Research Paper   Open Access

Cultural continuity, Indigenous identity, language and education matters: A case study of Japan and Aotearoa

Diana Amundsen
[1](*Education Policy & Leadership, Faculty of Education/ University of Waikato, New Zealand*)

ABSTRACT: A history of public policies in Japan and Aotearoa New Zealand reveals similar effects on cultural continuity, Indigenous identity, language and education matters for both Indigenous Ainu and Māori. In both cases, such policies battered the identity and pride of their Indigenous people, took away their homelands, endangered the survival of their languages,instigating significant grief over many generations. For decades, both the Japanese and the New Zealand mainstream public remained largely unaware of the debilitating effect of public policies on Indigenous language, cultural values and traditional ways of living. This article describes the introduction of public policies which impacted heavily on education pathways and language survival for Ainu and Māori, in each case resulting in cultural continuity crunch points. Consequences of these policies are evaluated; this research advocates for more non-Indigenous researchers to embrace education research which encourages social justice, reconciliation and restoration of Indigenous well-being and cultural rights.
KEYWORDS: *Ainu, cultural continuity, education, Indigenous policy, Māori*
If not us, who? If not now, when? (Levi, 1982).

I.   INTRODUCTION

I begin this article with immediate acknowledgement that I am a non-Indigenous researcher who attempts first to understand, and then to act in recognition of Indigenous rights in education policy with hope, determination and efforts of conscientization[1]**Error! Reference source not found.**.Kureheanakne Diana Amundsen ne . Irankarapte, Irairaykere.KoMauaotōkumaunga，ko Wairoa tōkuawa，ko Tauranga tōkumoana，koNgātiPākehārauakoNgāti Aotearoa ōku iwi，ko Mason tōkuhapū，koTeWhareWānanga o Waikato tōkukura，ko Diana Amundsen tōkuingoa . (My name is Diana Amundsen, nice to meet you. My mountain is Mauao, my river is Wairoa, my ocean is Tauranga, I am a European New Zealander from the Mason tribe, and my place of learning/teaching is the University of Waikato).

Indigenous people are working hard to develop their own political, economic, social, linguistic, educational and cultural establishments to end discrimination and oppression wherever they occur. Two such Indigenous cultures are the Ainu in Japan and Māori in Aotearoa New Zealand. The need for research which supports social justice and promotes the restoration of wellbeing of Indigenous people is evident [2]. I share this research from the position of an outsider [4]; a non-Ainu, non-Māori and non-Indigenous scholar who identifies the pressing importance of supporting Indigenous rights in education and language policy, specifically for both Ainu and Māori. I am a white-skinned, third generation New Zealand Pākehā of Scottish and Irish descent; a female university Teaching Fellow and doctoral researcher whose first language is English. I have lived and worked in Japan over a six year period; I speak and understand Japanese language and early-intermediate level Te Reo Māori. Information in English about Ainu is limited; this research may be valuable for English-speakers who do not read Ainu, Japanese or Māori language, but are concerned about the education, language and cultural revitalizationendeavors of either or both Ainu and Māori cultures.

Okada [3]found that a major 21st century issue is the preservation of Indigenous cultures and recognition of rights for Indigenous people. Similar to many Indigenous peoples, both Ainu and Māori share common accounts of historic injustices as a result of colonization and dispossession of resources and lands. Comparisons of public policies that have impacted education and language pathways for both Indigenous Ainu and Māori people reveal both similarities and differences. For example, in 2007, the United Nation's Declaration of the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (UNDRIP) Resolution was adopted by the General Assembly 61/295 [5]. At that time, Japan voted in favor of the resolution, then hurriedly formally recognized Ainu's existence a few months later in 2008 [3][6]. By contrast, New Zealand voted against adopting the UNDRIP resolution, yet recognized Māori as Indigenous to New Zealand in 1840 by using the term *tangatawhenua* (people of the land) when The Treaty of Waitangi was signed [7]. Despite similarities and differences between the cases of Japan and Aotearoa, presently the language of both Ainu and Maori cultures remains in jeopardy.

Two main purposes of this article are to: 1) advocate for Ainu and Māori families and communities' rights to share in and determine policies regarding language preservation and education of their own people, and; 2) propose that a responsibility lies with non-Indigenous researchers to join Indigenous researchers' efforts and embrace social and economic justice, restoration of well-being, cultural and language rights to ensure Indigenous cultural continuity.

II.   INSIDER/OUTSIDER DYNAMICS IN INDIGENOUS RESEARCH SPACES

Researchers have noted that within any cross-cultural research, there is always some degree of insider/outsider positionality [4][8][9][10]. As an 'outsider', I cannot truly comprehend the position of Ainu or Māori—I must interpret what is known and felt by insiders and outsiders and draw upon their insights. By using a method of combining insiders' perspectives and knowledge evidenced from the literature and a personal awareness grown through experiences living and working in both Japan and Aotearoa, I endeavor to express insights which provide as much of a representation of 'reality' as is possible for an outsider. Seeking ethical research practices for Indigenous groups and contexts and developing Indigenous research paradigms and processes which empower their institutions and communities are paramount [11][12][13].

Some Indigenous researchers[14][15][16]are open to providing space for non-Indigenous researcherswho acknowledge alternative conceptions of the world, and whose honest aspiration is to support the cause of Indigenous people through sensitive research approaches. Researchers [17]note that, "…all inquiry is both political and moral" (p.2) encouraging use of Indigenous methods critically for explicit social justice purposes. As Freire [1]stated, "the pursuit of full humanity, however, cannot be carried out in isolation or individualism, but only in fellowship and solidarity; therefore it cannot unfold in the antagonistic relations between the oppressors and oppressed" (p.85). This article calls for non-Indigenous researchers to respectfully and sensitively join Indigenous researchers' efforts and embrace social justice, restoration of well-being, cultural and language rights to ensure Indigenous cultural continuity.

Shimazaki (2010, in Okada, 2012[3]) of the Hokkaido Ainu Association discusses obstacles to Ainu research embracing research assistance from diverse and outsider avenues (so long as Ainu Indigeneity is respected). He states, "…the difficulty of combining people's voices and social needs is because currently there are no mechanisms to collect data" (p.13). These are significant areas where research, which values and respects the Indigenous standpoint, can provide evidence promoting social justice to restore the wellbeing of Ainu people [14]. Māori academic Mahuika[15] also believes in the importance of respectful collaboration between Indigenous and non-Indigenous, suggesting that in a New Zealand context, transformation and revitalization in a living sense of Māori language, culture, history and identity must be realized in a sensitive partnership.

