section 3.2.1.


- Maori parents—as other parents—will be able to educate their children at home or establish their own institutions if the system is not sufficiently responsive to their needs. Section 3.2.3.
- Groups of parents will be able to withdraw from an existing institution and set up a separate one if the particular educational needs of their children cannot be met locally. Section 5.5.1.
- The parents will have to represent at least 21 students and, once their charter is approved, the new institution will be funded by the state in the same way as other institutions. Section 5.5.2.
- The definition of “special-character” schools (which currently covers integrated schools only) will be extended to include kaupapa Maori schools, bilingual schools and others where the Minister decides a “special character” exists. Section 5.6.1.

Linda and Graham Smith described their initial reaction to the Picot Report as ‘extremely sceptical’ in terms of the changes recommended ‘being able to deliver on anything significantly different for Maori’. But the possibilities raised in the Tomorrow’s Schools Report, and subsequent opportunity for interested parties including Maori to make submissions on the most desirable way forward, led them to the hope that they could:

now look with some optimism to the introduction of the legislation for the reform of education which may hold the opportunity for children to learn and be taught totally through the language of our ancestors and within a structure which is designed to ensure that it will be a successful experience. This is what we hope for; the establishment of Kura Kaupapa Maori (Maori immersion schooling which will cater for those children who have gained fluency in Maori through Kohanga reo’.

But as the reform process was scrutinised more closely there was considerable disquiet amongst some prominent Maori commentators. For example Dr Pita Sharples suggested in a submission to a Kura Kaupapa Maori Working Party that that Kura Kaupapa Maori was a new concept in schooling which ‘does not equate with any of

---

the school types outlined in Tomorrow’s Schools and accordingly it is not catered for in the proposed transition of schools in the current reform of education administration’. 1602

He pointed out that the Kura which had been developed to date ‘all exist outside or on the “fringe” of the state education system’. They were characterised by limitations and practical difficulties with regard to pursuing the characteristics and goals of a Kura Kaupapa Maori as outlined in Tomorrow’s Schools because they:

clearly lie outside the structure, stated aims and methods of any school category at this time. The flexibility to develop its particular form of administration and delivery is simply not present in the Tomorrow’s Schools proposals. 1603

Moreover he drew critical attention to Section 5.5.3 in Tomorrow’s Schools which stated that ‘The setting up of a new institution will be a last resort, and its charter must be consistent with national guidelines’. To Sharples, offering this ‘opting-out’ option as a legitimate avenue through which whanau could set up a school to satisfy the special needs of Maori parents for their children, ‘was quite unacceptable for the establishment of Kura Kauapa Maori’, and amongst reasons for this appeared to be the probability of protracted negotiations with the Ministry of Education to ‘prove: that the needs of Maori students were not being met in existing schools. 1604

Another reason he considered the ‘opt-out’ clause unsuitable was ‘perhaps the most important’; this was that kura kaupapa Maori was a Maori initiative which ‘should be established as a Mainstream alternative within the state system. In accordance with the partnership promised by the Treaty of Waitangi, Kura Kaupapa Maori should be established for its own worth and particular Maori character and not by default because the system couldn’t fit us in’. For a century now, things Maori have been “fitted in” to the general state system. The character of Kura Kaupapa Maori contains

1603 Ibid, p.33;
1604 Ibid, p.34;
many of the taonga of our Maori ancestors and are not and cannot be “fitted in”-rather they must stand as of their own right’.1605

There was another related aspect of the “last resort” regulation which upset many Maori, which was that recognition of the official status of Te Reo Maori in 1884, and its place among nga taonga protected in Article 2 of the Treaty of Waitangi was also, by implication, being relegated to the category of a last resort.1606

Graham Smith expressed the concern that the requirements of the new institutions ‘must be consistent with national guidelines’ and this would ‘probably rule out the setting up of kura ‘as their methods (and philosophy noted above) currently lie outside the norm’. There was also anxiety about funding, with Smith (and also Sharples) noting that even if kura kaupapa Maori could be established under the clauses laid out in Tomorrow’s Schools they would presumably be ‘funded in the same way as other institutions’. This was regarded as unsatisfactory because they had particular funding needs.1607

It was primarily the efforts of whanau which led to kura kaupapa Maori eventually then being included in the Education Amendment Act 1989 as a different and particular type of schooling. But even then those which were established experienced many difficulties in achieving equity within the system. In 1991 one respected observer, Tamati Reedy, commented that they remained seriously under-funded, with some struggling to provide even adequate sanitation.1608

A decade later the Ministry of Education’s own official Report on Maori Education, Nga Haeta Matauanga, acknowledged that a shortage of adequate numbers of skilled teachers of te reo Maori and teaching resources persisted.1609

1605 Ibid;
Significantly, it took until 1999 for ‘a new establishment process for kura kauapapa Maori’ to be developed ‘so new kura are identified and established using a consistent approach and sound viability criteria (both financially and educationally’ (Author’s emphasis).\(^{1610}\)

The area of assessment remained a concern for one prominent educationist, Professor Russell Bishop, who pointed to the continuation of a serious lack of assessment resources in te reo Maori.\(^{1611}\)

After reviewing *Tomorrow’s Schools* in relation to kura kaupapa Maori a Victoria University researcher, Peter Appleby, concluded in 2001 that:

Tomorrow’s Schools and the subsequent policies reviewed have not enhanced the development of Kura Kauapapa Maori. These schools have succeeded “in spite of” policy. Whether the policy direction of the last decade has inhibited such a development is more difficult to assess. However it is not unreasonable to suggest that amidst all the difficulties facing Kura Kaupapa Maori (experienced leadership, teacher supply, resourcing) the demonstrable lack of policy support over the period of the review constitutes an inhibiting factor in the successful development of these important schools.\(^{1612}\)

The most dramatic increase in the number of kura kaupapa Maori and kura teina was in the 1990s with an increase from 13 in 1992 to 73 in 2005.\(^{1613}\) A kura teina is an initiative by a community which wants to become a kura kaupapa Maori, has prepared a business case and been formally accepted by Ministerial approval into the establishment process. The growth has slowed since then with a 24% increase since 2000. Over the same period the number of students has increased by 25 percent from 4,964 in 2000 to 6,181 in 2005, and it has been pointed out that if this trend continues their will be a further increase in the demand for teachers who are able to teach the entire curriculum in Maori when a shortage of teachers already exists. This still

\(^{1610}\) Ministry of Education, 2001, p.11.


