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This article is an attempt to confront the intricacies and the problems inherent in interpreting history, with reference to a specific case. It starts with the story of a school and its teachers as told in its centennial history. Its focus is on the schoolmistress who was responsible for opening the school. The school is a Native School and history has ‘told’ us certain things about those who taught in the Native Schools system in nineteenth-century New Zealand. The young woman ‘must’ therefore be Pakeha, and her teaching practices must be seen accordingly. She is, in fact, Maori. The article traces the processes through which ethnic identity was defined at this period of New Zealand’s history, and the implications of this for understanding the role of this young woman as an early educator in the state system of Native Schools. It offers just another interpretation of Mary Ann’s story.

INTRODUCTION

In recent decades challenges to traditional history have seen an increasing concern to acknowledge the multiple levels at which subjective understandings can intervene in creating and in informing subsequent readings and recordings of historical events. At the fundamental level at which historical events occur, dominant systems of meaning, values and actions shape not only commonsense interpretations of the world and the way it is organised, but also the way it is written about. Such interpretations are shifting and open to challenge, however, and the lens through which historical documents are later read reshape the story that is told. With reference to the early history of a Native School in New Zealand, this article explores and demonstrates the complexity of perspective and interpretation available to observers, recorders and readers of historical events.

The study is centred on ‘two’ women who are identified, in the centennial jubilee booklet, as the first and second teachers at the Waihake School in the Bay of Islands, New Zealand. It is indicated that they were both sole charge teachers — from 1876-1877 and
1877-1883 respectively. The school is a Native School and history has alerted us to certain 'facts' about those who taught in the Native Schools system in nineteenth-century New Zealand. Although we are told little of the 'first' teacher, we take it for granted that she is Pakeha. The 'second' teacher must also be Pakeha. There is nothing in the early inspection reports on the school to suggest otherwise and her teaching practices are judged accordingly. These 'two' women are in fact one — Mary Ann — and she is Maori. The article seeks to determine why Mary Ann's identity has been so constituted. It draws on family records to add a further dimension to her story and to make visible the contradictions implicit in her lived experience as a ‘half-caste European’. It also discusses the processes through which ethnic identity was officially defined at this period of New Zealand's history, and the implications of this for understanding the role of this young woman as an early educator in the state system of Native Schools.

Despite the current debates that have developed around the nature and validity of 'history per se' and 'modernist renditions of history' (Jenkins 1995, p.10) in particular, archival records of the past, however constituted or historised, remain essential to the historian's task. Hayden White, in his discussion of history as narrative discourse, refers to the elements of events that will be discovered from historical records as 'found' or 'known' (1987, pp.ix-xi). For White, however, the context in which the 'found' components of history have taken place can never be recaptured and must therefore be 'invented' or 'imagined', thus obscure the true significance or meaning of the events. Jenkins (1991, p.69) suggests we need to become 'reflective historians', to adopt a 'reflective methodology', taking and acknowledging our idiosyncratic position. James Banks poses a different kind of problem. While acknowledging that historical knowledge reflects both the reality observed and the subjectivity of the knower, he feels that '[t]o attempt to clearly distinguish the objective and subjective elements of knowledge ... to label objective knowledge legitimate and subjective knowledge mere interpretation ... is inconsistent with the ways that human beings know' (Banks 1995, p.15).

One way forward, if not a complete solution, is to follow the advice of Petersen (1992) and broaden the scope of understanding by drawing on a wide range of documentary and other sources. Petersen acknowledges that, because we do not share the same 'universe of discourse' as those who have created the primary documents that become so central to our study, or of those for whom such documents were prepared, we do not share the same assumptions that would enable us to make sense of the 'hints' or the 'sciences' embodied in them. He acknowledges also the necessity of recognising the limitations imposed on historians because of this, but suggests that we can be drawn closer into that 'universe of discourse' by exploring widely various documents of the period (p.34). In this way the historian is better equipped to establish context, to interrogate ideological and discursive underpinnings of structurally and culturally produced knowledge:

You have to read widely in the records of the period so that your general knowledge is adequate to catching hints. You have to ask: What did this person know: what was their angle of vision? And you have to decide who it was they were writing for and what

that person's angle of vision is likely to have been. You have to try and enter the universe of discourse shared by the writer and reader at the time ... (p.35)

WHO IS MARY ANN?

