THE SPLIT TŌTARA:
TE REO MĀORI AND TRANS-TASMAN MIGRATION

Paul Hamer: *Institute of Policy Studies, Victoria University of Wellington, PO Box 600, Wellington 6140 <paul.hamer@vuw.ac.nz>*

He tōtara wāhi rua, he kai mā te ahi.
'The tōtara that contains a split will be cut up with the axe.'[1]

Abstract
The enormous growth of the Māori population in Australia since the late 1970s has coincided with the modern Māori language revival movement. The two phenomena are seldom considered together. Now that the Waitangi Tribunal has highlighted the faltering health of te reo, however, it is timely to assess what impact trans-Tasman migration is having on revival efforts. The sheer number of Māori emigrants who speak te reo suggests that emigration has played more of a role in the language's renewed decline than has been recognised. At the same time, te reo struggles in Australia, and may suffer one of the highest rates of shift of any community language. That is because practically all the factors that contribute to language shift apply to Māori in Australia. In any event, te reo Māori has now become a transnational language, which raises the question as to what if any support speakers in Australia should receive from the Government and organisations committed to maintaining the language in New Zealand.

1. Introduction

Three decades ago te reo Māori faced a genuine crisis. Richard Benton's survey for the New Zealand Council for Educational Research showed that, at the end of the 1970s, probably no more than 100 Māori children under five were fluent speakers (Benton 1997; Benton and Benton 2001:425). In response to the sheer extent of language loss, grass-roots Māori movements such as Te Ātaarangi (1979), kōhanga reo (1982), and kura kaupapa (1985) breathed new life into the language.[2] A successful claim to the Waitangi Tribunal[3] led to the Government's passage of the Maori Language Act in 1987, which met some of the Tribunal's recommendations for improving te reo's status and use. Community momentum gathered and, soon enough, progress was surpassing expectations. The positive results for te reo in the 1996 census question about languages were, for Richard and Nena Benton (2001: 423), an 'amazing revelation'.

At the same time, however, large-scale emigration to Australia had become a feature of Māori demography. Just as the te reo revival movement burgeoned from the late 1970s, so did trans-Tasman migration. The 1986 Australian census gave an official return of 26,035 people of Māori ancestry, most of whom had not been in Australia ten years earlier (Lowe 1990:54). There is good reason to believe that this return also understated the Māori population by at least 15 per cent (Hamer 2007: 21, 25, 32). In other words, the Māori community groundswell in support of te reo was accompanied at the outset by a significant Māori movement across the Tasman.

Since the 1980s many commentators have considered the health of te reo. In 2010 this again included the Waitangi Tribunal (in its Wai 262 inquiry concerning claims to cultural and intellectual property and mātauranga Māori). The Tribunal's view (2010: x) is that te reo is once more 'approaching a crisis point', with steadily declining proportions and absolute numbers of speakers and learners in census and education statistics, both amongst the young and old. At the 2006 census, for example, the overall proportion of those in the Māori ethnic group who could converse in te reo fell from 25.2 to 23.7 per cent, meaning '8,000 fewer Māori conversational speakers of te reo than there would have been had the 2001 proportion been maintained'.

Neither in the Tribunal's report nor in practically any of the other scholarly considerations of te reo, however, is the likely impact on the language of Māori emigration assessed. Aside from passing mentions of external migration by Richard Benton (1997:29) and Jeffrey Waite (1992:18),[4] there has been no

apparent engagement with the subject.[5] But it is hard to imagine there has been no impact. By 2006 the official return for those of Māori ancestry in the Australian census had risen to 92,912, which for a variety of reasons to do with census practice probably reflected a total Māori population of around 126,000 (Hamer: 2007/2008). This latter total represented approximately one Māori in every six (a calculation which includes the likelihood of no more than 15,000 Māori in all other countries besides Australia and New Zealand – Hamer 2007/2008: 168–171), and roughly equates to a population rise of some 750 per cent since the mid-1970s. From 1996 to 2006, while the number of Māori speakers of te reo remained relatively static in New Zealand – edging forward from 129,033 in 1996 to 130,485 in 2001 and 131,613 in 2006 – the Māori population of Australia will have practically doubled. The number of home speakers of te reo in Australia climbed nearly 60 per cent during this period, from 4,156 to 6,617.

It is timely, therefore – now that the Tribunal has cast the spotlight on te reo's faltering revival – to consider whether emigration may be a factor in the decline. This article assesses the impact using Australian and New Zealand census data[6] as well as qualitative information from surveys and interviews with those involved in teaching the language on both sides of the Tasman. The focus, for practical reasons, is on Māori rather than all speakers of te reo. Certain questions arise. Has there been a largely unrecognised 'brain drain' of Māori speakers to Australia, for example? And can we speculate about the cumulative effect of every te reo speaker departure?

There is, of course, another side to this story. For thirty or more years te reo has existed as a community language in Australia.[7] Significant Māori migration to Australia has coincided with the more accepting phase of Australian attitudes to immigrant languages, and te reo is part – albeit a relatively ignored part – of post-1970s Australian multilingualism. This article therefore also gauges how successfully te reo is retained and transmitted within the Māori community in Australia, including the degree of support its speakers receive both locally and from New Zealand.

The qualitative data are drawn from 31 survey responses and one in-depth interview with teachers of te reo in New Zealand and 12 survey responses and seven in-depth interviews with teachers of te reo in Australia. All were concluded in the second half of 2009. The New Zealand responses came predominantly from Māori-medium school principals, including those at six kura kaupapa Māori and one other full immersion school. After university ethics approval, the surveys had been mailed to 176 individuals or

organisations involved in teaching te reo Māori in New Zealand and seven in Australia. In New Zealand these included national representative bodies as well as specific schools, tertiary institutions, training establishments and so on. The Australian interviews were conducted with community teachers of te reo, including several involved in formal adult evening classes. Two Australian field trips were undertaken, to Sydney and Melbourne in August and November 2009 respectively.

As can be seen, approximately one in five survey forms sent to New Zealand recipients were returned. Overall, of course, the completed surveys and interviews were not drawn from a representative sample, and given this and the low response rate to the mailed surveys the qualitative data have obvious limitations. They do, however, provide anecdotal information to back up the conclusions which can be drawn from the statistical analysis.