III.   METHODOLOGY

Methodologies are the way we purposefully seek knowledge and are the paradigms that inform our worldviews [18]. Indigenous methodologies are fluid, dynamic approaches to research processes, emphasizing circular, cyclical perspectives with alternative ways of thinking about research practices[19]. Based on a methodology, appropriate methods were selected to understand and explain social phenomena that represent 'reality'.Smith, Maxwell, Puke and Temara[18]discuss the emergence of an academic discourse which they term 'IK mātauranga' based on combinations of 'Indigenous knowledge internationally' and 'mātauranga Māori'. IK mātauranga questions concepts of knowledge creation, the work of meaning making, and ways of knowing and being. It closely considers the role of 'research methodologies' in the context of an alternative knowledge space to traditional academic disciplines and speaks to the 'mayhem at play' around academic work.

Indigenous researchers have demonstrated that research practices among Indigenous communities must address the prevailing ideologies of cultural superiority within social, economic and political institutions, and begin with the intention to provide benefits to the researched [14][15][16][20][21]. This raises questions for an outsider non-Indigenous researcher about which research provides benefits, and which does not, who benefits, and how to engage with Indigenous methodologies. Drawing on a culturally responsive methodological approach, I used Bishop and Glynn's [21]IBRLA framework to guide data collection and analysis, as noted here:

I   Initiation: Whose concerns, interests and methods of approach determine/define the outcomes of the research? This research arose when the need for promoting Indigenous rights in education policy for both Ainu and Māori was identified during conversations between the researcher (currently involved in a research project with Māori participants in an Aotearoa tertiary education context) and Māori tertiary education students enrolled at a wānanga. Interest in Ainu rights stems back to the researcher's personal and professional experience living and working in an educational arena in Japan in the 1990s, alongside two Ainu nationals.

B   Benefits: Who will directly benefit from the research? Despite it being the goal of this research, it is difficult to determine in such a short time span, what difference this research will make for either Ainu or Māori, and what meaningful benefits may result. However, it is hoped that, in the long term at least, this research supports both Ainu and Māori culture and language and education policy aspirations through the

contribution of the research findings. "We need more discussion on Indigenous issues and to create a future vision on cultural promotion, multicultural education…we need to accumulate interdisciplinary research results and to encourage researchers of Ainu, Japanese, or other ethnicities to use such approaches and study such issues" (p.102, [19]).

R   Representation: Whose research constitutes an adequate representation of one's social reality? At the level of policy making in both Japan and Aotearoa, Indigenous voice has often been marginalized, or grouped in with other minorities as one voice. This research, though primarily conducted by a non-Indigenous researcher, actively recognizes the struggle by two unique Indigenous peoples to gain access to better representation at policy making level.

L   Legitimation: What authority do we claim for our texts? The researcher is not a poet, artist, singer or musician or film-maker who can use those mediums as a means for expressing Indigenous histories and spirit, an important form of representation for establishing Indigenous voice today. However it is hoped that instead, outside awareness can be raised through the process of academic research and writing, albeit in a westernized context.

A   Accountability: Whom are researchers answerable to? Who has control over the initiation procedures, evaluations, construction, and distribution of newly defined knowledge? This research must be subject to academic scrutiny if it is to contribute to advocacy efforts for Indigenous families and communities' rights to share in and determine education policies. The researcher acknowledges a deep responsibility to Ainu and Māori families and communities, herself and her university, and as such, the outsider position of the researcher as well as the methods of research are openly and clearly stated.

IV.   METHODS

The objective of this research was to identify and evaluate the significance ofpublic policies which impacted heavily on education pathways and language survival for Ainu and Māori.From the outset, the goal of the research projectwas advocacy for more non-Indigenous researchers to embrace education research matters encouraging social justice, reconciliation and restoration of Indigenous well-being and cultural rights.

A literature review of publications (n=71) was carried outalongside analysing notes, discussions and e-mail question-and-answer conversations with the author and key Māori, Ainu, Japanese and Hawaiian experts.First, ProQuest Central, EBSCOhost and Google Scholar database searches were conducted iteratively during May to October 2017 to retrieve and read articles related to either Indigenous Ainu or Māori, as well as literature related to education policies within both New Zealand and Japan. The assistance of two subject librarians was sought to identify and locate relevant information sources, as well as to design effective search strategies. Search terms included, but were not limited to, "Japan OR Japanese", "education OR educational" "Ainu", "policy OR policies" Ainu education", "Māori education", "UNDRIP", "Japanese indigenous educational/language policies", "Aotearoa/New Zealand educational/language policies". During searches related to Ainu literature, no specific key words were required as an inclusion criteria; a lower number of publications exist on the topic, so a "bottom-up" search strategy was necessary. Articles were retrieved from diverse areas: educational research, social work and health research, Indigenous research, legal, anthropological and geographical research, government documents, media articles and association websites. In order to discover further articles, reference lists of each article were reviewed in detail. Some adaptations to search terms broadened to include terms such as "Ainu language preservation" or "Māori identity".

The researcher read each article in full text (n = 71), evaluated the relevance of retrieved articles, and recorded the main findings of each study. Articles were marked as either "RC" or "RO" based on whether or not it was "Relevant for the Current" or "Relevant for Other" research issues. Articles that were included gave information about Ainu and Māori by referring to education, government and language policy either currently or historically. A total of 59 RC articles and 12 RO articles were reviewed. A few (n=4) articles were in question over their relevance; this was resolved by an additional reviewer. In addition, to address the goal of identifying the significance of Indigenous rights in education in both Ainu and Māori areas, books were used for background information, and summaries of the relevant information were written. Main issues regarding public policies identified in each publication were recorded. During this process, seven key themes began to emerge, listed here alphabetically: colonization, discrimination, decolonization, educational innovation, language loss, reconciliation, self-determination.

During the literature review and data coding process, the researcher became aware of a leading Māori-Ainu relations expert and sought to meet him in person, in Aotearoa. This person, although ina notable public role having a high profile and extremely busy job, agreed to meet with the researcher providing further background and insights. Furthermore, introductions were given to Ainu education specialists in Japan. Similarly, an Ainu-focused researcher located in Hawai'i, and one Ainu-Māori relations expert located in Japan also featured prominently in the literature. The researcher visited and met with two key experts in Hawai'i in person and contacted the person in Japan by e-mail to ask them questions related to this research topic. Adopting a Māori language term, these people are referred to as a *Kaikōrero* (one who speaks). In reviewing the literature,

it became clear that the major stories being told were conceptually similar to those revealed during discussions with the Kaikōrero, though communicated a bit differently. Subsequently, seven themes were consolidated into two main areas: a) impacts of public policy for Ainu; b) impacts of public policy for Māori.