A rich document bank holds just as much potential for enhanced accuracy as it does for misinterpretation, and it is often where records are scarce that their true value can be fully appreciated. The representation of Mary Ann as two people in the history of Waikare School is a case in point. The jubilee booklet tells of the establishment of the school:

The history of Waikare School commenced in 1876 with the establishment of a ‘Native School’ at Waithaha sited on land known today as the Pataiohoi Block. With a Miss Stephenson as appointed teacher the school was underway. The erection and repair of buildings at Government expense cost £287-6-9 plus £50 contributed by the Natives.

After noting early problems relating to attendance, the arrival of the 'new' teacher is noted: 'July 1877 saw a revival in numbers attending with the new appointed teacher, Mrs. M.A. Horsley' (Waikare Jubilee Booklet 1976).

The setting aside of the school reserve in 1876 can be verified through Native Land Court records, but details relating to the first four years in the history of the school are scarce. The first official mention of the school simply includes it within a list of Native Schools and notes the presence of a Miss Stephenson as its teacher (AHR 1876 E-6). The absence of further comment is probably due to the fact that the school opened during a period of transition in New Zealand’s educational history as the discrete provincial arrangements were collapsed and replaced by a centralised system. Although the Native Schools had been controlled by a central state agency from their inception in 1867 (and in fact constituted the first national state education system in New Zealand, some ten years prior to the centralising of the 'mainstream' system for settler children in 1877), their administrative arrangements were still undergoing change in preparation for their transfer from the Native Department to the newly establishing Education Department (see Stephenson 2000, pp.224-230). Thus, contrary to what occurred for most Native Schools, the officially recorded details relating to the establishment of the school at Waithaha, which was to become Waikare, and to the formalisation of the appointment of the first teacher, were presented in retrospect, in conjunction with the inaugural report on the school by James Pope in 1880, shortly after his appointment as permanent full-time inspector of Native Schools. These details often appear as fragmentary notes in response to intra-departmental queries. Mary Ann is not mentioned at all by her maiden name in the early archival records, although a note by Pope in response to a memo from the Inspector General states that 'Mrs Horsley was appointed in July 77' (National Archives Auckland: BAAA 1001/627b). In July 1877, however, Mrs Horsley was still Miss Stephenson, her marriage to George Horsley being officiated at the Russell Registry Office on 22 April 1878 (Marriage Certificate No. 164).

In 1964, in anticipation of their up-coming centennial celebrations, the secretary of the Waikare School Committee approached Alex Khoury, an executive officer in the
Native Schools service, for information relating to the school's history. Drawing his information from the available Education Department records, Mr Khouri identified Mrs Horsley as the sole teacher at the school up until her resignation in August 1883 (NAA: BCDQ A739/1550a). Why, then, did the compilers of the jubilee history note the contribution of Miss Stephenson and also reproduce Pope's note relating to Mrs Horsley's appointment in 1877, and so deduce that there were two teachers? Here local memory supports the earlier recorded detail, as evidenced in the emphatic pronouncement made by the oldest surviving kuia, 'Mary Ann Stephenson was the first teacher of that school' (Pers. comm. 25/11/00). Within a context grounded in oral tradition, confusion within the written documents was dismissed. Such authority renders problematic the tendency to equate anything not directly experienced as event or retained directly within the span of memory, as being subject to 'some form of hearsay' (Barrzun 1950, p.31). While unable to unravel the intricacies of the appointment made 100 years earlier, the school committee in its report was true to the collective memory of the community, as passed on through the spoken word. For the people this was indisputable evidence, albeit that, in the light of further analysis, it is evidence that at one and the same time gives a more accurate and a less accurate version than that provided by the 'official' documents.

'A "HALF-CASTE" EUROPEAN'

If the foregoing discussion goes some way to explaining the confusion over the physical identity of the first teacher at Waiikare, it neither raises questions about nor acknowledges the significance of her cultural identity. In a very real sense, therefore, it misrepresents Mary Ann just as definitively as have the commentaries of the past. So who, besides being Mrs Horsley née Stephenson, was Mary Ann (Annie), and what was it about this young woman that rendered her involvement with the Waiikare Native School so interesting?