Finally, in introduction, it should be noted that there are of course innumerable cases of language loss amongst diasporic populations. Arguably, native Hawaiian is the most comparable example. As with Māori, in Hawai'i the indigenous people, outnumbered by colonists and significantly affected by land loss and cultural dislocation, reached the point a generation ago where their language was severely endangered. A range of measures have been put in place to reverse this decline. At the same time, however, a steady stream of Hawaiians have migrated to the mainland United States, 'spurred by economic struggles and a lack of employment opportunities in Hawai'i' (Kauanui 2007: 144). By 2000, 40 per cent of native Hawaiians and about 30 per cent of Hawaiian speakers lived on the United States mainland.[8] The 2010 American census will show what further impact migration is having on these numbers.

2. Migration from New Zealand

Three notable statistics allow us to conclude that trans-Tasman migration is having a greater impact on the te reo revival in New Zealand than has been recognised. These are: the number of recent migrants to Australia who report speaking te reo in the home; the number of te reo-speaking trained teachers living in Australia; and the number of children entering Australia needing English as a second language (ESL) assistance whose first language is Māori. This section relates each of these in turn.

First, Australian census results allow us to measure the approximate number of te reo-speaking migrants to Australia for each inter-censual period

since 1986. Unlike the New Zealand census, which asks respondents about the languages they can converse in about a lot of everyday things, the Australian census asks whether the person speaks a language other than English (LOTE) at home. If the answer is 'yes', the census asks for the main LOTE spoken only. It then asks how well the person can speak English. These questions are asked, according to the Australian Bureau of Statistics, to assist with the development of language services, for the implementation of language policies, and 'as an indicator of "active" ethnicity' (Pink 2007: 36–37).

Australian linguists tend to agree that the form of the census language question – on use within the home – understates the number of speakers of community languages (Baldauf 2005: 133–134; Clyne, Hayek and Kipp 2008: 1; Clyne and Kipp 2002: 30; Kipp 2007: 17; and Clyne 1991: 39–40). This is because many – particularly younger – speakers will not use a community language in their own home, but will speak it when meeting or visiting older relatives. Whether this applies to Māori in Australia is not clear – conceivably home use could, for some people, equate to the use of simple greetings and karakia. But, if the question is interpreted as meaning the language of predominant use in the home, then it may well tend to give a lower speaking rate for Māori than the New Zealand census question, which measures theoretical ability but not actual use. In New Zealand, as noted, the te reo-speaking rate of the Māori ethnic group in 2006 was 23.7 per cent, while in Australia amongst those reporting Māori ancestry it was just 5.6 per cent. At least some of that difference is likely to arise from the different nature of the two questions.

Table 1: Australian census speakers of te reo Māori and usual address indicator five years ago

	CENSUS YEAR			
Usual address indicator five years ago	1991	1996	2001	2006
Either same as current address or elsewhere in Australia	1,947	2,443	2,678	3,546
Not applicable (aged 0–4)	217	316	383	466
Not stated	214	198	223	310
Overseas	1,557	1,197	2,220	2,294
Grand total	3,935	4,154	5,504	6,616

Source: Australian Bureau of Statistics.

With that in mind we can see in Table 1 that those overseas at the time of the previous census have consistently been 30–40 per cent of the total number of te reo speakers in Australia. Added together, 7,268 home speakers of te reo moved to Australia (certainly almost always from New Zealand) between 1986 and 2006. Of course a proportion will have since returned to New Zealand, and some individuals would be included twice in this total after re-emigrating to Australia. But this total is a significant sum of people, for the following reasons:

- 7,268 would probably represent the minimum number of home speakers of te reo who had moved to Australia during the period, because (a) some speakers would have returned to New Zealand before being counted and (b) many who arrived as home speakers of te reo would have stopped using the language in the home by the time of the next census;
- to the 7,268 could be added the 1,382 speakers aged 0–4,because these children may well have been born in New Zealand if their parents had not emigrated;
- if the numbers were measured in New Zealand census language question terms, the gross number of speakers who emigrated from 1986 to 2006 might be well over 10,000.

This latter point can be made in another way. The 2006 Australian census recorded there were 16,838 Māori who had been living overseas in 2001. These migrants arguably left New Zealand with an average conversational speaking rate of around 25 per cent (i.e. approximately the 2001 New Zealand census rate for the entire Māori ethnic group), or possibly slightly less since they would have included fewer older, more fluent speakers. That means that around 4,000 or more Māori speakers of te reo (in New Zealand census terms) moved to Australia between 2001 and 2006. If there had been an equivalent number leaving from 1996 to 2001 (in 2001 the number of Māori who had been overseas in 1996 was also nearly 17,000) and somewhat fewer from 1986 to 1991 and 1991 to 1996, then New Zealand would have incurred a gross loss of around 13,000 conversational te reo speakers to Australia since 1986.

Even if the 25 per cent conversational speaking rate is overstated, the total number of emigrating speakers may not be, since the census undercounts the Māori population. Moreover, migrants in the 1980s would have had a higher rate of te reo use. The ratio of all people (not just Māori) aged five and over

speaking te reo to Māori in Australia in 1986 (i.e. not just the most recent arrivals) was 17.7 per cent (Lowe 1990: 16)[9], compared to 7.4 per cent in 2006.[10]

There has of course been movement of people in the other direction, to New Zealand. Just as there were 16,838 Māori in Australia in 2006 who had been overseas in 2001, so too in New Zealand in 2006 were there 7,416 Māori who in 2001 had been living in Australia (see Table 2). In other words, the rate of return migration for the 2001–2006 period was around three Māori returning for every seven leaving. Of those 7,416 who had returned from Australia, 1,347 were able to speak conversationally in te reo. While these people made up only 1.0 per cent of all Māori speakers of te reo in New Zealand, the more relevant fact is their rate of speaking Māori of only 18.4 per cent. In 2001 the rate of speaking Māori of those Māori in Australia five years earlier was 18.9 per cent and in 1996 it was just 17.5 per cent. One can conclude from this that, if return migration markedly increases in the future, the overall Māori rate of te reo speaking will edge slightly lower as a result. To that extent the health of te reo in Australia will continue to have a limited – but potentially growing – impact on the health of te reo in New Zealand.

Of course the impact of the loss of te reo speakers to Australia depends in part on the levels of fluency amongst the speakers who have left. Two Māori-medium school principals surveyed expressed doubt that the most knowledgeable in te reo would emigrate. Table 3 certainly suggests that Māori-speaking professionals are less likely to emigrate, no doubt because there are specific roles for them in New Zealand and their skills are more highly sought after. Teachers are the obvious example of this. Of the 8,757 Māori tertiary, secondary, primary, early childhood and special education professionals, 4,314 or 49.3 per cent were te reo speakers at the 2006 census.