This paper is written by a non-Indigenous scholar who respects and cares deeply for the plight of Indigenous rights yet struggles to find the 'right' way to articulate this viewpoint. I endeavor to work respectfully in this space and avoid perpetuating the hegemony of my colonizer heritage. Sensitivity is required. With the knowledge that my ancestors may be looking on, and that my children's children might ask, "what did you do in your time to ensure Indigenous people's flourishment?" [18], I press on, *kiatūpato,* (cautiously mindful) of Primo Levi's (1982) question, *if not us, who? If not now, when?*

V.   FINDINGS

A.   Impacts of public policy for Ainu

The present director of the Hokkaido Ainu and Indigenous Research Centre has documented much about law and policies for Ainu [23][24][25][26][27]. Ainu literally means 'human' and Ainu Mosir refers to 'Land of the Ainu' [28][29][30][31][32][33]. The land referred to as Ainu Mosir includes areas of what is now known as Hokkaido (the northern island of Japan), the Kuril Islands and southern Sakhalin. Ainu language and culture have roots in these areas as far back as the Satsumon period during the 12th century [28][30][32]. Ainu society was not united as one whole nation, rather, over the centuries, people gradually clustered into numerous groups under various leaders in different regions [3]. Despite this, the Japanese government has traditionally viewed Ainu as one foreign ethnic group predominantly located in Hokkaido [34]. Even today, the government's term 'Dogai Ainu' refers to any Ainu who live outside Hokkaido [35].

In the 1800s, Russia and Japan battled for control over land, trapping Ainu groups in the midst of this struggle [3]. By 1854, without Ainu consent, the Japanese and Russian governments negotiated the Treaty of Shimoda[3][28]. Under this treaty, boundaries were marked, with 18 of the Kurile Islands north of Uruppu belonging to Japan and, Sakhalin Island nominated as a shared living area where both Russian and Japanese nationals could live [29]. At this point, the Japanese government declared Ainu as Japanese. Later, in 1868 at the start of the Meiji government, many Ainu were 'rounded up' by the Japanese government and forced to abandon traditional hunting, fishing and gathering ways of land use to assimilate into Japanese culture and 'settle' in Hokkaido as farmers [32].

By 1869, without permission or agreement from any Ainu, the Japanese government re-named the island of Ezo to *Hokkaido*, meaning 'northern sea pathway', establishing a Colonization Commission [28][29]. Ainu became stigmatized through being labelled as *Kyu-Dojin* (Former Aborigine, or 'commoner') which had the effect of devaluing and relegating them to a lower and almost invisible status immediately and for years beyond [3]. Subsequently, in 1899, the *Hokkaido Kyu-Dojin Ho* (Hokkaido Former Aborigines Protection Act) was legislated to 'protect' Ainu. The Colonization Commission had authority to choose which laws should apply to Hokkaido and thus considered the 1899 legislation as a special law for Ainu[28]. The only existing law for Ainu today, the Culture Promotion Act (CPA), can be traced back to this[33].

Japanese used the *Hokkaido Kyu-Dojin Ho* to mandate teaching in the Japanese language, ensuring the education curriculum cooperated with the central Japanese government's assimilation aims. During the Meiji period, school books endorsed by the Japanese government described Ainu as a nearly extinct indigenous people and perpetuated stories with dualistic ideologies of Japanese superiority and Ainu inferiority [3]. Such beliefs influenced administration of Ainu schooling from the late-1800s and into the 1900s. Some Ainu children were even taken away from their families and shipped off to Tokyo [3]. Ainu children born after about 1890 grew up more fluent in Japanese than in Ainu.

The 1899 Hokkaido Kyu-Dojin Ho resulted in disastrous discrimination [28][36][37]banning Ainu language, education of spiritual beliefs, cultural practices such as women's wrist, ankle and mouth tattoos and men's ear piercing and long hair and suspending Ainu's fundamental rights to vote. In short, this law was the basis for discriminatory practices, including segregation of Ainu children at school, enforcing Ainu to 'become' Japanese [36]and depriving Ainu of their traditions, culture, land, language and identity[3][38].

B.   Recasting Ainu as Indigenous

Around the late 1960s, a new wave of young Ainu activists began rejecting the rhetoric of assimilation and redefining themselves as Indigenous people (Senju-minzoku) with separate rights [39][40]. Emphasis was on cultural rights, beginning with the right to recognition as a self-defining population with a distinct cultural identity. In 1972, in an attempt to improve conditions for Ainu, the Hokkaido Prefectural government began conducting eleven-yearly socioeconomic status surveys with the Ainu [26][41]. This led to the creation in 1974 of the Hokkaido Utari Welfare Measures which comprised protections regarding life and employment, scholarships, housing and financial support [26]. However, these only applied to the approximately 24,000 Ainu living in Hokkaido [6] and ignored those estimated 5,000 to 10,000 [42]Dogai Ainu living outside of Hokkaido.

Bodgdanowizc[30]cautions that Ainu population counts must be carefully considered due to intermarriage, adoption and social prejudice, thus it is difficult to ascertain exact population statistics.

Ainu academic Hasegawa [36] is a former director of the Ainu Association of Hokkaido (AAH), an association founded in the 1980s to lobby for a new legislation to replace the 1899 Act [43]. AAH is currently the biggest organization of Ainu [28]. Almost a century after passing the 1899 Hokkaido Kyu-Dojin Ho, the law was repealed and replaced in 1997. Instead, the Law for the Promotion of the Ainu Culture and Dissemination and Advocacy for the Traditions of the Ainu and the Ainu Culture, abbreviated to the Culture Promotion Act [CPA] (Ainu Bunka Shinko Ho) was sanctioned in 1997 through the efforts of Ainu politician ShigeroKayano[43]. Unfortunately, this law stopped short of recognizing that Ainu are Indigenous people. Although the government insisted on the constitutional protection of the rights of individuals, they remained (and still remain) opposed to the idea of collective, especially Indigenous, rights [40]. In this sense, though the state may 'protect' Ainu culture, Ainu people as a unique ethnic group (let alone as Indigenous people) are not supported or recognized by the government to enjoy full citizen rights [40].