Annie's birth in 1845 pre-dates registration requirements. She was the eldest child of the family of Samuel Stephenson and Hira Moewaka, to whom eight sons and seven daughters were born between the years 1845-1868. Samuel Stephenson arrived at Kororareka in the Bay of Islands in 1832 where, in collaboration with James Clendon, he became a successful and respected merchant and trader. As noted by one visiting supplier, 'these two men [were] the first in the place for business and character' (Peabody Museum, Salem: M 636 1833 M7), a not too difficult distinction to achieve given the dissolute environment of the early trading centre. Such an environment was threatening at both a personal and a business level and the arrival of the British Resident, James Busby, in the Bay of Islands in 1833 was seen as an opportunity by concerned residents of Kororareka to establish some form of law and order. In May 1834, 21 residents, including Samuel Stephenson and James Clendon, petitioned as 'His Britannic Majesty's Subjects in the Bay of Islands' that 'His Britannic Majesty's Government will be most graciously pleased to afford them the necessary protection for their lives and property' (cited in Stephenson & Stephenson 1993, p.11). Matters did not improve, however, and it was left to the settlers themselves to seek a solution to their concerns. In 1838 the Kororareka Association was formed by the local householders 'in consequence of the absence of any Magisterial Authority in the Bay of Islands, to frame Laws for the better regulation of matters connected with the welfare of the Inhabitants, both European and Native' (Auckland Museum: MS DU418). The other precaution that many of the wealthier inhabitants took was to locate themselves in bays away from the main settlement. In 1836 Samuel Stephenson purchased land a mile away at Tapaeke on which he built his first family home (NA Wellington: Old Land Claims).

Hira Moewaka was from Waiakaire, of Te Kapotai hapu (family group), and for a time had lived with early Russell settlers Mr and Mrs George Greenway (AM: MS 340, p.100). Within the Pakeha community she was commonly known by the English name Ada Charlotte and it is this name that appears on official Pakeha registration certificates. In 1844 at age 18 she married Samuel Stephenson in a Maori ceremony. Although Samuel was an active member of the Church of England congregation at Kororareka, church edict imposed sanctions on marriages between Maori and Pakeha, an issue that was formally relaxed somewhat in 1847 when Bishop Selwyn, charging his clergy to ensure that the formality of marriage that were required in England were recognised in New Zealand, allowed them discretion to marry English men and Maori women who had 'lived faithfully together as man and wife' (Morrell 1973, p.275). It is not known why Samuel and Moewaka chose to remarry by English rite in 1852, but by that time there were several children who were officially classified as 'European' and who were beginning to receive a Pakeha-style formal education.

As the oldest child Annie was first formally pronounced 'half-caste' European' before her first birthday. While census data in New Zealand was not collated on a systematic basis until the 1850s, there were some official and unofficial attempts to calculate population statistics much earlier. In May 1846 James Clendon reported to the governor on a census taken by him of the European population in the North. The statistics were compiled under two categories — European and half-caste, but a further method of classification was operational. Concluding his covering letter, Clendon clarified that only those living as European were included in his count, thus creating a 'European' identity for children of mixed parentage who were ostensibly living a Pakeha lifestyle. His entries for the Stephenson family are clear:

Stephenson Samuel; N. [Native] Wife; 1 child ['=] 1 half-caste, 1 European. (Whangarei Library Archive)

Within this count of the European population Moewaka was not included, but Mary Ann, a 'half-caste' child, officially joined the European population of New Zealand, her identity imposed through ideologically conceived notions of 'race' and 'civilisation' that saw a Pakeha lifestyle as a suitable socialising force for a European population.

This mode of categorising Maori was to be reinforced by the formalising of census-taking procedures across both Maori and Pakeha populations. It was also written into the legal statues of the country and used variously by the state in their assimilatory agenda and in their drive to access Maori land (Stewart-Harawira 1993, pp.28-29).
earliest comprehensive census data relating to Maori was taken over a one-year period and dated 24 March 1858 (RCSP 1988, p.51). It gave a simple recording of the total Maori population, with some crude district specific indication of age groupings (Pool 1977, p.55). Regular census taking began in 1874 and the data compiled in that year returned a record of the total Maori population further differentiated by lineage and by living arrangements. The statistical breakdown into ‘Maoris plus “half-castes living as Maoris” and “half-castes living as Europeans”’ (p.237) indicates that, at the time that Annie was about to embark on her teaching career, procreation between Maori and Pakeha continued as an issue for official definition and statistical classification. It continued, moreover, to cast her unproblematically as European. It has been suggested furthermore that, because entries between 1874 and 1921 were recorded by the official enumerator rather than by those being recorded, conditions were created whereby identities could be defined and/or imposed by subjective assessment (p.57). In 1874 the enumerator for the Bay of Islands was James Hamlyn Greenway, whose parents had played a significant role in the socialisation of a young Moewaka. This was yet another check against Annie’s Maori heritage being acknowledged.