Table 2: Māori in New Zealand aged 5+ resident in Australia 5 years previously, 1996–2006

	TE REO SPEAKERS	LANGUAGE NOT STATED	TOTAL POPULATION	% SPEAKERS
1996	1,131	114	6,579	17.5
2001	999	54	5,343	18.9
2006	1,347	102	7,416	18.4

Source: Statistics New Zealand.

Table 3: Te reo speakers and Māori by occupation in Australia and New Zealand, 2006*

OCCUPATIONAL CLASS	COUNTRY	SPEAKERS OF TE REO	TOTAL MĀORI	% SPEAKERS
Managers	NZ	5,016	23,859	21.0
	A	182	3,105	5.9
Professionals	NZ	10,056	28,899	34.8
	A	239	3,601	6.6
Technicians and trades workers	NZ	4,830	25,590	18.9
	A	384	6,337	6.1
Community and personal service workers	NZ	5,880	22,512	26.1
	A	324	4,308	7.5
Clerical and administrative workers	NZ	4,569	22,404	20.4
	A	365	5,551	6.6
Sales workers	NZ	2,898	17,553	16.5
	A	175	3,295	5.3
Machinery operators and drivers	NZ	5,286	21,522	24.6
	A	728	7,394	9.8
Labourers	NZ	10,242	43,545	23.5
	A	893	9,539	9.4
Total	NZ	48,777	205,748	23.7
	A	3,290	43,130	7.6

* New Zealand figures are total Māori speakers of te reo and total Māori ethnicity. Australian figures are total speakers of te reo and total Māori ancestry, so the Australian percentages are slightly higher than they would be if the comparison was direct.

Source: Australian Bureau of Statistics and Statistics New Zealand.

In fact the average te reo speaking ability of New Zealand-resident working Māori drops from 23.7 per cent to 22.6 per cent if the teaching profession is excluded. In Australia, by contrast, higher rates of home te reo use are to be found amongst machinery operators and drivers, labourers, and community and personal service workers. This reflects one of the most fundamental and self-evident differences between Māori speakers in Australia and New Zealand: there is essentially no market for use of the Māori language professionally in Australia.

Despite this, several of the principals surveyed related the loss of teaching staff or others expert in the language, as well as the difficulty of replacing them. In its Wai 262 Report (2010: xi, 41) the Waitangi Tribunal cited the failure to train sufficient te reo teachers – both teachers of the language and those able to teach other subjects in the medium of Māori – as perhaps the key contributor to te reo's decline. We can indeed see that a pool of potential te reo teachers now resides in Australia, which brings us to the second telling statistic. At the 2006 Australian census no fewer than 139 speakers of te reo in the home had an educational qualification in 'teacher education', including 32 at 'advanced diploma/associate degree' level, 52 at bachelor degree level, and 23 at postgraduate level. In the context of there having been an average of 11.7 Māori language or Māori-medium teacher vacancies at the start of each school year in New Zealand secondary schools alone from 1997 to 2010 (Waitangi Tribunal 2010: 98–99), this is arguably a significant number. Indeed, in 2006 there were 21 te reo-speaking Māori teachers in New Zealand who had been living in Australia five years previously.

Notably, only 19 people actually employed as teachers in Australia spoke te reo in the home in 2006, despite there being 335 Māori school teachers. What this suggests is that relatively few te reo-speaking Māori teachers continue to work as teachers upon moving to Australia. One can assume that many instead choose a more lucrative (and even lower-skilled) profession. In fact two Australian-resident te reo teachers interviewed knew of qualified kaiako (teachers) from New Zealand driving trucks. In a similar vein, a te reo teacher at a provincial New Zealand secondary school said that 'I personally have a sister-in-law from Ruatoki whose first language is Te Reo Rangatira living in Perth and the majority of her whanau are there and they too are teachers of the reo, working doing other mahi because they get paid better.'[11] He had also been invited to work in Australia and explained that he felt 'torn [between] our people and the need of the reo here and money in Australia that can help my family financially'. Robert Haig's research for the Department of Labour shows that many lower-skilled occupations pay considerably higher wages in Australia than in New Zealand, and that 'many New Zealanders … are working in jobs in Australia that do not fully use their formal qualifications' (Haig 2010: 45–51, 54).

It is of course not only teachers who leave for Australia but, more commonly, school students with their whānau. Practically all kura principals surveyed had experience of this. In larger schools such losses had a lesser impact, but in smaller schools the impact could be severe. The principal of a

small, rural Māori-medium school wrote that her kura had suffered a 'huge loss', with the departure within the previous year of '3 families of more than 4 per family who could speak Te Reo and do performing arts'. A kura kaupapa principal was also faced with the potential loss of seven families when one of his town's main employers, the freezing works, closed down. The parents needed new employment and 'He Karoti nui a Ahitereiria' ('Australia was a big carrot').

The third indication, therefore, derives from Australian administrative data showing the likely scale of the loss of students from immersion settings. Each year, for example, the Victorian Government records the number of newly-arrived students from non-English speaking backgrounds overseas who need ESL assistance. In 2009, 10 of the 6,455 new arrival ESL learners had a language background of te reo Māori (Department of Education and Early Childhood Development 2010: 14, 46). In 2008 there were 12 Māori language new arrivals, in 2007 23, in 2006 13, in 2005 39, in both 2004 and 2003 9, and in 2002 6.[12] On the face of it, this suggests that each year since 2002 an average of 15 students from a Māori immersion education environment have moved from New Zealand to live in Victoria. A similar picture emerges in South Australia, where the advice from the Department of Education and Children's Services in November 2009 was that there were 50 students whose home language was recorded as Māori (New Zealand), of whom 35 were receiving ESL support (Jasser 2009).

Since Victoria has consistently had about 16 per cent of the Māori population in Australia, the figures suggest that, each year over the last decade, at least 95 children have moved from a Māori immersion education environment in New Zealand to live in Australia (it would be at least 95 because others have presumably moved from such schools but not needed ESL assistance). In the context of the delicate state of the reo revival in New Zealand, such losses clearly cannot help, especially since the overall number of Māori-medium students has declined each year since 2004 and the proportion of Māori students in Māori-medium education has fallen significantly since the high point of 1999 (Waitangi Tribunal 2010: x).

In sum, therefore, three key pieces of statistical evidence indicate that trans-Tasman migration is having an adverse impact on the revival of reo Māori. These are:

- the likelihood of over 10,000 speakers of te reo moving to Australia from 1986 to 2006;

- nearly 140 trained teachers speaking te reo in the home in Australia in 2006; and
- the further likelihood of around 95 schoolchildren arriving in Australia each year whose first language is Māori and whose command of English is such that they need ESL assistance.