From the outset, Ainu were dissatisfied with the CPA. Ainu politician Kayano himself was critical of the specifics of the Act, but noted that he heard several politicians implying the Act would be withdrawn altogether if the draft was not acknowledged by Ainu. Therefore, he decided to accept the law as a first step, leaving issues of Indigeneity for a supplementary resolution [44]. Ainu have basically been excluded from present Ainu policymaking[33]. This was certainly the case when the Japanese government pulled together a panel of experts in 2008 to consider policies related to Ainu, but only involved one Ainu member [42]. The panel released a report in 2009 after ten meetings showing that Ainu educational achievement rates were lower than the Japanese average, despite higher proportions of 'livelihood protections' [42]. Further, the report acknowledged the need for more research about Ainu living in other parts of Japan, culminating in a 2011 Survey on the Living Conditions of Ainu outside Hokkaido.

The original panel was replaced by an Ainu Policy Promotion Panel, this time including five Ainu members, mostly from the AAH (Ainu Association of Hokkaido, 2008) to conduct the survey. Despite difficulties identifying and reaching Ainu, findings were disturbing, not least the number of Ainu who feared telling their spouses, friends, neighbors and even children that they were Ainu for fear of discrimination [42]. The definition of Indigeneity imposed by colonizers in western countries is increasingly being confronted, thus self-identification is seen as crucial to the recognition of the reality and diversity of Indigenous identity[35]. Countries such as Aotearoa, USA and Canada are using self-identification for statistical collection, however, in the case of Ainu, it may be important for policy makers to implement new Indigenous policies without necessarily waiting for comprehensive data. "It must be noted that just because there is a tendency for under-reporting, this does not mean that ethnic policies, welfare measures, and social services are unnecessary" (Nakamura, 2015, p.671[35]). Broader challenges must be addressed for well-being information to be collected from Indigenous peoples in a culturally responsive way[45].

In the Japanese context, the tendency to under-report reflects a social environment in which the majority of the Japanese population remain largely unaware of the existence of Dogai Ainu [46][47]. Researchers have noted that reasons for this range from: a lack of education; widespread belief that Japan is ethnically homogeneous; minor differences in facial appearance between Japanese and Ainu; small Ainu population; highly Japanized lifestyle of Ainu; contemporary Ainu have Japanese names and can hide their ethnicity if they do not 'come out' [35][47].

In sum, impacts of public policy for Ainu from the 1800s to today have battered the identity and pride of Indigenous Ainu. Today, the Ainu language is rated 'critically endangered' by the UNESCO classification system meaning that the youngest speakers are grandparents and older, and they speak the language partially and infrequently [48]. The introduction of public policies, which impacted heavily on education pathways for Ainu has consequently resulted in a language and cultural continuity crunch point. The time is long overdue for a new law in Japan which recognizes the Indigenous Ainu and facilitates social justice and self-determination for Ainu people.

C.   Impacts of public policy for Māori

In the case of Aotearoa, steps are being taken towards social justice for Māori; attempts of language restoration and reconciliation to address well-being issues which remain from a legacy of colonization are seen in some government policies. It is useful to first recognize the historical context to better understand the present social times. However, the way histories and Māori migration have been conceptualized and produced in Aotearoa/New Zealand can depend on one's worldview and cultural standpoint. As a non-Indigenous, non-Māori researcher, I re-state here that I can only write about Māori concepts and values as an outsider. I take responsibility as a partner to *TeTiriti o Waitangi* for learning about and working towards understanding of Māori ways of 'knowing, being and doing' and draw attention here to both Māori and non-Māori ways of knowing where Māori came from.

European authors such as Edward Shortland and William Colenso in 1869, later followed by dubious assumptions from Percy Smith and then contradicted by 'traditionalist' propositions from Elsdon Best in the early 1900s, wrote about the arrival of Māori in Aotearoa. Dixon, Skinner and TeRangiHiroa played a significant part in the search to answer the 'Polynesian question' of where Māori originated[49]. Anderson[50]claims that a widely accepted European viewpoint was that because of troubles in home islands, Polynesians set out on long migration sea voyages using astral navigation with reasonable accuracy over long distances. Sea voyaging led to Polynesian discovery of Aotearoa and Māori settlement approximately 800 years ago. Research led towards validating a scholarly view in New Zealand that perhaps 'Māori stories' have some ultimate facts behind them [50].

However, in the first major work about Māori and their historical development published in a westernized format of a book, highly respected Māori author Sir Ranginui Walker [51]challenged widely-held assumptions about historical events, presenting the evolution of a Māori culture distinct from its Polynesian origins. Furthermore, in accordance with the customs of the NgātiPorou people, Mahuika[52]offers another perspective on the origins of Māori, writing: "We, as People of this Land have been here since the beginning of time, or more aptly in the context of Aotearoa, since Maui fished up TeIka-a-Maui (North Island)" (p.133). Like Ainu, it appears that Māori did not see themselves as 'one whole nation' prior to European arrival. Rangihau[53]stated there is no such thing as Māori (a concept invented by Pākehā), there are only iwi (in his case, NgāiTūhoe iwi). Unique regional variations of the Māori language developed from Eastern Polynesian migration to Aotearoa around 800-1000 years ago[54]. Yet, there was awareness of collective communities, and shared ancestral descendants. Through these ancestral connections, along with spiritual understandings of the earth, sky, ocean, stars and other natural elements there developed a common Māori worldview [52].

One thing is clear. By the 1800s, before Europeans came, there were established methods of teaching and learning with education always having a fundamental place in Māori society [55][56][57]. Prior to European arrival, education was controlled through the *whānau, hāpu,* and *iwi*(family, sub-tribe and tribe)[58]. Communication of Māori knowledge and culture relied on the strength of the language [57][59]and worked both informally through iwi and whānau relationships and formally through systems such as *whare wānanga*(houses of learning) and *tohunga* (tribal specialists). Education had a central role in traditional pre-colonial Māori society; clearly an educative philosophy, system and process was in place[55][57][60][61][62][63].

Impacts of European settlers arriving in Aotearoa from the 1800s eroded established Māori educative processes. Significantly, building on the work of Governor George Grey who first propagated policy to introduce 'native' education, the government began segregating Māori children into separate schools [58]. In 1867 the Native Schools Act was enacted and despite official education policies taking the line of integration, i.e. bringing together the best aspects of European and Māori culture, in reality the policies had the intention of assimilation and attaining social control (and it could be argued that they still appear to). The 1867 Native Schools Act mandated teaching in the English language, ensuring the education curriculum cooperated with government assimilation aims. Māori children received harsh punishments for speaking their first language at school [58]. From the outset, intentions of European colonizers were to assimilate and integrate Māori into European norms [16].