THE ENGLISH INFLUENCE

From the outset there was a strong hint of a continuing English influence over Annie’s upbringing. Her given names follow the English familial tradition, Mary from her English aunt and Ann from her paternal grandmother, who had been brought by Samuel to the Bay of Islands but who had died before Annie’s birth. This influence was maintained through church associations and through her schooling.

Missionaries were the first Pakeha educators in New Zealand and the isolated nature of the early settlement that had developed meant that education provision was similarly fragmented and unsystematic. Church leaders had been able to assume a remarkably uncontested and authoritative role in defining Pakeha ideals of the future New Zealand society and in having them expressed in substantial schooling activity for Maori and in isolated initiatives for children of early Pakeha settlers. Just as many of the settler families had elected to reside in bays away from the Kororareka township, early attempts at schooling their children were similarly kept isolated from the town centre, either at home, away in mission boarding schools, or sometimes overseas (King 1989, p.8). The majority of the children who remained in the township were Maori, of Maori/Pakeha descent, or of working-class Pakeha families and there was some attempt by the competing denominational groups to provide for their education. While the French Roman Catholic mission, attempting to win converts in an environment hostile to its presence, established ‘several classes for anyone of any age or race who wished to attend’ from 1839, the Church of England endeavoured to establish a school for ‘poor whites’, but met with little success (p.10).

The situation changed somewhat in the mid-1840s. Maori resistance to Pakeha activities subsequent to the signing of the Treaty of Waitangi was manifested in Hone Heke’s symbolic felling of the flagstaff on the Maiki Hill above the township and the devastation of the town in 1845. On rebuilding, the town lost its focus as a significant commercial centre and became less hostile to family life. Accordingly Samuel and Moewaka moved their family home to a waterfront property, close to their trading store in Kororareka. When a ‘school for young ladies’ was established for both boarders and day pupils by a Mrs Woolley of Prospect House, Tapeka, Marie King notes, ‘the older daughters of Samuel Stephenson seemed to have walked over the Flagstaff saddle and down to Tapeka each day’ (p.14). The boys received their education in a boarding and day facility for boys that was established in the town around 1853-54. This school operated as a state-subsidised church school under an educational scheme initiated by George Grey in 1847. The prime recipients of its educational activities were Maori and poor Pakeha children, but it also catered for day pupils from well-known families, who paid a fee (pp.12-14). It was run by Frank Gould, a minister of religion. The school gained a reputation for the quality of instruction it offered in music.

Music was a significant part of the Stephenson family life. The girls were proficient musicians and there is a record of at least one daughter, Minnie, teaching piano (AM: MS 340, p.98). Louisa Worsfold explains how this interest in music made the Stephenson home a favourite for musical soirees:

Stephenson’s place was known as ‘The House’ — to all the township. They were very musical — both on the piano and singing — the boys had been taught sight-singing by Mr Gould, when they attended his school. They all had good voices which would blend with anyone’s — musical people of other places who came to Russell from time to time were surprised at the quality and of the training they must have received, because no matter who might get out of tune, those voices never varied from the right note. ... There used to be great gatherings at ‘The House’.

When there was going to be a concert, an amount of practising would take place; I can still hear the clattering up and down the stairs! The frocks that were made and pressed or renovated — white muslin was the proper thing for any gathering of young people. Ribbons were gay; well dressed hair was a noticeable feature, always shiny and lots of plaits coiled round the head, and those girls had such great quantities of it. (pp.94-95)

‘The House’ sported other European characteristics and again it is from the voice of Louisa Worsfold, a self-proclaimed ‘special chum’ of the much older Carrie Stephenson, that we can build up a picture:

Between the store and the living section was a 4-roomed cottage — with the kitchen, Mr and Mrs Stephenson’s room off that — then the dining-room, with a small verandah into an orange-grove, this room also off the kitchen in another corner, and another little sitting room. The little dining-room is where we had our tea ...