3. Te reo Māori as a community language in Australia

Despite the ongoing movement of te reo speakers across the Tasman, and the rise in speaker numbers, te reo struggles as a community language in Australia. As can be seen in Table 4, the official number of home te reo speakers increased 66 per cent from 1986 to 2006 (from 3,979 to 6,617), but the number of Māori in Australia rose 257 per cent, from 26,035 to 92,912. Put another way, Māori were in 1986 the 34th-largest ancestry group in the Australian census and te reo was the 44th-most spoken language. By 2006 Māori had risen to the 22nd-biggest ancestry group but te reo had fallen to 56th. In 1986 the rate of home te reo use was approximately twice that of 2006. Long-term residence or birth in Australia, therefore, is clearly a factor in te reo's loss. Whereas the New Zealand born comprise 64.9 per cent of Māori in Australia (59,155 out of the 91,135 who stated a birthplace), they make up 85.2 per cent of the Māori te reo speakers. Australian-born Māori comprise 33.9 per cent of the Māori population in Australia but only 12.3 per cent of the speakers (see Table 5).

Table 4: Te reo speakers and Māori ancestry in the Australian census, 1986–2006

CENSUS YEAR	TE REO SPEAKERS	MĀORI POPULATION	% SPEAKERS*
1986	3,979†	26,035	15.3
1991	3,935	Not known	N/A
1996	4,156	Not known	N/A
2001	5,504	72,956	7.5
2006	6,617	92,912	7.1

* No ancestry question was asked at either the 1991 or 1996 Australian censuses. The te reo speakers will include some non-Māori, so the percentages are slightly higher than they would be if the comparison was direct.

† This figure includes an unknown number of temporary visitors from overseas (Lowe 1990: 8, 16).

Source: Australian Bureau of Statistics and Lowe 1990: 16.

Table 5: Speakers of te reo in Australia by birthplace and Māori ancestry, 2006

BIRTHPLACE	TE REO SPEAKERS	NOT STATED LANGUAGE	TOTAL	% SPEAKERS
New Zealand	4,348	526	59,155	7.4
Australia	628	298	30,935	2.0
Other birthplace	125	9	611	20.8*
Birthplace not stated	115	79	1,794	6.7

* The high proportion of speakers amongst those born in other countires stems from a 93.5 per cent rate of speaking Māori amongst those born in the Cook Islands. Although these people are Cook Island Māori speakers, many simply enter 'Māori' in response to the census language question.

Source: Australian Bureau of Statistics.

Sociolinguists measure language shift by the proportion of people of a particular birthplace or ancestry who do not speak their community language in the home.[13] That is, if ten per cent of the Xian[14]-born in Australia speak English only in the home, then there is a first-generation language shift rate from Xish of ten per cent. If 20 per cent of those born in Australia with (a) Xian-born parents (in 1991 and 1996) or (b) of Xian ancestry with parents born overseas (in 2001 and 2006) speak English only in the home, then there is a second-generation shift rate from Xish of 20 per cent. Third-generation shift is gauged by the proportion of those of Xian ancestry born in Australia, and whose parents were also born in Australia, who speak English only in the home.

In the case of te reo this is of course much more difficult to assess than with other community languages, because not all Māori arrive in Australia as home speakers of the language. The speaker rate of 7.4 per cent among New Zealand-born Māori, therefore, does not mean a first generation rate of shift from te reo of over 90 per cent. Instead it makes more sense to nominate a starting point for Māori migrants upon arrival in Australia and calculate the degree of shift from that. That base could be somewhere slightly above the 11.5 per cent rate of home use among migrants who arrived in Australia from 2002 to 2006. But, as we can see, this starting point would have been much higher for the most recent migrants in 1986.

Taking that into account, a conservative but reasonable estimate of the base for home te reo Māori use among all New Zealand-born Māori migrants to Australia (that is, not just those migrating now but those who have migrated in previous decades as well) would be 15 per cent. If there had been no

shift, then in 2006 15 per cent of the 58,629 New Zealand-born Māori who answered the languages question would have reported te reo use in the home – a total of 8,794 people. That there were only 4,348 New Zealand-born Māori speakers of te reo in the home suggests a first generation rate of shift from te reo of roughly 51 per cent. This rate of shift is nearly as high as that from German and Dutch, which Sandra Kipp and Michael Clyne (2003:34) have consistently found to be the highest in Australia. Shift in the second and subsequent generations confirms this picture. If 15 per cent of 30,637 Australian-born Māori who answered the languages question had spoken te reo in the home in 2006 there would have been 4,596 such speakers. However, there were only 628, representing a rate of shift (from the 15 per cent starting base) of around 86 per cent. Again, this places te reo among those community languages with the very highest rates of shift.

Why, then, is language shift so pronounced among Māori in Australia? The first and most obvious factor is that most Māori migrants already speak English as their first language. Moreover, emigrants from New Zealand have essentially moved away from the site of the struggle to revitalise te reo to an environment in which public recognition of the existence of the language barely exists. It is likely that Māori are seen as first-language speakers of English and that migration from New Zealand has seldom, if ever, been regarded as an aspect of Australian multiculturalism. As but one example, the New South Wales Government's Community Relations Commission (2010) – the agency responsible for promoting multiculturalism and community harmony in the state – offers interpreting and translation services in 100 languages, but te reo Māori is not one of them.

Practically all the factors that linguists have identified as contributing to higher rates of shift apply to Māori in Australia (for a full description of these factors see Clyne (1991), chapter 2 (36–111)). There is, for example, little cultural distance between New Zealand and Australia, notwithstanding the fact that Māori culture is Polynesian. That is, mainstream Australian culture and religion is close to that of New Zealand and not particularly foreign to most Māori immigrants. Māori in Australia can simply fit into Australian workplaces and communities more easily than many other migrant groups. In these circumstances shift away from te reo use in the home will occur in many cases as a matter of course.

The extent of exogamy is also clearly a significant factor, as inter-marriage with other ethnicities leads to much higher rates of language shift. At the 2006 Australian census – and with the exception of Thai, Indonesian,

Filipino and Japanese women – Māori rates of exogamy were the highest of any non-European ancestry groups (excluding 'American' and 'New Zealander'), with 53 per cent of first-generation partnered Māori men and 50 per cent of partnered Māori women (of sole Māori ancestry) having a spouse of a different ancestry. (Rates of intermarriage amongst those of sole Māori ethnicity in New Zealand in 2001 were lower, at 42 per cent for women and 46 per cent for men (Callister, Didham, and Potter 2005: 58–59)). In the second generation the rates of exogamy for Māori men and women were 89 and 88 per cent (Khoo, Birrell, and Heard 2009: 20–21). In that these rates measured partnered individuals who provided a sole ancestry response only, one can well imagine that rates of exogamy for all partnered Māori would be significantly higher.