Indigenous academics [2][16][57][63]claim that the role of the education system from the late 1800's to mid to late 1900's was an ideological conquest aimed at assimilating Māori people into colonial thoughts and customs in order to achieve social 'stability'. For nearly one hundred years, there was a steady domination, oppression, exploitation and marginalization by Pākehā over Māori [16]. This eroded traditional Māori education practices and knowledge in favor of English language and Pākehā philosophies and systems [16][65]. Consequently, native speakers of Māori declined markedly [66]. Whereas in 1913 about 90 percent of Māori school children were fluent speakers of Māori, only about 25 percent spoke the language by 1958[67].

From around the 1960's to the 1990's, much of the research raises concern around Māori in education and documents the underachievement and poor performance of Māori students relative to Pākehā. This period of time is recently being viewed as the 'deficit approach' by researchers [68][69][70][71][72]whereby Māori educational underachievement is seen in terms of students lacking appropriate knowledge and skills. This rationale views the deficit with Māori people themselves, not with a deficit in the education system itself. Rameka[73]notes, "the problem has tended to be located with Māori children rather than with assessments. Clearly if one takes a sociocultural perspective, achievement is situated" (p.245). By the 1960s, Aotearoa was heading towards a Māori language and cultural continuity crunch point.

D.   Cultural Continuity and Maori Language Revival Trends

Urgent steps needed to be taken, otherwise the language might die out in less than a generation, taking with it precious knowledge and practices. The 1960s was a decade of both agreement and continuing tensions between Māori and Pākehā[74]. Swelling numbers of young, urban Māori sought a stronger Māori voice in politics and national matters, demanding formal recognition of the Māori language and culture, much as Ainu youth are doing today. Both Māori and Pākehā took part together in protests for return of previously confiscated

Māori land taken from the government, especially in the earlier colonial conquest period. However, disagreements over education rights prevailed. Māori students tended to drop out of school earlier than their Pākehā peers, provoking criticism from Māori elders who blamed the Eurocentric school system. In addition to elders' views that state education failed to serve the needs of Māori children, pointing to TeTiriti o Waitangi as grounds for their arguments, they held schools responsible for failing to preserve and restore Māori language and culture. By the 1980s, Māori were reaching a language and cultural continuity crunch point. Graham Smith [2]notes, "it was a dual crisis of educational underachievement on the one hand and the loss of language, knowledge and culture on the other" (p.57). In a dramatic move to respond to this situation, Māori leaders developed a 'language nest' notion in their communities and *tekōhanga reo* (pre-school centres) initiative was born. It was within this context that dynamic changes began and the tide began to turn.

The growth of kōhanga reo inspired, or perhaps was inspired by, a wider undertaking by Māori to question westernized philosophies of knowledge, culture and research and, perhaps related to the movement of *tino-rangatiratanga* (self-determination).Encouragingly, the Ministry of Education released its first bicultural early childhood education curriculum framework *TeWhāriki*[75]. Aotearoa became recognized globally for efforts to prioritize Māori children in primary and secondary schools [76] as well as being at the forefront of culturally responsive education [77][78]. In a landmark publication from Aotearoa, Linda Smith's (1999) *Decolonizing Methodologies* paved the way in Euro-centrically dominated academic circles for more Indigenous-led research that encouraged social justice, reconciliation and restoration of Indigenous well-being and cultural rights. "The revival was a Māori movement, it was achieved through education, and it was incredibly successful at a grass-roots level" (Waitangi Tribunal, [80], p.439). Undoubtedly, the 1980s and 1990s saw a genuine revival of Māori language propelled by the knowledge that there were few speakers left and the language was endangered.

Language revitalization must be considered more than solely a matter of linguistics; it encompasses social, cultural and political implications [81]. Former Māori Development Minister Flavell[82]highlighted advances in Māori language and culture, citing gains for Māori in not just kōhanga reo and *wharekura*(school) enrolments, but also in Māori language TV and radio broadcasting, launching of Google's Māori language search engine and noting that 746 Māori words reside in the New Zealand Dictionary of English. Many Māori terms have entered the general vocabulary widely known by New Zealanders[83]. As Aotearoa approached the beginning of a new millennium it seemed as though the language and cultural continuity crunch point had passed. Māori culture and language was in revival.

Or, was it?

Despite all of the above and more, researchers [84]are commenting about the media's lack of cultural competency and tendency to largely ignore the bicultural makeup of Aotearoa. Māori language speakers currently show a declining trend [80][81][82][85][86]. Since the initial spectacular rise of kōhanga reo centres, there has been a steady fall in numbers of centres [80][81][87][88]. Māori enrolments in kōhanga reo peaked in 1993 at approximately 50 percent of all Māori children enrolled in ECE centres attending kōhanga reo. The 2013 census revealed that about one in five Māori could converse in everyday language in Māori but that was a five percent drop from the 2006 census [85][86]. Current trends suggest that Māori with high levels of language proficiency are in older age brackets and as they pass away, the younger age group who represent the future health of Māori are not offsetting the losses [80][81]. Reasons for these declines are varied but include: a) continued loss of older native speakers; b) complacency by the institutions that instigated the revival; c) concerns about quality of education received at immersion centres; d) shortage of supply of teachers; e) excessive regulation and control, and; f) ongoing lack of education resources to teach the full curriculum in the Māori language (Waitangi Tribunal, 2011). Most crucial of these issues appears to be the short supply of teachers.

Māori families and communities have worked hard to gain their rights to determine their own policy direction regarding responsibilities for Māori language education of their own people.In 2011, policymakers recognized that the direction needed to be reset for Māori language revitalization and the government made it clear that Māori language must become a matter for Māori self-determination. These fundamental legislative changes mean responsibility of Māori language policy was handed from government to Māori themselves. This neo-traditionalist [81]turn now positions Māori language as a matter *for* and *by* Māori in the interests of Indigenous development (rather than as an element of shared bicultural postcolonial identity). This flies in the face of emerging research [81]which suggests that future Māori, Pākehā and Māori/PākehāNew Zealanders aspire to a more truly bilingual nation.

In sum, impacts of public policy for Māori from the 1800s to today have impacted cultural continuity, identity, language loss and education matters. The Māori language is not as critically endangered as the Ainu language, yet the introduction of public policies has heavily impacted on the present language and cultural continuity crunch point. It remains to be seen whether recent legislative changes can provide the impetus to facilitate long overdue social justice for Māori people.