\(^{1612}\) Appleby, pp.118-119.

represents, of course, a tiny percentage of the total enrolment of Maori students in schools.\textsuperscript{1614}

\section*{10.7.2 Maori Immersion Schools}

Maori–medium education schools are not limited to kura kauapa Maori but also include other primary immersion schools and schools with immersion or bilingual units or classes. It was estimated in 2001 that about 17 percent of Maori children of school age were enrolled in some form of Maori-medium education.\textsuperscript{1615}

The distinguished linguist Dr Richard Benton, writing in 2001, pointed out that one of the reasons that enrolment in Maori-medium schools remained comparatively low was that ‘Acess is limited by government regulation and the scarcity of government-funded resources. The overwhelming majority of Maori children are still unable to receive Maori-medium education’.\textsuperscript{1616}

\section*{10.7.3 National Certificate of Educational Achievement (NCEA)}

There is evidence that students in high or total immersion schooling have outperformed Maori students in mainstream schools. For example in 2005:

- 53 percent of Year 11 Maori candidates in immersion schools gained at least NCEA level 1 compared to 39 percent of Maori students in English medium schools.
- 50 percent of year 12 Maori candidates in immersion schools gained at least NCEA level 2 compared to 45 percent of Maori students in English medium schools.

\begin{flushleft}
\textsuperscript{1614} Ibid;  \\
\end{flushleft}
• 58 percent of Year 13 Maori candidates in immersion schools gained at least NCEA level 3 compared to 29 percent of Maori students in English medium school.1617

But there is obviously room for further improvements, with the Ministry of Education itself acknowledging that in Maori immersion education there is still too much variability in quality, reflecting to some extent ‘some of the challenges of increasing the supply of teachers and resources’, and Maori language providers ‘are struggling with a shortage of teachers and resources’.1618

Another Ministry publication acknowledged in 2005 that:

Despite improved staffing ratios, kaupapa Maori schooling continues to struggle with shortages of appropriately skilled and qualified teachers and a shortage of educational resources, as well as the pressures of developing relevant pedagogy, curricula, teacher training and professional development. Where improvements present a substantial challenge for the mainstream system with its relatively large and strong infrastructure, the challenges are far greater for kaupapa Maori schooling with its developing and still fragile infrastructure’.1619

And the Review of Schools’ Operational Funding commissioned by the Government in November 2005 reported in 2006 that ‘There are some signs of pressure on Maori language immersion schools.’1620

10.7.4 Kura Kaupapa Maori Schools and the East Coast

Efforts to give more attention to instruction in the Maori language had already begun in some East Coast mainstream primary schools by 1970. An inspection report on the Tolaga Bay DHS in 1971 noted that ‘Children in S4/F1/F2 are interested in the Maori

1618 Ibid, and p.23;
language programme. Repetitive drills are well organised and overall the Maori programme is going well.’1621

At the Hiruhrama School in 1980 an inspection report noted that ‘The emphasis placed on the Maori language and culture is to be commended, and the use of Maori was noted in all classrooms (Although) a more varied and active approach to the teaching of the language in the senior classes would further increase the pupils’ understanding and attitudes to their taha Maori’.1622

At the same school in 1983:

It was readily apparent that the Maori language programme is an integral part of the school and is in line with the aspirations of parents and the community. The commitment of teachers to the programme and their fluency and consistent use of the language are pervading features of the total programme.1623

Nevertheless many East Coast people had become frustrated with the slow progress being made to continue the teaching in Maori of students coming onto the primary schools from kohanga reo, and the lack of official support for the efforts which were being made. One expression of this was a paper prepared by the Principal of the Rerekohu Area School, Anaru Paenga, in 1987.1624

He linked this slow progress to the lack of success many Maori experienced in mainstream schools, pointing out that at Te Waha o Rerekohu only 3-5 students in Forms 3-6 were performing at above average levels in subjects other than Maori, and only 3-5 students entered the sixth form under the traditional pass-fail system, before asking ‘What’s happening to the other 15 students in the class?’ and pointing out that apart from the Maori boarding schools similar failure levels were evident in most state schools. Whereas:

1621 Inspection Report, Tolaga Bay DHS Primary Department, 14 October 1971. AAZY Acc W3901/98, School Inspection Tolaga Bay. ANZ-W. DB.
1622 Inspection Report Hiruharama School, 24 April 1980. ABDJ AccW3568/142, Miscellaneous Hiruharama. ANZ-W. DB.
1623 Inspection Report Hiruharama School, 27-28 April 1983. ABFI AccW3556 Box 96, School Files Gisborne, E12/1. ANZ-W. DB.
In a community like Te Araroa where the population is predominantly Maori I feel that it is the parents responsibility to ensure that the vital link between our history, the landscape and the language be encouraged, revitalized and given *status and dignity in the eyes of the children*. The time has never been more opportune than at present to consider the introduction of an immersion programme.\(^\text{1625}\)

He pointed out that the number of graduates from kohanga reo were entering primary schools on the Coast in increasing numbers and over the next 3-4 years would probably double, and asked ‘should we risk a possible arrest of their Maori language skill’ or implement a bilingual approach which would enhance those skills? His answer was that he would like to make the new entrants class in 1988 be a ‘totally immersed one. This in effect means that the medium of instruction would be Maori’.\(^\text{1626}\)

After discussion by the school and community the suggestions in the paper were forwarded to the Minister of Education by the Hiruharama Parents Bi-Lingual Committee, and the Chairperson and Secretary of the Hiruharama School Committee.\(^\text{1627}\)

However the initial response of a Departmental official was cautious. After visiting the area and talking to the Principal and member of the Management Committee he felt that there were ‘still some aspects of the proposal that the people were uncertain about. The teaching of Maori as a subject is not being opposed. The notion of immersion however is unclear for many in the district’. He then outlined the policy and procedures which would need to be gone through before a bilingual class was approved.\(^\text{1628}\)

An example of some of the problems those schools faced which were attempting to develop bi-lingual programmes was seen in a letter from the Chairperson and Secretary of the Hiruharama School to the Minister of Education in 1984. They