Residential dispersal is another important factor, with speakers of te reo in the home in Australia probably as dispersed as the Māori population is itself. The work of geographers James Forrest, Michael Poulsen, and Ron Johnston shows that, while some clustering occurs, Māori in Sydney are much more spread throughout the population than in Auckland, for example. In New Zealand cities Māori often form 'major ethnic enclaves', but in Sydney Māori 'do not live in relatively exclusive enclaves, nor do they constitute a major component of the population within the CDs [census collection districts] in which they live' (Forrest, Poulsen, and Johnston 2009: 482).

In other words, most Māori do not congregate residentially to the extent that would promote home, neighbourhood and community language use, the vital stage 6 of Joshua Fishman's 8-stage model for reversing language shift (see below). Moreover, such concentration that does occur (at district level at least) does not necessarily have any bearing on rates of te reo use. In a statistical sub-division like Logan City in Brisbane, where the proportion of Māori who spoke te reo in 2006 was 6.1 per cent, Māori were a high 2.4 per cent of the total population. But in Goulburn in regional Victoria, where the proportion of speakers was 8.4 per cent, Māori were only 0.2 per cent of the population. Examination of te reo-speaking in smaller areas, such as the Sydney collection districts (with an average size of 600 people) used by Forrest et al, might reveal some degree of local community language use. But given the dispersal of Māori (and Māori speakers) that we already know of, this is likely to be limited.

More to the point, Māori migrants are now heading in increasing numbers to a state with a poor tradition of multilingualism, Queensland. Speakers of LOTEs have traditionally experienced higher rates of language

shift in Queensland than most other parts of Australia. According to Clyne (1991: 26), this reflects the state's convict origins, the low number of early non-English-speaking settlers, and the historical 'conservatism of central authorities in Brisbane'. In 2006 16.8 per cent of the Australian population spoke a LOTE at home, and the multiculturalism of contemporary Sydney and Melbourne was amply demonstrated by their LOTE-speaking rates of 31.4 and 27.9 per cent respectively (Clyne, Hajek, and Kipp 2008: 1). Brisbane's (2001) rate, by comparison, was only 10.1 per cent, placing it lower than Adelaide (15.3 per cent) and Perth and Canberra (14.2 per cent) (Clyne and Kipp 2002: 29).[15]

Queensland is now the most populous state for Māori in Australia, with 33.4 per cent of the Māori population at the 2006 census. But the stronghold of te reo in Australia remains New South Wales, and particularly Sydney (see Table 6). Both in 1986 and in 2006 Queensland had a lower rate of te reo speakers to Māori than every other state except Tasmania.

Table 6: Major centres of Māori population and te reo speaker numbers in Australia, 2006

STATISTICAL DISTRICT	MĀORI TE REO SPEAKERS	MĀORI POPULATION	% SPEAKERS
Sydney	1,493	22,945	6.5
Melbourne	684	11,742	5.8
Perth	531	8,427	6.3
Gold Coast	368	6,975	5.3
Brisbane	872	16,530	5.3

Source: Australian Bureau of Statistics.

All this means that the chances of te reo's 'revival' in Australia are limited. Under Fishman's 'Graded Intergenerational Disruption Scale', the highest level of reversing language shift (stage 1) is reached when the language is used in education, work spheres, mass media and governmental operations 'at higher and nationwide levels'. When a language is at its most severe state of dislocation (stage 8), it has essentially to be reconstructed and learnt anew by adults Xians. Stage 7 consists of 'cultural interaction in Xish primarily involving the community-based older generation'. Here, however, te reo in Australia instantly runs into difficulties, since there are so few grandparents

(let alone kaumātua) in what is a typically young immigrant population. Stage 6 involves 'intergenerational and demographically concentrated home-family-neighbourhood-community: the basis of mother-tongue transmission' (which reflects the founding methods of the kōhanga reo movement in New Zealand). Again, however, there are significant difficulties for te reo in Australia at this stage, given the lack of Māori neighbourhoods or communities. But for Fishman, stage 6 is a threshold to further advancement – for many languages it is the 'fulcrum' of the entire scale and a 'crucial nexus' (Fishman 2001: 466–467)

Fishman's model is routinely applied to immigrant communities and indigenous communities but never, it seems, to indigenous groups that have emigrated. Clearly, te reo in Australia combines the challenges of a struggling indigenous language as well as a struggling community language. It accordingly lacks many of the basics required to even begin the process of reversing language shift, and diglossia in Māori and English seems a rather distant ambition. Moreover, the path to reach diglossia and beyond would require the kind of self-segregation from the rest of Australian society that Māori immigrants would hardly favour. As Clyne (2001: 388) puts it,

> Language shift can be reversed in Australia but it has not been reversed very much. Many of the measures discussed in Fishman's writings are not favoured by either ethnic communities and families or by wider Australian society because they detract from the interactionist aspects of multiculturalism and from desired socioeconomic mobility, at least by the second generation. The crucial Stage 6 is therefore difficult to achieve.

To be fair, most te reo advocates in Australia are realistic about what can be attained. Within that, of course, are bottom lines. One te reo teacher interviewed remarked that 'without our language we basically, in my opinion, cease to exist'. Another's immediate response to being asked about the future of the language in Australia was 'my hope is that we never lose our reo'. There are, however, some aspects to being Māori in Australia that do count in te reo's favour. Since the vitality of any community language ultimately depends on the motivation of its potential community of speakers, at least in Australia there exists among many middle-aged and older Māori a strong reconnection drive that compels them to seek out opportunities to learn te reo. The interviewees stressed repeatedly, for example, that there is never any shortage of students seeking to enrol in their kura reo. As a news story (Waatea News

Update) put it in April 2008, 'A Sydney-based teacher of Māori says there are no problems attracting students … but finding teachers is a different story.'

4. Support for te reo Māori in Australia?

Te reo Māori has become internationalised. Besides Australia, there will be other, smaller groups of speakers around the world, but by far the most significant community of speakers beyond New Zealand's shores exists across the Tasman. The question arises as to how and whether these people should be supported by either the Government or Māori in New Zealand.

Other countries have undoubtedly grappled with this issue and decided to support their national language in an overseas context. Aside from obvious examples such as the British Council, Alliance Française, and the Goethe Institute (where the context is admittedly quite different), the Italian Government has allocated considerable funds to the teaching of Italian in Australian schools and the Welsh Language Board – the work of which is relatively comparable to that of Te Taura Whiri i Te Reo Māori – funds a Welsh language school in London (Welsh Language Board no date).