Then a few paces away from this cottage was the rest of the quarters. It had a brick oven ... where the family bread was cooked — you can imagine that it was needed when that family was together! There were rows of clothes baskets, full of garments waiting to be ironed ... There was the big drawing-room, the width of this house, at the entrance to it there was a short passage and the stairway, steep and narrow, and many
bedrooms at the top of it. In the drawing room was horse-hair furniture, mahogany — huge armchairs ... There was a piano and a tall and well-filled music-stand, that was more like a wardrobe for size. (p.98)

THE MAORI INFLUENCE

These circumstances, however, did not mean that the family was divorced from their Maori whanau (extended family) relationships nor from an education in Maori tikanga (custom). Moewaka taught the children to swim and to fish in accordance with Maori customary practice, and, although they did not grow food on the Russell site, she continued to observe the importance of seasonal cultivation of essential food crops in Waikare. Louisa Worsfold notes that her trips back home to Waikare every kunara planting season were crucial also to her retaining in a tangible way, her links with the land, and thereby her tuurangawaewae — 'her place to stand', which, in a very real sense, is an affirmation of identity, of belonging. They were also essential in consolidating those same links for her children who were otherwise immersed in the Pakeha lifestyle. The formalisation of these links can be evidenced in Native Land Court succession records to lands in and around Waikare.

This recognised signal of ahī kaa — 'keeping the fires burning' through occupation — was to serve other functions for Moewaka. Returning home was sometimes a response to the need for moral support in an environment that did little to recognise her cultural 'comfort zone'. Louisa Worsfold recalls Moewaka expressing her frustrations:

Ada, his wife, used to say, 'When 'Tipene' (Stephenson — that is what she called him) make a row, I go home to Waikare and leave him and the children till he come to get me'. ... She went as long as she could paddle her own small canoe — after that she got taken some other way — she might go as far as Opua, and the relatives from the Waikare would meet her there. (AM: MS 340, p.100)

These visits were thus to provide relief from the constant demands of living the Pakeha lifestyle and of coping, without the wider family support so integral to Maori social structure, with a large and socially demanding family. ('My boys') were so much easier to clothe — only trousers and shirt. Girls want too many clothes ... too many petticoats' (p.103.)

Moewaka's determination to instil in her children the richness of their Maori tradition and the importance of their genealogical links meant that they frequently accompanied her to Waikare and were therefore well known and loved by their whananga. It meant also that social and cultural contradictions were part of the lived reality for Moewaka and her children as they negotiated their way in and out of two epistemologically distinctive systems. This was manifested at an official level, most notably in Native Land Court documents which, despite their origins in Pakeha defined law, had to deal with Maori matters. Thus succession rights to the land of Hira Moewaka in the Waikare area dated 21 June 1900 (18 months after her death) note Mereana Tiwhini (Mary Ann Stephenson) along with her living brothers and sisters similarly listed. More interesting still are the documents that grant separate succession rights to the children under both their Maori and Pakeha names. In official terms, however, regardless of the number of years she had spent immersed in a Pakeha cultural environment and subjected to Pakeha norms and expectations, Moewaka remained Maori. Her children were literally 'counted as' European. At Waikare, on the other hand, it was taken for granted that they were Maori — albeit with experiences in the Pakeha world.

It is no surprise, then, that when a school was being mooted in the area, Annie, brought up and schooled in the Pakeha system, as the oldest daughter of a respected woman of Te Kapotai, should be put forward by the community as the prospective teacher. But how would such an appointment be viewed at the departmental level? Who were the people teaching in the Native Schools in the 1870s? Were Maori ever employed? Were women? A brief historical overview indicates that while Pakeha men were the most visible members of the teaching force, in fact Maori men and women were also active but often silenced participants.

WHO WERE THE TEACHERS?