\(^\text{1625}\) Ibid, p.2;  
\(^\text{1626}\) Ibid, p.5;  
\(^\text{1627}\) Committee to Minister, 14 May 1984. ABDJ W3568/142, ANZ-W. DB.  
\(^\text{1628}\) W. Kaa for Director-General to C. Bell, General Manager Hawke-s Bay Education Board, 10 December 1987. Ibid;
reminded him that the school had been designated as an experimental bi-lingual one but they did not feel that the children were getting:

a fair go in that their teachers have limited resources with which to implement directives outlined by your Dept. It is generally felt that after three years in the experimental stage, major teething problems are behind us, our progress however is stunted by lack of resources. The immediate need is for a series of graded sequential readers in Maori, comparable to the “Ready to Read” series. A set of perhaps ten basic readers with at least six supplementaries…What is the point of issuing “Ready to Read” series in English to a designated Bi-lingual School practising total immersion in Maori in the lower classes. It leaves one with the presumption that the whole theory of Bi-lingualism is not expected to succeed.\textsuperscript{1629}

Greater awareness of the need to cater for the children coming onto primary schools from kohanga reo was also reflected in a recommendation to the staff of the Whangara School that in consultation with community and other resource persons they should give ‘careful consideration to establishing a policy, programmes and practices which recognise the 40+% Maori roll and the needs, aspirations and potential contribution of these children from the time they leave Te Kohanga Reo’.\textsuperscript{1630}

\textbf{10.7.5 1997 Education Review Office Report}

The 1997 ERO Report referred to earlier pointed out that five kura had been established on the Coast since 1993 and the schools and the students enrolled in them were required to be taught the New Zealand curriculum in te reo Maori. All of the kura had been reviewed in 1997 and ERO was quite critical in summarising the results, describing:

- three kura boards as having ‘a very limited understanding of their role and responsibilities especially with respect to basic accountability requirements’.
- The kura boards were ‘not generally managing personnel well. Of the five kura only one had a performance management system in place’.

\textsuperscript{1629} P. Pollitt and G. Parker to Minister of Education, 14 May 1984. ABDJ W3568/142, ANZ-W. DB.
\textsuperscript{1630} Inspection Report Whangara School, 27 February 1989. ABFI Acc W3556 Box 96. ANZ-W
• However inconsistency of curriculum delivery with regard to national curriculum statements was identified as ‘the main issue in all five kura’.1631

To bring the discussion up to date I obtained the most recent (2006) ERO reports available for a sample of three kura and present below a description and analysis of them. The reports will be made available in the Document Bank for further use by claimants or their counsel as required.

Placing too much weight on the findings from such a small sample would be unwise. Nevertheless it is possible to make some general comments. Reports on two of the kura praised the positive role they were playing in building a strong cultural identity amongst the tamariki by learning about the historical, spiritual and cultural aspects of their tribal heritage, in which the use of te reo Maori was an essential part.

However when the reports moved to the areas of governance, teaching and learning it appears that some of the difficulties identified in the 1997 ERO Report still persist. This was apparent in the quite critical comments made by the reviewers in these areas and the suggestions that improvements needed to be made. They included, in addition to governance issues, issues relating to curriculum management and planning, the quality of teaching, assessment, strategic planning, performance management and in at least one instance leadership.

10.7.6 The Whaia te iti Kahurangi Final Report 2004

Before moving to a discussion of the kura selected, sections of the above report which was commissioned by Te Runanga o Ngati Porou and the Ministry of Education Partnership and referred to earlier, is relevant to the discussion which follows. The report pointed out that whanau decision-making was the governance form in the kura kaupapa Maori and:

In small schools, trustees were more likely to feel their dependence on principals, or to see that they needed to provide additional practical

assistance, sometimes blurring the line between governance and management, in order to allow the principal to concentrate on the curriculum, on teaching and learning, which was for these boards, the proper priority for principals...The trustees and principals interviewed identified a need for both specific training and advice for existing trustees, and for more general training for new trustees.1632

10.7.7 Te Kura Kaupapa Maori o Waipiro

Located in Waipiro Bay the Kura had 12 pupils enrolled in 2006. The ERO review team visited it in August 2006 and their report was presented in November 2006.1633

In their very positive observations related to Te Ira Tangata the Reviewers described the whanau and staff as having developed goals that were clearly stated and reflected their wish to provide a ‘holistic’ or whole person approach to the development of the pupils based on their cultural and spiritual beliefs. They provided several examples of how this was being successfully achieved. The whanau was described as providing a ‘cooperative learning environment where tuakana-taina relationships were valued and supported. When students became upset they were supported, and they were encouraged to follow healthy habits and attitudes, one example of this mentioned being the noho marae experiences providing them with regular physical fitness activity. Learning experiences were also described fostering Maori values including aroha, manaaki, tiaki, tautoko karakia, mihi tautoko and himene. However the need for a more thorough review of existing policies designed to provide a safe physical and emotional environment for the students and deal with any complaints was identified.1634

Moving to a consideration of te reo Maori the Reviewers described a commitment on the part of the whanau to ensuring that the language used in the kura would generally be ‘exclusively Maori’. They also noted that a more planned approach for 2006 and beyond would ‘better support the language development of the students’ and identified several of the ways it was intended to achieve this. A suggestion was made...

1633 ERO Report, 2006. DB.
1634 Ibid, p.13;
that the board and teaching tumuaki ‘should provide clear guidance and direction for
the kaiawhina to support the students with limited ability in te reo Maori’.\textsuperscript{1635}

The Reviewers described the governance of the kura as ‘ineffective’ with more
attention needing to be paid to aspects of the roles and responsibilities of board
members. They suggested that the trustees should seek further external support to
assist them to ‘improve their practice, particularly in the areas of strategic and annual
planning, self-review, performance management and curriculum management and
implementation’.\textsuperscript{1636}

In discussing Te Ao the Reviewers described the whanau as being very active in
ensuring that the students would be secure in their knowledge about the Maori world,
with regular opportunities provided for them to ‘learn and take leadership roles in
powhiri, karakia, moteatea, and tikanga’. Students were also provided with
experiences which enabled them to explore the wider world and the Reviewers
identified several examples of the way this was being achieved.\textsuperscript{1637}

However several areas were identified by the Reviewers where they felt there was
room for improvement. One of these was curriculum management and the Reviewers
made several suggestions of how improvements could be achieved. Another was the
quality of teaching, with the Report describing the students as not being ‘provided
with programmes of learning that are tailored to their individual strengths and needs’.
Students needed a clearer understanding of what was required of them, better
motivation to learn and more involvement in learning for longer periods of time.
Personnel and performance management were described as another two areas where
improvement was required. In the former a need was identified to up-date procedures
relating to managing staff performance and for the board to have clearer systems in
place to guide and support personnel management. In the latter there was a need to
negotiate performance agreements and give more attention to staff appraisal. A ‘lack
of professional leadership’ was identified, the absence of the permanent principal
meaning that the board needed to provide more of this ‘in the areas of strategic

\textsuperscript{1635} Ibid, p.14;
\textsuperscript{1636} Ibid, p.15;
\textsuperscript{1637} Ibid;
planning, personnel and performance management, curriculum management and implementation and self review’.  