There is no mention of Māori moving, living or returning from overseas in the Government's 2003 Māori Language Strategy (MLS). In theory of course there is no exclusion of them either. Thus goal 1's aim that 'The majority of Māori will be able to speak Māori to some extent by 2028' (Te Puni Kōkiri 2003: 19) could conceivably include Māori living in Australia, although it was doubtless never the intention that it would. Overall, the Government's consideration of requests for assistance from Māori in Australia wishing to promote or teach te reo seems ad hoc, or at least not governed by a coherent strategy. If any general rule is applied it appears to be, as far as the author is aware, the principle that only those living in New Zealand should benefit from New Zealand taxpayer funds.

There have, however, been a number of attempts by organisations involved in teaching te reo in New Zealand to extend opportunities for learning te reo across the Tasman. Te Taura Whiri has, despite the silence of the MLS, been relatively amenable to supporting the upkeep of te reo Māori in Australia. In describing its plans several years ago to establish a series of 'Puna Reo' or regional entities equipped to support iwi language initiatives, a Te Taura Whiri paper (no date: 3, 5) noted that 'overseas communities' would not be excluded from the Puna Reo network, and named Sydney as a location where a Puna

Reo would 'be situated in the future'. In 2006 Te Taura Whiri granted $6,000 from its Mā Te Reo fund (that supported local-level community language initiatives) to the Te Ātaarangi Māori language school in Sydney (the New South Wales Māori School of Learning – NSWMSL). The NSWMSL's application (2006: 7) had included the statement that:

> For the Maaori population in Australia to be largely non-Maaori speaking can only have negative consequences for Maaori in New Zealand. Therefore it is in the best interests of Maaori in New Zealand to do what they can to assist Maaori in Australia in learning Te Reo. We believe that with such large numbers of Maaori in Australia and with the population mobility between New Zealand and Australia, any money spent furthering Te Reo education in Australia is vital as a part of the overall picture of Maaori development.[16]

Te Wānanga o Aotearoa offered courses in te reo at Sydney University in 2004 which – according to the NSWMSL application (2006:1) – attracted 'a huge amount of interest' before being withdrawn 'due to unforeseen circumstances'.[17] In August 2009 Te Wānanga o Raukawa held hui in locations in south-east Queensland to discuss plans to deliver a te reo programme in Brisbane. And in an act of particularly significant recognition, Te Ātaarangi held its annual hui whānui (national meeting) in Sydney in late October-early November 2009.

There was a divided reaction amongst New Zealand survey respondents as to whether any government assistance should be offered to te reo speakers in Australia. Many felt that reduced access to learning te reo was a price the emigrants would have to pay. Public funds, these respondents thought, should only be available to those remaining in New Zealand. Moreover, some argued that broadening government funding to Māori in Australia would inevitably weaken te reo in New Zealand. One secondary school te reo teacher wrote that 'Pena ka kore e taea te whiwhi enei putea e ngā māori tūturu o te kainga nei. Me pehea kē kā whiwhi putea mai i tāwahi i Ahitereiria' ('If the local people back home can't get decent access to these funds how on earth can people in Australia get any access to them?').

Others, however, felt that assistance should be provided to those wishing to maintain or learn te reo in Australia. For example, another secondary school te reo teacher said that 'With things being really tight right now throughout the world, I understand that this might not happen but I feel we're responsible for our language and tikanga where ever our people are'. None of this latter group,

however, seemed unquestioning of how much funding should be available and how it should be used. Their view seemed to be that money should be made available if it was in the interests of the language.

The Australian interviewees also had generally mixed views on the subject. Some saw support for te reo as more of a New Zealand Government responsibility than an Australian one. As one te reo teacher remarked, 'we can't really expect the Government here to give us back what the New Zealand Government took away. So as far as I'm concerned if there are any funds to be given by a government it should be our government giving the funds.' By contrast another teacher said that 'if it's going to deprive people in New Zealand, no, it's not a good idea. … I mean it's like cutting your nose off to spite your face really.' Another felt that 'it wouldn't … be fair … in that hard-earned taxpayers' money from Aotearoa is for Aotearoa. And for those of us Māori that shift across here, why should we get a slice of the pie while we're in a country that has really no connection or obligation to home?'

Indeed, the question legitimately arises as to whether New Zealand Government spending on the maintenance of te reo Māori in Australia is justifiable. The fact is that te reo in Australia is subject to very high rates of shift, and financially supporting the language will not change the factors contributing to this like rates of exogamy and residential dispersal. Such is the struggle to maintain te reo in New Zealand that scholars have occasionally proposed radically concentrating revitalisation efforts in order to at least ensure pockets of success. For example, economists François Grin and François Vaillancourt (1998: 233) proposed addressing teacher supply problems by temporarily shifting all teaching resources to Māori-medium schools. And linguist Winifred Bauer (2008: 67) went further with her suggestion for saving te reo as a living language:

> I believe that our best strategy for saving te reo Māori would be to put our efforts into fostering Māori in those communities which have the best chance of delivering eighty percent of the community able to speak Māori: I am suggesting putting all our eggs in one or two baskets, and pouring our resources in abundance into those communities … . The resources I am talking about include not only money, but also, crucially, Māori immersion schooling right through the secondary school period, provided by the best Māori teachers we can find.

Grin, Vaillancourt and Bauer would almost certainly see New Zealand investment in te reo in Australia as a case of spreading resources too thinly.

That said, the kura reo that operate in Australia, and cater for the interested and reconnecting middle-aged Māori migrants, serve a purpose in keeping the profile of te reo alive in Australia. They will never perform a vital role in safeguarding the language's very existence, but they do make the most visible contribution to the cause for the one in six Māori who now live in Australia. Agencies like Te Taura Whiri providing them with occasional support would be symbolic as much as anything, but symbols can be powerful indeed. Therefore, a small amount of New Zealand government support for the learning and use of te reo Māori in Australia seems justifiable, particularly if it takes the form of practical assistance with community language planning rather than simple cash contributions. For example, one Australian interviewee said what was needed was not so much funding but 'a bit of direction':

> It's the knowledge, and the templates, those kinds of resources – and perhaps just … someone to come and say 'Well this is what you can do'. And then sow a seed and pick someone here that is able to deliver it and just keep in touch with them from time to time and do it that way, if that makes sense.