Prior to the establishment of the state system of Native Schools in 1867, the majority of the teachers in mission schools were Pakeha, usually linked to the missionaries or their families. The role of missionary women was pivotal, although largely written out of the published histories (see Fitzgerald 1995). Early writings indicate also that within a short time Maori who had acquired a degree of competence in print literacy were themselves setting up schools to further disseminate this new knowledge (Simon 1992, p.33). Missionary attempts to train Maori teachers explicitly began with the establishment of Central Institutions and there is evidence of Maori women being prepared for teaching in these cooperative missionary/state ventures that were formalised under the Education Ordinance of 1847. This becomes clear from the Annual Reports submitted by both school managers and government inspectors as reported in the Appendices to the Journals of the House of Representatives. Octavius Hadfield, reporting on the Otaki Industrial Native School in 1858 for example, noted that the school had 'supplied most of the villages in the district with young men and women who give instruction to the numerous children of these places' (AJHR, 1858 E-1, p.42). Historians Barrington and Beaglehole (1974, p.50), in writing of girls' boarding schools established by the Church Missionary Society prior to 1852, note furthermore that one intention of such schools was 'to produce women teachers and good wives for the young men passing through the other schools'. It would appear that the latter objective was the principal anticipated outcome, as little has been told of the contribution of these women to school teaching.

For the most part mission documents do not make explicit that future teaching occupations were envisaged for Maori girls on completion of their education, and references to their trainees tend to be exclusively male. The first training institute, for example, established by the Wesleyans at Three Kings in Auckland, set out to select a number of Maori 'men' to be instructed in English so that they might become 'more efficient teachers of their countrymen in matters of religion and civilisation' (Morley 1900, p.111). Mor-
key suggests missionaries had ‘been on the alert’ around the country to select potential students; in particular it was envisaged that ‘sons of chiefs’ and those ‘whose rank gave them large influence’ would be ideal candidates (p.100). Potential trainees, it appears, were always to be male. Nonetheless women were trained and, despite the demonstrated centrality of these women to the success of the schools in which they were involved, their role has been largely subordinated to one of ‘assistant’ to absentee male managers or to male co-teachers (see Stephenson 1993).

When the state took over full responsibility for educating Maori in 1867, the removal of the missionaries saw the state confronted with the problem of staffing a rapidly expanding service with minimal resources. Many teachers remained untrained, and a general attitude prevailed that good scholarship was less important than ‘moral character, common sense and a patient kindness’ (AJHR 1871 E-5, p.8). It was not until 1880 — when the schools had been taken under the control of the Education Department, a permanent full-time Inspector of Native Schools had been appointed, and a code of regulations had been formalised — that ‘sending a man and his wife to set an example of European civilisation’ (NAA: BAAA 1001/272c) became the principal determinant for staffing decisions. Provision had been made in the Act of 1867 for the employment of Maori teachers ‘in remote districts when it may be found impossible to provide English teachers’ (Statutes of NZ 1867, p.470), despite the fact that it was feared that such appointments may compromise the intention to ‘in the English language only’ (AJHR 1872 E-5, p.4). The principal objective was to ensure that such appointees were to be ostensibly ‘Europeanised’ Maori, and Maori women, if suitably Europeanised, were not explicitly excluded from taking on such positions.

It would appear that the first Maori woman so employed was Mary Tautiri, who operated a boarding and day facility at Taumarere in the Bay of Islands. James Grey, on visiting the school, commented on the ‘excellent European education’ the pupils — ‘European, Maoris and half-castes’ — were receiving (1879, p.24). They were instructed also in instrumental music and singing as well as household duties ‘in order that they may be Europeanised as much as possible, and in all respects rendered fit to become the wives of settlers in the country’ (p.25). Although Mrs Tautiri was classified by Grey as ‘half-caste’ she was, unlike Annie, openly identified as a Maori teacher — married to a Maori and living in the Maori community of Taumarere.

A ‘EUROPEAN’ TEACHER FOR WAIKARE

In his account of the setting up of the first schools to be established under the 1867 Native Schools Act, Inspector A.H. Russell demonstrated an accepted practice in the appointment of teachers wherein potential applicants were nominated by a committee of community members for approval by the inspector, acting for the government. He noted instances also where, in particularly isolated areas, the residents had themselves taken the initiative in setting up temporary schools and installing teachers in anticipation of gaining the inspector’s approval (AJHR, 1872 E-5, p.4). It appears that such an arrangement marked the beginnings of the Waikare (Waikere) School in 1876. This explains why confirmation of Annie’s appointment was not noted until 1877. She was, however, to be officially recognised as the appointed teacher from 1876, and Pope’s May 1880 report on the school noted that Mrs Horsley qualified for a ‘seniority allowance’ as reckoned on her having completed four years of teaching service.