Moving to strategic planning the Reviewers described this as ‘ineffective’, with plans lacking cohesion. While important strategic goals were in place including improving reading and writing in te reo, student achievement in number, confidence in speaking te reo Maori and developing it, some of the plans did not sufficiently support and focus the staff and board on the achievement of the goals. There was an absence of students achievement targets for 2006. Moreover policy and procedure self-review was described as ‘ineffective’ without any thorough attention to it ‘for any areas of kura operations for 2005 or for 2006’. More detail was required in curriculum planning to guide the teachers and ensure quality learning programmes were provided, and assessment practices were described as ‘ineffective’, with a failure to use student achievement to develop curriculum plans for individual student needs.  

However the reviewers were much more positive when they moved from the above areas of governance, teaching and learning to asset and financial management. In the former they described appropriate systems and processes having been developed by the board, a budget prepared which identified spending priorities with funding to support student learning given a high priority. Appropriate systems were also described as being in place in relation to property management, including a ten-year maintenance plan in place, regular self-review of property issues and goals for further improvement.  

---

1638 Ibid, p.16;  
1639 Ibid, p.17;  
1640 Ibid, p.18;
10.7.8 Te Kura Kaupapa Maori o Taperenui-a-Whatonga

This is a full primary (Year 1-) rural kura located in Rangitukia which at the time of an ERO review in 2006 had an enrolment of 13.\footnote{ERO Report, 2006. DB.}

The ERO Report was extremely positive about the efforts of the staff, board and whanau to assist the students to develop a strong sense of their identity and their turangawaewae of Rangitukia by learning about the ‘historical, spiritual and cultural aspects of their tribal heritage’.\footnote{Ibid, p.10;}

However it was less positive about some other aspects of the Kura’s operations. For example governance was an area that was described as requiring ‘major development’. Board members needed to develop a greater understanding of their roles and responsibilities, and also to place less reliance on the tumuaki to make decisions independently of the Board. The quality of teaching was described as ‘variable’. Several aspects of teaching practice were identified as effective including well-established classroom routines which students were familiar with, use of positive reinforcement to encourage students’ efforts, encouragement of the development of independence and opportunities to use computers. But the Report also identified ‘significant areas’ where it said improvement was necessary. Included here was the need for teachers to provide more challenges to effectively engage students in their learning, a greater focus on behaviour management and a brighter and more stimulating learning environment. The Report concluded this section with the fairly critical overall comment that ‘The quality of teaching does not adequately provide students with a solid foundation of learning’.\footnote{Ibid, p.11;}

Moving to the area of ‘Strategic Planning’ the Report described this as ‘ineffective’ in that it ‘does not adequately support the board, staff and parents to attain their aspirations’, with ‘specific, measurable and achievable student achievement targets’
not having been developed by the board’. Overall a failure of planning to focus on raising student achievement was identified. The Report also described ‘Curriculum Management’ as ‘ineffective’ and an area where ‘major development’ was needed. Not all curriculum areas were covered, curriculum policy documents had not been reviewed and teachers were described as ‘not well guided in curriculum development, management or implementation’. Moreover an absence of any systematic approach to self-review of the curriculum area was identified, and the board was described as ‘lacking a sound understanding of curriculum management and implementation.’ Discussing ‘Assessment’ the Report described this as ‘inadequate’, with an absence of adequate gathering, analysing and documenting of student progress and achievement. Reading was identified as an area where this was ‘of particular concern’. The teachers were described as not being assisted to improve their practice in the assessment area and not having received professional development in assessment, which the Report identified as a major area for further development.1644

10.7.9 Te Kura Kaupapa Maori o Mangatauna

Located at Mangatuna near Tolaga Bay for year 0-8 students the kura had an enrolment of 15 in 2006.1645

A full ERO Review was originally intended but because of the absence of the permanent tumuaki for all of term four 2006 it was agreed to narrow its scope to cover aspects of Te Ira Tangata and Ahuatanga Ako. As a result the review was briefer than many others.

The Review concluded that the environment was not one where parents could be confident that ‘tamariki experience positive interactions and relationships’, and adequate behaviour management systems and practices needed to be established. Moreover further steps needed to be taken to ensure that a proper organisation was in place to ensure that student safety was maintained when they were taken on trips outside the kura. The Review also identified a need to improve the quality of the

1644 Ibid, p.12;
1645 ERO Report, 2006. DB.
teaching to enable the tamariki to fulfill their potential, with greater attention needing to be paid to a range of activities which would ‘extend, challenge and motivate learners’, with Kaimahi currently not having adequate ‘strategies to cater for individual abilities and interests of the students’. However in the junior class learning activities were described as ‘well-organised and prepared’.  

Yet despite the negative nature of these comments the next section of the Report appeared to some extent to contradict aspects of them, at least as far as some of the students were concerned. For example it went on to praise the whanau for having been active in seeking support for students who had learning and behavioural needs; individual education plans had been developed in consultation with parents and external agencies for some students, goals for learning and development had also been identified for these students and ‘progress is effectively monitored and reported’ for them.

10.8 Wananga

10.8.1 Introduction

It could be regarded as one reflection of the standing with which the concept of a wananga was held by government authorities at the time that when the 1988 Report of the Government Taskforce to Review Education (the ‘Picot Report) discussed tertiary education it relegated what its authors referred to as ‘Other Education’ to a secondary position. And it included here ‘some specifically Maori institutions, for which funding-if any-comes principally from the Department of Maori Affairs’, including Te Wananga o Ruakawa at Otaki, although it also pointed out that the funding for its three staff came from Vote: Education.