In the meantime, the agencies responsible for te reo in New Zealand might be more explicit about where Māori in Australia stand in relation to strategies such as the MLS or pūtea (funds) such as Mā Te Reo.[18] Given the importance placed by the Waitangi Tribunal on teacher supply, and the fact that some 140 trained te reo-speaking teachers were living in Australia in 2006, the current sufficiency of incentives to train and make a career out of te reo teaching in New Zealand may also need to be reconsidered. Most importantly, the authorities might at least acknowledge that trans-Tasman migration is having an impact on te reo's revival. To return to the metaphor in the title, emigration is probably not endangering the entire tree, but it is certainly limiting its growth.

Acknowledgments

I would like to thank: Paul Callister and two anonymous reviewers for providing helpful comments on a draft of this paper; Paul Callister, Robert Didham, Tahu Kukutai, Winifred Bauer, and Richard Benton for commenting on an earlier working paper that provided the basis for this article; Robert Didham and Jamie Newell for supplying, respectively, New Zealand and Australian census data; the Australian Bureau of Statistics, which gave some direct assistance with census data; Piripi

Walker and Ian Cormack for their translation work; the Foundation for Research, Science and Technology for funding this research; and all survey respondents and interviewees in both New Zealand and Australia.

Notes

1 This proverbial saying about the dangers of being divided was a surveyed te reo teacher's description of the impact on te reo Māori of trans-Tasman migration. The translation into English of this and other survey responses was by Piripi Walker with reference to Ian Cormack.
2 Te Ātaarangi is a community-based Māori language learning programme for adults; kōhanga reo are pre-school language 'nests'; and kura kaupapa Māori are Māori language immersion schools.
3 This claim, known also as Wai 11, led to the Tribunal's landmark 1986 report, *Report of the Waitangi Tribunal on the Te Reo Maori Claim*.
4 Benton wrote that of the approximately 64,000 fluent and 30,000 marginal speakers of Māori in the 1970s, just over 15,000 of them would be left in New Zealand by 2011 after '[t]aking into account death and emigration to foreign countries'. Waite similarly remarked that 'It is doubtful that the 3,000 children who currently leave kōhanga reo each year speaking Maori are enough to replace those speakers lost through death or emigration.'
5 There is no discussion of the matter, for example, in Benton and Benton (1999); Benton and Benton (2001); Reedy (2000); Harlow (2003); Spolsky (2003); Spolsky (2005); Bauer (2008); or in the various publications of Te Puni Kōkiri (2002 and 2008) concerning the health of te reo.
6 This article is based on research undertaken for the Institute of Policy Studies-led project 'Education capital formation, employment, migration, gender, work-life balance and missing men', which is funded by the Foundation for Research, Science and Technology. Census data were provided directly by project team members Robert Didham of Statistics New Zealand (who supplied the New Zealand census data) and Jamie Newell of Monitoring and Evaluation Research Associates (who supplied the Australian census data via an Australian Bureau of Statistics Table Builder licence). Some Australian census data were also purchased directly from the Australian Bureau of Statistics.
7 The use of 'community language' adopts the common term for 'migrant' or 'ethnic' languages in Australia (see Clyne (1991): 3). It is not meant to imply that te reo is spoken widely in 'the community' in Australia.
8 At the 2000 US census there were 401,162 native Hawaiians, 59.7 per cent of whom (239,655) lived in Hawai'i , which was down from 66 per cent in 1990 (Kauanui 2007: 144). Of the 161,507 on the mainland, 60,048 lived in California (Kanaiaupuni and Melahn 2001: 1–2). At the same census 27,160 people over the age of five were recorded as speaking Hawaiian in the home, of whom only

19,045 or 70.1 per cent lived in Hawai'i (United States Census Bureau: Census 2000 Special Tabulation 224). If one assumes for argument's sake that all 27,160 speakers were native Hawaiians, the speaker rate amongst native Hawaiians aged five and over in Hawai'i was a minimum of 7.9 per cent and amongst mainland native Hawaiians it was a minimum of 5.0 per cent (it is the minimum because the speaker total of course excludes those under five, whose numbers in both Hawai'i and on the mainland are for present purposes unknown).

9 This included both an unknown number of Cook Island Māori and temporary migrants from New Zealand.

10 A breakdown of the ancestry of the 1986 speakers is not available, so this calculation uses comparable 2006 data.

11 The spelling, punctuation, and grammar of survey respondents' written comments are presented as the respondents submitted them.

12 Reports for all these years are available at http://www.education.vic.gov.au/studentlearning/programs/esl/resources/onlineeslreports.htm

13 The 1991 and 1996 Australian censuses did not include an ancestry question but did ask country of birth of parents. The 2001 and 2006 censuses asked for ancestry but only asked whether parents were born in Australia or overseas. This makes the identification of the ancestry of those born in multi-ethnic and multi-lingual countries impossible in the earlier two censuses, while it is equally impossible to know the connection between individual parents' birth countries and respondents' ancestry and language use in the two later censuses. Despite these difficulties, socio-linguists are able to depict a very reasonable picture of community language maintenance and shift.

14 This adopts Joshua Fishman's terminology in his renowned 1991 work *Reversing Language Shift*, where 'Xish' is the language Xians struggle to maintain in the face of domination by Yish and/or Yians. Needless to say, Yish is English for all community languages in Australia, although this is not necessarily the case for Aboriginal languages, where instead shift initially may be occurring to another Aboriginal language (Lo Bianco and Rhydwen 2001: 399).

15 The LOTE-speaking rate in the home in the Northern Territory outside Darwin is 41.0 per cent, which of course relates to indigenous language use.

16 This application, dated 12 May 2006, was supplied to the author by the NSWMSL committee. The NSWMSL applied to the Mā Te Reo fund for a further grant in 2009 but were unsuccessful.

17 Te Wānanga o Aotearoa's withdrawal was partly the catalyst for the formation of the NSWMSL.

18 2010 was the final year of the Mā Te Reo fund, which was established in 2001. It is unclear whether it will be replaced with a similar fund.

References

Baldauf Jr., Richard B. 2005. 'Coordinating government and community support for community language teaching in Australia: overview with special attention to New South Wales.' *The International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism* 8(2–3): 132–144.

Bauer, Winifred. 2008. 'Is the health of te reo Māori improving?' *Te Reo* 51: 33–73.

Benton, Nena and Richard Benton. 1999. *Revitalizing the Māori Language: Unpublished Consultants Report to the Māori Development Education Commission*. Ngāruawāhia: Alta Vista Pacifica Tāpui.

Benton, Richard A. 1997. *The Maori Language: Dying or Reviving?* Wellington: New Zealand Council for Educational Research.