VI.　　　CONCLUSION

I conclude this article by re-stating my outsider position as a non-Indigenous researcher who embraces Indigenous concepts of knowledge creation, the work of meaning making, and alternative ways of knowing and being. I cannot know what it means to be in the position of either Ainu or Māori. My research offers an interpretation of public policies that have impacted education and language pathways for both Indigenous Ainu and Māori people, revealing similar histories and injustices. Consequently, Ainu culture is placed in a perilous position with the language classified as "critically endangered" [48]placing Ainu in a cultural continuity crunch point today. Likewise, time will tell whether in Aotearoa, TeMātāwai's governance will re-direct Māori language away from a decline towards a growth trend to ensure cultural continuity. Ainu and Māori have been (and it could be argued, are still) subjected to their cultures viewed as subordinate and excluded from decision-making and policy frameworks. This author advocates for: 1) Ainu and Māori families and communities' rights to share in and determine policies regarding language preservation and education of their own people, and; 2) suggests that a responsibility lies with non-Indigenous researchers to sensitively join Indigenous researchers' efforts and embrace social and economic justice, restoration of well-being, cultural and language rights to ensure Indigenous cultural continuity.

If not us, who? If not now, when?

VII.　　　ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

REFERENCES

[1]　　P. Freire, *Pedagogy of the oppressed*(New York: Herder and Herder, 1970).

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

[3]　　V. Okada. The plight of Ainu, Indigenous people of Japan, *Journal of Indigenous Social Development, 1(1),*2012, 1-14.

[4]　　P. Sikes, Decolonizing research and methodologies: Indigenous peoples and cross-cultural contexts,*Pedagogy, Culture & Society, 14(3),* 2006, 349-358.

[5]　　United Nations [UN], *General Assembly adopts declaration of rights of Indigenous peoples; 'Major step forward' towards human rights for all, says president*, (United Nations.org, 2007), Retrieved from http://www.un.org/press/en/2007/ga10612.doc.htm

[6]　　N. Onishi, Recognition for a people who faded as Japan grew, *New York Times,* (2008, July 3). Retrieved from http://www.nytimes.com/2008/07/03/world/asia/03ainu.html

[7]　　States Services Commission, *All about the Treaty,*(Wellington, New Zealand: States Services Commission, 2005). Retrieved from: https://nzhistory.govt.nz/files/documents/All_about_the_Treaty.pdf

[8]　　D. Cohen, E. Hoshino-Browne, and A. Leung, Culture and the structure of personal experience: Insider and outsider phenomenologies of the self and social world,*Advances in experimental social psychology, 39(1)*, 2007, 1-67. doi: 10.016/S0065-2601(06)39001-6

[9]　　B. Mullings, Insider or outsider, both or neither: some dilemmas of interviewing in a cross-cultural setting, *Geoforum 30(4),* 1999, 337-350. doi: 10.1016/S0016-7185(99)00025-1

[10]　　E. Pio, K. Tipuna,A. Rasheed, and L. Parker, TeWero—the challenge: reimagining universities from an indigenous world view, *Higher Education, 67(5),*2014, 675-690. doi: 10.1007/s10734-013-9673-1.

[11]　　M. Msoroka, and D. Amundsen, One size fits *not quite* all: Universal research ethics with diversity, *Research Ethics, 14(3), 2017,* 1-17. doi: https//doi.org/10.1177/1747016117739939

[12]　　R. Koster, K. Baccar, and R. Lemelin, Moving from research ON, to research WITH and FOR Indigenous communities: A critical reflection on community-based participatory research,*The Canadian Geographer, 56(2),*2012, 192-210.

[13]　　J. Tauri, Resisting condescending research ethics in Aotearoa New Zealand,*AlterNative, 10(2), 2014,*134-150.

[14]　　P. Morelli, and P. Mataira, Indigenizing evaluation research: A long-awaited paradigm shift,*Journal of Indigenous voices in social work, 1(2),* 2010, 1-12.

[15]　　N. Mahuika, Revitalizing TeIka-a-Maui: Māori migration and the nation, *New Zealand Journal of History, 43(2),*2009, 133-149.

[16]　　L. Smith, *Decolonizing methodologies: research and indigenous peoples*(London: Zed Books, 2012).

[17]　　K. Denzin, Y. T, Lincoln, andL. T. Smith, *Handbook of critical and indigenous methodologies*(Thousand Oaks, California: Sage Publications Inc, 2008).

[18]   L. Smith, T. Maxwell, H. Puke, and P. Temara, Indigenous knowledge, methodology and mayhem: What is the role of methodology in producing Indigenous insights? A discussion from Mātauranga Māori,*Knowledge Cultures, 4(3),*2016, 131-156.

[19]   N. Nakamura,Realizing Ainu Indigenous rights: a commentary on Hiroshi Maruyama's 'Japan's post-war Ainu policy. Why the Japanese Government has not recognized Ainu Indigenous rights? *Polar Record, (50)1*, 2014, 209–211

[20]   M. Berryman,S. Soohoo, and A. Nevin, *Culturally responsive methodologies* (Bingley, UK: Emerald Group Publishing Ltd, 2013).

[21]   R. Bishop, and T. Glynn, Researching in Māori contexts: An interpretation of participatory consciousness. *Journal of Intercultural Studies, 20(2),*1999, 167-182.

[22]   P. Levi, *Se non ora, quando? [If not now, when?]* (Harmondsworth: Penguin Group USA, 1982).

[23]   K. Ochiai, and T. Tsunemoto, *On policy measures for the socio-economic betterment of the Ainu people,*(Sapporo, Hokkaido: Hokkaido University Collection of Scholarly and Academic Papers, 2013). Retrieved from https://eprints.lib.hokudai.ac.jp/dspace/bitstream/2115/52997/1/HLR64-2_009.pdf

[24]   T. Tsunemoto, Rights and identities of ethnic minorities in Japan: Indigenous Ainu and resident Koreans. *Asia Pacific Journal on Human Rights and the Law, 2(1)*, 2001, 119-141.

[25]   T. Tsunemoto, *Requests for Ainu policy measures*,(Hokkaido, Japan: Hokkaido University Collection of Scholarly and Academic Papers: USCAP, 2011), Retrieved from: http://eprints.lib.hokudai.ac.jp/dspace/bitstream/2115/48212/1/AINUrep01en_011.pdf

[26]   T. Tsunemoto, Requests for Ainu policy measure, in T. Onai (Ed.), *Living conditions and consciousness of present-day Ainu*, (Sapporo, Hokkaido: Centre for Ainu Indigenous Studies, 2012) 117-120.