Writing in 1989 Graham and Linda Smith left no doubt as to how they felt about some of the limitations for Maori of existing tertiary structures, particularly the

1646 Ibid, p.8;
1647 Ibid, p.9;
universities. While they acknowledged that some efforts had been made to respond to Maori at the primary and secondary levels, they also argued that ‘the one sector which is struggling is tertiary’ and it was the sector which was ‘the most powerful, the most entrenched and the most ill-prepared for change far as Maori were concerned’. They suggested that Maori had a choice of going through the prolonged process of attempting to bring about change, which had taken years at the primary and secondary level ‘or move outside these structures and get on with what we want to do’, and acknowledged that under the new system of state tertiary education arising from the reforms it was probable that that could be achieved.\footnote{1649}

In fact Te Wananga o Raukawa had already been established earlier. In 1981 it had two full-time students and one degree, the Bachelor of Maori and Administration, BMA. As Pakake and Whatarangi Winiata point out this was at the time the only private institution in the country offering degrees.\footnote{1650}

However the Education Amendment Act 1989, under the heading ‘Establishment of Institutions’, gave the Minister the power to recommend a wananga as a new tertiary institution, and specified its requirements as follows:

\begin{quote}
A Wananga is characterised by teaching and research that maintains, advances and disseminates knowledge and develops intellectual independence and assists the application of knowledge regarding ahuatanga Maori (Maori tradition) according to tikanga Maori (Maori custom).\footnote{1651}
\end{quote}

By 1990 there were two officially recognised Wananga, the one at Otaki already referred to and Aotearoa Institute Wananga in Te Awamutu, followed soon after by Te Wananga o Awanuiarangi in Whakatane. According to Smith and Smith these wananga were ‘severely under-resourced when compared to other tertiary institutions’.\footnote{1652}

\begin{footnotes}
\footnotetext{1649} Linda and Graham Smith, ‘Kei hea tatou e ahuana? Which way education?’ \textit{Access}, 8, 2, 1898, p.78.
\footnotetext{1651} Education Amendment Act 1989 (s.162).
\footnotetext{1652} Smith and Smith, 1995, p.193.
\end{footnotes}

511
Writing in 1999, over a decade after their establishment, Professor Hirini Mead wrote that:

The Government has no wananga policy, nor has the Ministry of Education. But there are three wananga in existence today and though the three have been on the educational landscape for a few years now Government officials are still not sure what wananga stand for, what they do and how they fit into the nation’s education system.\textsuperscript{1653}

He went on to point out that wananga were also handicapped by ‘lack of capital funding’ which restricted normal adequate development for staff, students and the provision of adequate buildings’, and Iwi were required to provide the land and buildings.\textsuperscript{1654}

This was, of course, a continuation into the tertiary sector for Maori of the former policy for Native/Maori primary schools. But despite these difficulties the three wananga had within a comparatively short period of time introduced more than 2000 Maori funded students into tertiary education and several hundred unfunded students.\textsuperscript{1655}

10.8.2 Wananga and Other Education and Training Institutions: East Coast

Wananga on the East Coast include Te Whare Wananga o Ngati Porou, and a branch of Te Wananga o Aoteroa. But there are also other education and training institutions between Gisborne and Hick’s Bay, including Tairawhiti Polytechnic (Gisborne), Te Aroha Kanarahi Trust (Hick’s Bay), Turanga Ararau (Gisborne), Tautoko Work Trust (Tokomaru Bay), Matapuna Training Centre (Gisborne) Indigenous Training which has its home base in Masterton, Gisborne Development Incorporated.\textsuperscript{1656}

\textsuperscript{1654} Ibid, p.49;
\textsuperscript{1655} Ibid, p.43;
\textsuperscript{1656} Information supplied by the New Zealand Qualifications Authority, May, 2007.
10.8.3  Te Whare Wananga o Ngati Porou

The Wananga was registered as a private training establishment in 1992. The NZQA Quality Audit (QA) in 2006 pointed out that previously it had delivered a range of courses including farming, forestry, pottery, carpentry, music, nga mahi toi, Ngati Porou studies, te reo Maori and marine studies from five different locations. But over time the number of courses and locations had reduced in number and for the second year the Wananga was not offering any training. An agreement had been entered into with Tairawhiti Polytechnic and the Tertiary Education Commission to transfer all its courses to the Polytechnic ‘until such time as the Wananga resumes training’. The last audit of the Wananga had been in 2005, at which time it had met all the expected quality assurance requirements except two, these being those related to governance and management including ‘application of the quality management system and financial viability’.1657

The authors of the 2006 QA described its aim as being to ‘obtain reasonable assurance’ that the Wananga was ‘a sound and stable provider, has effective quality management systems in place, and is substantially achieving its goals and objectives as required by Quality Assurance Standard’ for an institution of its type. Research was not included in the audit because the Wananga does not offer degree courses.1658

The Audit described the Wananga as meeting all but one of the applicable requirements of QA Standard 1, that being the provision of information to students. It had not been possible for the Wananga to demonstrate requirements not met at previous audits, such as moderation, because no training had been delivered.1659

The Wananga was described as providing goals and objectives which supported its mission of providing education and training leading to higher education, and although the training had currently been transferred to the Polytechnic, it was described as wanting to ‘engage in joint venture agreements with other institutions to broaden the scope of training that can be offered when it resumes training’. While the Audit

1657  Quality Audit Summary on Te Whare Wananga o Ngati Porou, 21 November, 2006, p.2. DB.
1658  Ibid;
1659  Ibid, p.3;
identified a comprehensive quality management system (QSM) in place, it noted that past audits had described this as being applied inconsistently. But it acknowledged that with the Wananga not currently training, demonstrating improvement in the application of policies and procedures was difficult. The Wananga had contracted Te Runanga o Ngati Porou to govern and manage it, a development described as in keeping with the wider strategic plan for Ngati Porou. The Audit described financial statements as demonstrating that under the Runanga the Wananga was ‘using acceptable financial management practices and achieving acceptable financial performance’.1660

Policies were described as being in place for recruiting and contracting staff, appraising staff performance, providing staff with professional development, ensuring that there were adequate learning resources, tools and equipment for training, and for assessment and moderation of students. However with regard to moderation the Audit referred to a finding from the previous audit that should the Wananga resume training it needed to strengthen this aspect. That Audit had also identified a need for greater notification and reporting on learner achievement, but in the interim procedures had been developed that should ensure this happened.1661

10.9 Other Institutions

The main campus of the Tairawhiti Polytechnic is located in Gisborne with rural campuses (or courses) in other East Coast locations such as Ruatoria and Tokomaru Bay. The Polytechnic’s Draft Strategic Plan for 2007-2011 has been submitted to the Tertiary Education Commission and is available on-line.