It was, then, with Mrs Horsley in sole charge of the school that the first inspector’s report was made. His judgement of the teacher was mixed:

‘Mrs Horsley is a lady of good address and manners; her influence is likely to be beneficial to her pupils, but she greatly needs to learn the modern methods of teaching. Her ignorance of these methods causes the quantity of effective work done to be small in comparison with pupils taken, while the noise in the school is far greater than it should be — in short, the literary work of school is at present not nearly up to the mark. Some technical instruction given to the teacher would probably bring about a great improvement in this respect.

On a follow-up visit to the school Pope expressed his belief that the teacher would greatly benefit from his spending two to three days instructing her in the new methods of teaching. This, he felt, would be worthwhile because she was ‘exercising a very salutary influence on her pupils and on the natives in the district’ (NAA: BAAA 1001/627b).

The instruction was given and the following year Pope was able to report much improvement in the teacher’s performance.

The new methods about which Pope wrote focused on guiding pupils ‘step by step, from what is simple and easy to what is complex and difficult’. Rather than learning through analysis of mistakes made when applying rules mechanically, pupils were to be thoroughly instructed in the ‘scope and object’ of the process involved in applying the rules. This pedagogical ideal was to be carried out in an environment ‘thoroughly disciplined by means of school drill’, in which ‘a breach of discipline’ would see the ‘principal offender’ singled out and the entire class stopped, to ensure ‘the restoration of complete order in the school before anything else was done’ (AJHR 1881 E-7, p.6). The school day was to be conducted in accordance with a timetable to be ‘hung up in a conspicuous position in the school-room ... its directions ... always strictly followed’ (AJHR 1880, H-1F p.1).

Despite her own Pakeha-style educational experiences, Annie’s times at Waikare and the persistence of her mother’s teaching prepared her well to conduct her school in accordance with Maori pedagogical practices. Whanau involvement was an important aspect of the Native Schools and pupils were often closely related. As Te Kapotai, Annie was similarly linked to the wider school community and to the pupils in her care through ancestral, traditional and spiritual bonds. These links supported values such as mutual caring and support, cooperative working, and learning and teaching with the emphasis on group rather than individual outcomes (Smith 1987, p.28). The mutuality of relationships in Maori society created the possibility for the learner to become the teacher, a relationship that was stifled in the rigidly disciplined and hierarchically structured Pakeha classroom with its focus on ‘ages and stages’ (Fringe 1988, p.126). Such ‘fluidity of roles’ (Matga 1983; Smith 1987; Ka'ai 1990), then, fostered a cooperative rather than competitive learning/teaching environment, with ‘children moving at their own
pace, sharing their skills, and helping each other" (Pringle 1988, p.126). The 'expert' becomes the 'guide' where appropriate, spontaneous interactions are fostered, and the classroom becomes a group resource and responsibility. A degree of freedom is allowed all participants, creating a fluidity of task-specific engagement not conducive to formal timetabling expectations. It creates also the freedom for inquiry and for assisted research so that children are not 'singled out' in any way — not permitted to feel whakahirihia (boastful) if they contribute ideas within their group or whakama (ashamed) if they do not contribute 'appropriately' (Ka'ai 1990; Metge 1986).

Constant observation, practice and performance taught children proficiency. Knowledge was thus absorbed rather than instructed through monologue. Both the pedagogical model that Pope was advancing and the form of discipline demanded were antithetical to Maori teaching and learning practices. When Annie's classroom practice was considered to be in need of correction by the inspector, her experience as a whanau member and the nature of her role as a participant in the Maori teaching/learning enterprise were being denied in themselves and denied validity in the Pakeha educational context. She was after all 'European' and 'inexperienced'. Her 'shortcomings' were the result of this inexperience.

CONCLUSION
The ways in which Mary Ann has been represented historically reflect both the political nature of identity production and the subjective nature of historical inquiry and recording. This re-reading of her story draws on a broad array of 'evidence' both written and oral. It has been constructed by a Pakeha historian of education and by a Maori environmental scientist — a member of Annie's whanau. It reflects the nature of current debates about history and historiography. It reflects also the social, political and cultural situation in New Zealand today. It is, therefore, just another interpretation.
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