[27]   T. Tsunemoto, Law, the Ainu and changing perceptions,*Research Highlight, Dec 20, 2016,* Retrieved from https://www.global.hokudai.ac.jp/blog/law-the-ainu-and-changing-perceptions/

[28]   C. Abe, Right to land and the Ainu,*Focus Asia-Pacific, 81(3),*2015, 2-4. Retrieved from https://www.hurights.or.jp/archives/focus/section1/Focus81.pdf

[29]   Ainu Association of Hokkaido [AAH], About the Ainu people,*Ainu Association of Hokkaido,* 2017, Retrieved from https://www.ainu-assn.or.jp/english/outline.html

[30]   T. Bodgdanowizc, Where are the Ainu now? In search of the answers about Japan's indigenous people,*The Japan Times*, 2003, Retrieved from http://www.japantimes.co.jp/community/2003/03/02/general/where-are-the-ainu-now/#.WUoHoWiGOUk

[31]   S. Cheung, Rethinking Ainu Heritage: A Case study of an Ainu settlement in Hokkaido, Japan, *International Journal of Heritage Studies, 11(3)*, 2005, 197-210. doi: 10.1080/13527250500160500

[32]   S. Cotterill, Ainu Success: the political and cultural achievements of Japan's Indigenous minority,*The Asia-Pacific Journal, 9(12),*2011, 1-33

[33]   H. Maruyama, Beyond the present Ainu policy: emancipating the Ainu from subordination to Japan,*Focus   Asia-Pacific,   81(3),*   2015,   5-8.   Retrieved   from https://www.hurights.or.jp/archives/focus/section1/Focus81.pdf

[34]   K. Namikawa, *Ainu minzoku no kiseki,*(Tokyo, Japan: YamakawaShuppansha, 2004).

[35]   N. Nakamura, Being Indigenous in a non-Indigenous environment: identity politics of the Dogai Ainu and new Indigenous policies of Japan,*Environments and Planning, 47(1),*2015, 660-675. doi: 10.1068/a130003p

[36]   O. Hasegawa, *Ainu living in Tokyo – Getting to know the indigenous people of Japan*(Japan for Sustainability,   2009).   Retrieved   from http://www.japanfs.org/en/projects/sus_college/sus_college_id033828.html

[37]   T. Takayanagi, and T. Shimomura, Indigenous women facing educational disadvantages: The case of the Ainu in Japan. *Prospects, 43(1),*2013, 347-360. Doi: 10.1007/s11125-013-9273-y

[38]   Ainu Association of Hokkaido [AAH],*Ainu lifestyle data results [Ainu no seikatsujittai],* 2008, Retrieved from http://www.ainu-assn.or.jp/about03.html

[39]   R. Siddle, *Race, resistance, and the Ainu of Japan*(New York: Routledge, 1996).

[40]   R. Siddle, The limits to citizenship in Japan: multiculturalism, indigenous rights and the Ainu, *Citizen Studies, 7(4),*2003, 447-467. Doi: 10.1080/1362102032000134976

[41]   T. Onai, Problem awareness and survey outline, in T. Onai (Ed.), *Living conditions and consciousness of present day Ainu* (Sapporo: Hokkaido University, Centre for Ainu and Indigenous Studies, 2010) 1-7.

[42]   S. Cotterill, Documenting urban Indigeneity: Tokyo Ainu and the 2011 survey on the living conditions of Ainu outside Hokkaido,*The Asia-Pacific Journal, 9(45),*2011, 1-17.

[43]   Y. Tanaka, Ainu people today – 7 years after the Culture Promotion Law,*Asia Pacific Human Rights Centre, 36(3), 2004,*5-7. Retrieved from
https://www.hurights.or.jp/archives/focus/section1/pdf/focus36.pdf

[44]   S. Kayano, *Ainu bunkawodenshosuru [Passing down Ainu culture]*(Tokyo: Sofukan, 1998).

[45]   F. Cram, Measuring Māori wellbeing,*MAI, 3(1),*2014, 18-32.

[46]   N. Ogasawara, *Shoppai Kawa: Tokyo niikiruAinutachi [Salty River: the Ainu who live in Tokyo]*(Tokyo: Kirokusha, 1990).

[47]   N. Nakamura, Realizing Ainu Indigenous rights: a commentary on Hiroshi Maruyama's 'Japan's post-war Ainu policy. Why the Japanese Government has not recognized Ainu Indigenous rights,*Polar Record, (50)1,*2014, 209–211

[48]   C. Moseley, *Atlas of the world's languages in danger, (3rd edition)*(Paris: UNESCO Publishing, 2010). Retrieved from http://www.unesco.org/new/en/culture/themes/endangered-languages/atlas-of-languages-in-danger/

[49]   M. White, Dixon, Skinner, and TeRangiHiroa: Scholarly discussion of Polynesian racial history,*The Journal of Pacific History, 47(3),*2012, 369-187.

[50]   A. Anderson, Changing perspectives upon Māori colonization voyaging,*Journal of the Royal Society of New Zealand, 47(3),* 2017, 222-231,Doi: 10.1080/03036758.2017.1334674

[51]   R. Walker, *Kawhawhaitonumatou – Struggle without end*(Auckland, NZ: Penguin, 1999).

[52]   N. Mahuika, Revitalizing TeIka-a-Maui: Māori migration and the nation, *New Zealand Journal of History, 43(2),*2009, 133-149.

[53]   J. Rangihau, Being Māori, in M. King (Ed.), *TeAoHurihuri, the world moves on: aspects of Māoritanga*(Auckland, NZ: Reed, 1992) 183-190.

[54]   T. White, and P.Rewi, The Value of Dialect amongst KāiTahu: Kāpuananī o TahuPōtiki, he Manawa Reo, he Manawa KāiTahu, *Psychology and Developing Studies, 26(2),*2014, 213-232.

[55]   M. Mead, *Tikanga Māori - living by Māori values* (Wellington: Huia Publishers, 2003).

[56]   T. Nepe, *Te Toi HuarewaTipuna: Kaupapa Māori, an educational intervention system* (Doctoral Dissertation, University of Auckland, Auckland, 1991).