In obtained the recent NZQA Quality Audits which were available on the Tautoko Work Trust, Turanga Ararau, the Matapuna Training Centre, and Gisborne Development Incorporated, and will include these in the Document Bank with this report in case they should be of interest to readers.

1660 Ibid;
1661 Ibid, p.4;
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BAAA 1001/1057a 44/6, General Correspondence and Inspection Files, Tikitiki, 1947-1958
BAAA 1001/1057b 44/6, General Correspondence and Inspection Files, Tikitiki, 1959-1963
BAAA 1001/1057c 44/6, General Correspondence and Inspection Files, Tikitiki, 1964-1969
BAAA 1001/32a 44/1/44, Attendance Returns, Tikitiki, 1926-1946
BAAA 1001/640c 44/1 Part 1, Buildings and Sites Files, Tikitiki, 1888-1898 (and subsequent files to 1937)
BAAA 1004/12h, Register Attendance Progress and Withdrawal, Tikitiki, 1887-1916
BAAA 1004/12i, Register Attendance Progress and Withdrawal, Tikitiki, 1916-1932
BAAA 1001/1060a 44/6, General Correspondence and Inspection Reports, Tokomaru Bay, 1926-1936
BAAA 1001/1060b 44/6, General Correspondence and Inspection Reports, Tokomaru Bay, 1937-1946
BAAA 1001/1061a 44/6, General Correspondence and Inspection Reports, Tokomaru Bay, 1947-1955
BAAA 1001/1061b 44/6, General Correspondence and Inspection Reports, Tokomaru Bay, 1955-1956
BAAA 1001/32d 44/1/44, Attendance Returns, Tokomaru Bay, 1926-1946
BAAA 1001/652a 44/4 Part 1, Buildings and Sites Files, Tokomaru Bay, 1878-1889 (and further files up to 1955)
BAAA 1001/1063b 44/6, General Correspondence and Inspection Reports, Tuparoa, 1888-1897
BAAA 1001/1063a 44/6, General Correspondence and Inspection Reports, Tuparoa, 1926-1939
BAAA 1001/1064a 44/6, General Correspondence and Inspection Reports, Tuparoa, 1940-1968
BAAA 1001/33c 44/1/44, Maori Schools – Attendance Returns, Tuparoa, 1926-1946
BAAA 1001/663b 44/4, Maori Schools Buildings and Sites Files, Tuparoa
BAAA 1001/664a 44/4, Maori Schools Buildings and Sites Files, Tuparoa, 1880-1897
BAAA 1001/664b 44/4, Maori Schools Buildings and Sites Files, Tuparoa, 1898-1899
BAAA 1001/665a 44/4, Maori Schools Buildings and Sites Files, Tuparoa, 1899-1897
BAAA 1001/665b 44/4, Maori Schools Buildings and Sites Files, Tuparoa, 1907-1913
BAAA 1001/665c 44/4, Maori Schools Buildings and Sites Files, Tuparoa, 1913-1924
BAAA 1004/13c, Register of Admission Progress and Withdrawal, Tuparoa, 1887-1898
BAAA 1004/13b, Register of Admission Progress and Withdrawal, Tuparoa, 1899-
BAAA 1001/1071b 44/6, General Correspondence and Inspection Reports, Waiomatatini, 1926-1947
BAAA 1001/1073a 44/6, General Correspondence and Inspection Reports, Waiomatatini, 1948-1968
BAAA 1001/695c 44/4 Part 2, Buildings and Sites Files, Waiomatatini, 1895-1900
BAAA 1001/686a 44/4 Part 3, Buildings and Sites Files, Waiomatatini, 1900-1909
BAAA 1001/696b 44/4 Part 4, Buildings and Sites Files, Waiomatatini, 1909-1918
BAAA 1001/697a 44/4 Part 5, Buildings and Sites Files, Waiomatatini, 1913-1925
BAAA 1001/697b 44/4 Part 6, Buildings and Sites Files, Waiomatatini, 1925-1938
BAAA 1001/35c 44/1/44, Attendance Returns, Waiomatatini, 1926-1946
YCAK 1365/1a, Register of Admissions Progress and Withdrawals, Waiomatatini, 1913-1936
YCAK 1365/1b, Register of Admissions Progress and Withdrawals, Waiomatatini, 1936-1951
YCAK 1366/1a, Maori School Log Book, Waiomatatini, 1936-1944
YCAK 1366/1b, Maori School Log Book, Waiomatatini, 1950-1958
YCAK 1366/1c, Maori School Log Book, Waiomatatini, 1959-1971
BAAA 1001/1075b 44/6, General Correspondence and Inspection Reports, Waipiro Bay, 1939-1963
BAAA 1001/1075c 44/6, General Correspondence and Inspection Reports, Waipiro Bay, 1964-1968
BAAA 1001/710c 44/1 Part 1, Building and Sites Files, Waipiro Bay, 1889-1947 (and further files up to 1968)
BAAA 1001/1077c 44/6, General Correspondence and Inspection Files, Whakaangiangi, 1936-1948
BAAA 1001/1078a 44/6, General Correspondence and Inspection Files, Whakaangiangi, 1948-1969
BAAA 1001/722d 44/4 Part 1, Buildings and Sites Files, Whakaangiangi, 1918-1948
BAAA 1001/912a 44/8, Conveyance and School Transport, Whakaangiangi, 1932-1940
BAAA 1001/913a 44/8, Conveyance and School Transport, Whakaangiangi, 1942-1947
BAAA 1003/9m, Maori School Log Book, Whakawhitira, 1942-1955
BAAA 1003/9n, Maori School Log Book, Whakawhitira, 1955-1964
BAAA 1001/1082b 44/6, General Correspondence and Inspection, Whakawhitira, 1926-1946
BAAA 1001/1082c 44/6, General Correspondence and Inspection, Whakawhitira, 1946-1963
BAAA 1001/1083a 44/6, General Correspondence and Inspection, Whakawhitira, 1964-1968
BAAA 1001/38d 44/1/44, Attendance Returns, Whakawhitira, 1926-1946
BAAA 1001/739d 44/4 Buildings and Sites Files, Whakawhitira, 1911-1925
BAAA 1001/740a 44/4 Part 2, Buildings and Sites Files, Whakawhitira, 1925-1939
BAAA 1004/14d, Register Admission Progress and Withdrawals, Whakawhitira, 1923-1955
BACW 1268/1a, Whangara Maori School, Headteacher’s Outwards Letter Book, 1954-1956
BACW 1268/1b, Whangara Maori School, Headteacher’s Outwards Letter Book, 1957-1958
BACW 1268/1c, Whangara Maori School, Headteacher’s Outwards Letter Book, 1958-1959
BACW 1268/1d, Whangara Maori School, Headteacher’s Outwards Letter Book, 1960-1961
BACW 1268/1e, Whangara Maori School, Headteacher’s Outwards Letter Book, 1961-1962
BAAA 1001/747b 44/4 Part 1, Buildings and Site Files, Whangara, 1886-1890
BAAA 1001/747c Part 2, Buildings and Site Files, Whangara, 1905-1915
BAAA 1001/748a Part 3, Buildings and Site Files, Whangara, 1915-1933
BAAA 1001/748b Part 4, Buildings and Site Files, Whangara, 1934-1943
BAAA 1001/749b Part 5, Buildings and Site Files, Whangara, 1944-1957
BAAA 1001/749c Part 6, Buildings and Site Files, Whangara, 1948-1969
BAAA 1001/850c, Equipment and Supplies, Whangara, 1935-1958
BAAA 1001/1087b, 44/6, General Correspondence and Inspection Reports, Whangara, 1948-1963
BACW 1267/1a, Register of Progress and Achievement, Primer 1, 2, 3, and 4, Standard 1, Whangara, 1955-1956
BACW 1264/1a, Register of Attendance, Primer 1, 2, 3 and 4, Standard 1, Whangara
BACW 1270/1a, School Committee Minute Book, Whangara, 1961-
BACW 1266/1c, Log Book, Whangara, 1963-1972
BACW 1266/1a, Log Book, Whangara, 1942-1960
BACW 1266/1b, Log Book, Whangara, 1960-1962
BAAA 1001/1092a 44/6, General Correspondence and Inspection Reports, Whareponga, 1946-1962
BAAA 1001/40d 44/1/44, Attendance Returns, Whareponga 1926-1946
BAAA 1001/763a 44/4 Part 1, Buildings and Sites Files, Whareponga (up to 1972)
BAAA 1001/921d 44/8, Conveyance and Board, School Transport, Whareponga, 1923-1954
BAAA 1001/921e 44/8, Conveyance and Board, School Transport, Whareponga, 1940-1960
BAAA 1004/14j, Register of Admission Progress and Withdrawal, Whareponga, 1901-1935
Archives New Zealand Wellington (ANZ-W)