Benton, R. and N. Benton. 2001. 'RLS in Aotearoa/New Zealand 1989–1999.' In Joshua Fishman (ed) *Can Threatened Languages Be Saved? Reversing Language Shift, Revisited: A 21st Century Perspective*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters: 423–450.

Callister, Paul, Robert Didham and Deborah Potter. 2005. *Ethnic Intermarriage in New Zealand*. Wellington: Statistics New Zealand.

Clyne, Michael. 1991. *Community Languages: The Australian Experience*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Clyne, M. 2001. 'Can the shift from immigrant languages be reversed in Australia?' In Joshua A. Fishman (ed) *Can Threatened Languages Be Saved? Reversing Language Shift, Revisited: A 21st Century Perspective*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters: 364–390.

Clyne, Michael, John Hajek, and Sandra Kipp. 2008. 'Tale of two multilingual cities in a multilingual continent.' *People and Place* 16(3): 1–8.

Clyne, Michael and Sandra Kipp. 2002. 'Australia's changing language demography.' *People and Place* 10(3): 29–35.

Community Relations Commission. 2010 (last updated 3 December 2010). 'Our languages' (http://www.crc.nsw.gov.au/services/language_services/languages accessed 15 December 2010).

Department of Education and Early Childhood Development. 20010. *ESL Report 2009: English as a Second Language in Victorian Government Schools*. Melbourne: Department of Education and Early Childhood Development.

Fishman, Joshua A. 1991. *Reversing Language Shift: Theoretical and Empirical Foundations of Assistance to Threatened Languages*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Fishman, J. A. 2001. 'From theory to practice (and vice versa): review, reconsideration and reiteration.' In Joshua A. Fishman (ed) *Can Threatened Languages Be Saved? Reversing Language Shift, Revisited: A 21st Century Perspective*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters: 451–483.

Forrest, James, Michael Poulsen and Ron Johnston. 2009. 'Temporary and disadvantaged? The economic and spatial assimilation of New Zealand Maori in Sydney.' *Population, Space and Place* 15(6): 475–492.

Grin, François and François Vaillancourt. 1998. *Language Revitalisation Policy: An Analytical Survey: Theoretical Framework, Policy Experience and Application to Te Reo Maori*. Wellington: The Treasury.

Haig, Robert. 2010. *Working Across the Ditch: New Zealanders Working in Australia*. Wellington: Department of Labour.

Hamer, Paul. 2007. *Māori in Australia: Ngā Māori i Te Ao Moemoeā*. Wellington: Te Puni Kōkiri.

Hamer, Paul. 2007/2008. 'One in six? The rapid growth of the Māori population in Australia.' *New Zealand Population Review* 33/34: 153–176.

Harlow, Ray. 2003. 'Issues in Māori language planning and revitalisation.' *Journal of Maori and Pacific Development* 4(1): 32–43.

Jasser, Dalica (Acting Assistant Manager, Data Management & Reporting, Department of Education and Children's Services). 11 November 2009. Email correspondence.

Kanaiaupuni, Shawn Malia and Chris Melahn. 2001. 'Census 2000 Highlights: Hawaiians in the United States and Hawai'i'. *PASE Data Report* 2001–02:06.

Kauanui, J Kēhaulani. 2007. 'Diasporic Deracination and "Off–Island" Hawaiians'. *The Contemporary Pacific* 19(1): 138–160.

Khoo, Siew-Ean, Bob Birrell and Genevieve Heard. 2009. 'Intermarriage by birthplace and ancestry in Australia.' *People and Place* 17(1): 15–28.

Kipp, Sandra. 2007. 'Community languages and the 2001 Australian census.' In Anne Pauwels, Joanne Winter, and Joseph Lo Bianco (eds) *Maintaining Minority Languages in Transnational Contexts*. Basingstoke and New York: Palgrave Macmillan: 13–29.

Kipp, Sandra and Michael Clyne. 2003. 'Trends in the shift from community languages: insights from the 2001 census.' *People and Place* 11(1): 33–41.

Lo Bianco, J and M Rhydwen. 2001. 'Is the extinction of Australia's indigenous languages inevitable?' In Joshua A. Fishman (ed) *Can Threatened Languages Be Saved? Reversing Language Shift, Revisited: A 21st Century Perspective*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters: 391–422.

Lowe, Jeremy. 1990. *The Australian Maori Population: Nga Maori Ki Ahiterēria*. Wellington: New Zealand Planning Council.

New South Wales Māori School of Learning. 12 May 2006. Mā Te Reo fund application.

Pink, Brian (Australian Statistician). 2007. *Census of Population and Housing: ABS Views on Content and Procedures*. Canberra: Australian Bureau of Statistics.

Reedy, Tamati. 2000. 'Te Reo Māori: The Past 20 Years and Looking Forward.' *Oceanic Linguistics* 39(1): 157–169.

Spolsky, Bernard. 2003. 'Reassessing Māori regeneration.' *Language in Society* 32(4): 553–578.

Spolsky, Bernard. 2005. 'Māori lost and regained.' In A Bell, R Harlow and D Starks (eds) *Languages of New Zealand*. Wellington: Victoria University Press: 67–85.

Te Puni Kōkiri. 2002. *The Health of the Māori Language in 2001*. Wellington: Te Puni Kōkiri.
Te Puni Kōkiri. 2003. *Te Rautaki Reo Māori: The Māori Language Strategy*. Wellington: Te Puni Kōkiri.
Te Puni Kōkiri. 2008. *Te Oranga o te Reo Māori 2006/ The Health of the Māori Language in 2006*. Wellington: Te Puni Kōkiri.
Te Taura Whiri i Te Reo Māori. No date. *Puna Reo 2000–2005*. Wellington: Te Taura Whiri i Te Reo Māori.
United States Census Bureau. No date. Census 2000 Special Tabulation 224: Detailed Language Spoken at Home for the Population 5 Years and Over.
Waatea News Update. 1 April 2008. 'Te Reo courses find demand across Tasman.'
Waitangi Tribunal. 1986. *Report of the Waitangi Tribunal on the Te Reo Maori Claim*. Wellington: Government Printer.
Waitangi Tribunal. 2010. *Wai 262 Report: Te Reo Māori*. Wellington: Waitangi Tribunal (pre-publication).
Waite, Jeffrey. 1992. *Aoteareo: Speaking for Ourselves – Part A: The Overview*. Wellington: Ministry of Education.
Welsh Language Board. No date. 'Are there any Welsh medium schools outside Wales?' (http://www.byig-wlb.org.uk/english/faq/pages/arethereanywelshmediumschoolsoutsidewales.aspx accessed 14 February 2010).