[57]   L. Pihama, L., Smith, M. Taki, and J. Lee, *A literature review on Kaupapa Māori and Māori education pedagogy: Critical success factors for effective use ofelearning with Māori learners*, (Wellington: Institutes of Technology and Polytechnics of New Zealand, 2004).

[58]   R. Calman, *'Māori education – mātauranga – The native schools system 1987 to 1969*, (Te Ara The Encyclopedia of New Zealand, 2012), Retrieved from http://www.TeAra.govt.nz/en.Māori-education-matauranga/page3.

[59]   T. Dewes, *The place of Māori language in the education of Māori* (An address delivered at the 40th ANZAAS Congress: Christchurch, 1968).

[60]   T. Hiroa, *The coming of the Māori*(Wellington, NZ: Māori Purposes Fund BoardWitcombe& Tombs, 1950).

[61]   M. Hōhepa, L. Smith, and S. McNaughton, TeKōhanga reo heitikangaakoiTe Reo Māori: TeKōhanga reo as a context for language learning,*Educational Psychology: An International Journal of Experimental Educational Psychology, 12(3-4),*1992, 333-346.

[62]   T. Ka'ai, *Tehiringataketake: Mai itekōhanga reo I tekura: Māori pedagogy: TeKōhanga reo and the transition to school.* (Doctor of Philosophy, Auckland University, Auckland, 1990).

[63]   P. Makereti, *The old-time Māori* (Auckland, NZ, original 1938 Victor Gollanz, London: New Women's Press, 1986).

[64]   R. Pere, *TeWheke: A celebration of infinite wisdom*(Gisborne, New Zealand: AoAko Learning New Zealand, 1991)

[65]   L. Smith,Kaupapa Māori research, in M. Battiste (Ed.)*Reclaiming Indigenous voice and vision*(Canada: UBC Press, 2000) 225-247.

[66]   M. King, *The penguin history of New Zealand*(London, England: Penguin Group NZ, 2003).

[67]   B. Biggs,*The structure of New Zealand Māori* (Auckland, New Zealand: Anthropological Linguistics, 1961).

[68]   M. Berryman, *Repositioning within indigenous discourses of transformation and self-determination* (Doctoral dissertation, The University of Waikato, 2008).

[69]   R. Bishop, M. Berryman, T. Cavanagh, andL. Teddy, Te Kotahitanga: Addressing educational disparities facing Māori students in New Zealand,*Teaching and Teacher Education, 25(5),* 2009, 734-742. doi: 10.1016/j.tate.2009.01.009

[70]   M. Durie, *Ngākāhuipou launching Māori futures* (Wellington, New Zealand: Huia Publishers, 2003).

[71]   R. Mahuika, Kaupapa Māori theory is critical and anti-colonial, *MAI Review, 3(4),* 2008, Retrieved from http://www.review.mai.ac.nz/index.php/MR/article/viewFile/153/180

[72]   L. Pihama, *Tungiateururua, kiatupuwhakaritoritotetupu o te harakeke: A critical analysis of parents as first teachers*(Master's thesis, University of Auckland, New Zealand, 1993).

[73]   L. Rameka, Being Māori: culturally relevant assessment in early childhood education,*Early Years, 31(3),*2011, 245-256. doi: 10.1080/09575146.2011.614222

[74]   H. Barr, Towards a bicultural education system,*National Forum, 94(1),*1994, Winter.

[75]   Ministry of Education [MoE], *TeWhāriki: Hewhārikimātauangamōngāmokopuna o Aotearoa*, (Early childhood curriculum, Wellington, New Zealand: Learning Media, 1996). Retrieved from: http://www.education.govt.nz/assets/Documents/EarlyChildhood/te-whariki.pdf

[76]   R. Bishop, M. Berryman, J.Wearmouth, M. Peter, and S.Clapham, Professional development, changes in teacher practice and improvements in Indigenous students' educational performance: A case study from New Zealand,*Teaching and Teacher Education, 28(5),* 2012,684-705. doi: 10.1016/j.tate.2012.02.002

[77]   J. Ritchie, and C.Buzzelli, TeWhāriki: The early childhood curriculum of Aotearoa New Zealand, in N. File, J. Mueller, & D. Wisneski (Eds.), *Curriculum in Early Childhood Education: Re-examined, rediscovered, renewed,*(New York, NY: Routledge, 2012) 146-159.

[78]   J. Williamson, and H. Hedges, Empowering Language: Lenses of knowing, being doing,*Language and Literacy, 19(2),* 2017, 72-89.

[79]   L. Smith, *Decolonizing methodologies: research and indigenous peoples*(London & New York: Zed Books Ltd, 1999).

[80]   Waitangi Tribunal, *Wai 262 Waitangi Tribunal report 2011* (Wellington: Legislation Direct, 2011).

[81]   N. Albury, An old problem with new directions: Māori language revitalization and the policy ideas of youth, *Current Issues in Language Planning, 17(2),* 2016, 161-178. doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.1080.14664208.2016.1147117

[82]   T. Flavell, *Te Pire mōTe Reo Māori/Māori Language Bill*,(New Zealand Parliament/Pāremata Aotearoa, 2016). Retrieved from https://www.parliament.nz/en/pb/bills-and-laws/bills-proposed-laws/document

[83]   P. Keegan, Making sense of kaupapa Māori: A linguistic point of view, *New Zealand Journal of Education Studies, 47(2),* 2012, 74-84.

[84]   A. McConville, T.McCreanor, M.Wetherell, and H.Moewaka Barnes, Imagining an emotional nation: the print media and ANZAC day commemorations in Aotearoa New Zealand,*Media, culture and society, 39(1)*, 2016, 94-110. doi: 10.1177/0163443716672300

[85]   Statistics New Zealand. *Quick stats about Māori,* (Census, 2006). Retrieved from http://www.stats.govt.nz/Census/2006CensusHomePage/QuickStats/quickstats-about-a-subject/Māori.aspx

[86]   Statistics New Zealand. *Quick stats about Māori,* (Census, 2013). Retrieved from http://www.stats.govt.nz/Census/2013-census/profile-and-summary-reports/quickstats-about-Māori-english.aspx

[87]   W. Bauer, 'Is the health of Te Reo Māori improving?' *The Journal of the Linguistic Society of New Zealand, 51(1),*2008, 34.

[88]   R. Benton, and N. Benton, (2001). Reversing Language Shift in Aotearoa/New Zealand 1989-1999, in J. Fishman (Ed.), *Can languages be saved? Reversing language shift, Revisited: A 21st century perspective*(Clevedon: Multilingual Matters, 2001) 425.