(a) The following records relating to East Coast Schools are located in Archives New Zealand Wellington. They include the records of schools which at one time were under the control of either the Department of Education or were administered by the Hawke’s Bay Education Board:

AAMX W3170/8 6/6/72, Reserves, Tolaga Bay School Site, 1887-1961
AAQD W3368/1, School Buildings and Sites: Tokomaru School 1893-1957
AAZY W3901/95, School Inspection: Rerekohu Area School, 1978-1987
ABDJ W3568/12g, Inspector’s and Examination Reports, Kanakanaia 1911-1939
ABDJ W3568/21a, Inspector’s and Examination Reports, Managatuna 1931-1933
ABDJ W3568/33f, Inspector’s and Examination Reports, Potaka, 1935-1938
ABDJ W3568/40a, Inspector’s and Examination Reports, Teesdale, 1921-1926
ABDJ W3568/45b Part 1, Inspector’s and Examination Reports, Annual Returns, Tolaga Bay, 1888-1902
ABDJ W3568/45c Part 2, Inspector’s and Examination Reports, Annual Returns, Tolaga Bay, 1903-1919
ABDJ W3568/45d Part 3, Inspector’s and Examination Reports, Annual Returns, Tolaga Bay, 1920-1956
ABDJ W3568/46e Part 1, Inspector’s and Examination Reports, Tokomaru Bay, 1898-1915
ABDJ W3568/46f Part 2, Inspector’s and Examination Reports, Tokomaru Bay, 1916-
ABDJ W3568/48e, Inspector’s and Examination Reports, Managatuna 1913
ABDJ W3568/52b Part 1, Inspector’s and Examination Reports, Annual Returns, Waipiro Bay, 1892-1912
ABDJ W3568/52c, Inspector’s and Examination Reports, Annual Returns, Waipiro Bay, 1913-1939
ABDJ W3568/55b, Inspector’s and Examination Reports, Annual Returns, Whakaangiangi, 1919-1935
ABDJ W3568/57g, Inspector’s and Examination Reports, Annual Returns, Gisborne High, Whangara Native School, Gisborne Evening Technical Classes, 1915-1935
ABDJ W3568/100 4/39, Evening Classes, Te Karaka District High School (until 1962; Waikohu College from 1963), 1969-1976
ABDJ W3568/142, Miscellaneous File Hiruharama, 1969-1988
ABDJ W3568/161, Miscellaneous File, Tokomaru Bay, 1985-1989
ABDJ W3568/163, Miscellaneous File, Waikohu College, 1984-1987
ABDJ W3568/165 Miscellaneous File, Whakaangiangi, 1969-1989
ABDJ W3568/165, Miscellaneous File Whangara, 1969-1989
ABDJ W3568/173, Special Grant, Tokomaru Bay District High School, 1958-1969
ABDJ W3568/226 55, Waiomatatini Native School Minute Book, 1946-1977
ABDJ W3672/F272, Closed Schools and Sites, Whakawhitira, 1936-1960
ABDV W3571/882, School Records, Potaka Road School, 1895-1922
ABDV W3571/883, School Records, Potaka Road School, 1948-1949
ABFI W3556/92, Report on Primary Schools, Tokomaru, n.d.
ABFI W3556/95, School Files Gisborne: E12/1, Reports on Potaka, n.d.
ABFI W3556/95, School Files Gisborne: E 12/1 Reports on Hiruharama, n.d.
ABFI W3556/95, School Files Gisborne: Mangatuna, n.d.
ABFI W3556/95, School Files Gisborne: E 12/1, Reports on Tikitiki, n.d.
ABFI W3556/95, School Files Gisborne: E 12/1, Reports on Waipiro Bay (2), n.d.
ABFI W3556/95 School Files Gisborne: E 12/1, Reports on Whakaangi, n.d.
ABFI W3608/101 33/5/CRO Part 2, Tikitiki Maori District High School, Maori Schools Transport 1948-1980
E 2/1927/1b 15/4/108, High Schools, District High Schools Establishment, Tolaga Bay High School, 1920-1927
E 2/1927/1c 15/4/107, Establishment of District High Schools, Te Karaka, 1921-1927
E 2/1927/5b 33/4/228 Part 1, Te Araroa Buildings and Sites, 1925-1927
E 2/1929/4f 43/2/44, Tikitiki Junior High School Establishment, 1929
E 2/1930/6a 14/5/36, Buckley, Tolaga Bay, Registration and Inspection 1922-1930
E 2/1933/9h 33/4/252 Part 1, Buildings and Sites, Mangatuna 1909-1933
School, 1937-1946
E 2/1949/48c 7/5, Buildings and Sites Waerenga a Hika, 1903-1949

(b) The following general policy files relating to Maori education are also located in
Archives New Zealand Wellington:
MA acc W2459 19/1/1531, Part 2 Box 186 a. Arts and Crafts Preservation and
Teaching, 1962-70,
E2 1956/4b. Brief Review of Maori Education by E.W.Parsonage, Maori Education
System 1949-56,

E2 1956/4b, 29/2/27 Maori Education. Bulletin for Maori Schools
EW 2536. Circulars to Native school Teachers
MA acc W2490, 57/1/3 Part 1 Box 279. Committee on Maori Education,
MA 28 7/13.Cultural Matters –Arts and Crafts General,
E 29/1/0Economies in Expenditure 1930-32,
E2 1956/4b. Education of Maori Pupils in Board Schools by E. W. Parsonage, Maori
Education 1946-56,
MA 1 57/1 vol.1. Education Policy and General 1945-50,
MA 17/1. Employment of Maoris, 19 September 1945,
E 37/24/27. Inspection reports on Te Aute,
E2 1956/4b Maori Education System 1949-56. Language Teaching in Maori Schools
MA acc W2459 19/1/605, Part 1 Box 192, and Maori Maori Language Committee,
AAMK 869, 16/2 625c Language Committee 1975-80,
MA 1 21/4 Vol.2. Maori Schools General 1949-54,
E2 1948/44d. Maori Schools Inspection Reports,
AAZY W3901, 44/1/2 Box 218. Native Schools 1919-39.
E3 Acc1940/1A. Native Schools Private-Te Aute 1927-1940,

E3 Acc 1939, 1A. Queen Victoria School for Girls 1915-1939,
Refresher Course for Native School Teachers, E2 1949/9b.

E2 1956/4b 29/2/27 Report of the Officer for Maori Education to the Committee on Maori Education 1963,

E29/1/9. Strong Papers
E. 14/5/17. Te Aute College Trust Board,
E 29/1/9. Treasury Department to Minister of Education,

I.A. (C.S.). Correspondence of the Colonial Secretary.

G7, G8. Despatches from the Lieutenant-Governor of New Munster,
G32, Despatches to the Lieutenant-Governor of New Ulster,
G36, Miscellaneous Outwards Correspondence,
(NZC) New Zealand Company Records
G25. Ordinary Despatches to the Secretary of State,
G1. Ordinary Despatches from the Secretary of State,

**Alexander Turnbull Library Wellington (ATL)**

MS-Papers-0032-0040 Native Minister Native Schools, McLean Donald, Micro-Ms-Coll-0535-082, Folders 86, 327, 486, 510, 524. McLean Donald, Papers,
MS 0032-0932 R.D. McLean-Correspondence re Makarini Scholarships.
qMS-2177 Wesleyan Missionary Society Grey Institution
MS-0213 Williams, Samuel .
MS-0151-19-21, Quotations and copies re Native Schools, McDonnell, Alexander Francis.
MS -0333, Brown W.F., Journal of W.F. Brown,
qMS-1586. Ngata Correspondence 1933-1950.
MS 2374 Henderson Hubert Collection,
MS 755. Ramsden Eric, Ramsden papers
**Published Primary Sources**

Appendices to the Journals of the House of Representatives (AJHR): These contain the Annual Reports of the Ministers and senior officials of the Native Affairs and Education Departments, the Hawke’s Bay and other education boards, reports of officers in Native Districts and inspectors of Native/Maori schools.

Acts of the New Zealand Parliament

New Zealand Parliamentary Debates (NZPD)

New Zealand Statutes

Regulations relating to Native Schools

**Secondary Sources**


Butcher A.G. *Education in New Zealand. An historical survey of educational progress amongst Europeans and Maoris since 1878*, Dunedin, 1930.


Lyons C. To Wash an Aethiop White, New York, 1975.

Mason H. *New Zealand Education Today*, Wellington, 1940.


------------------------------- *He taonga tuku iho: Ngati Porou stories from the East Cape* Auckland, Reed, 2001.


McKenzie David, ‘More than a Show of Justice?’: The Enrolment of Maoris in European Schools Prior to 1900, *NZJES*, 17, 1, 1982, pp. 1-10.

McQueen H. C., *Vocations for Maori Youth*, Wellington, 1945.


Ngata A.T. ‘The Employment of Maoris after Leaving School’, In Sutherland, 1940.
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Pope James, *Te Ora mo te Maori (Health for the Maori)*, Wellington, 1884.
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Strong T. B., ‘The Education of South Sea Natives’ in Jackson, 1931, pp. 188-94.


Tokomaru Bay School Committee, *History of the East Coast Native Schools*, 1924.


Waitangi Tribunal, *Report of the Waitangi Tribunal on the Te Reo Maori Claim*,
Waitangi Tribunal, 2006.


Williams, F. Through Ninety Years, Wellington, 1937.


Woods Sybil, Samuel Williams of Te Aute, Christchurch, Pegasus press, 1981


**Unpublished Theses and Research Essays.**


Goodfellow, K., ‘Health for the Maori?’: Health and the Maori Schools 1890-1940’,
Research essay, Auckland University, 1991.


Raureti, R., ‘Matatana Native School 1872-1969’, M.Ed. thesis, Waikato University,


Research Reports
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Report of the Maori Congress, Wellington, 1908. MS 0189-173aNA.


**Newspapers, Newsletters, and Bulletins.**

*Auckland Star*

*Bulletin for Maori Schools*

*New Zealand Maori Council Newsletter*

*The Daily Telegraph*

*The Dominion*

*The Hawke’s Bay Herald*

*The Hawke’s Bay Herald Tribune*

*The Waikato Times*

*Te Waka Maori*

*Te Wananga*