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Abstract: This report follows up a previous paper that outlined the goals and plans of a research project that focused on both theoretical and cultural questions regarding the supervisory process for Māori doctoral students (McKinley, Grant, Middleton, Irwin, & Williams, 2007). The major goal of the project is to enhance understanding of the teaching and learning process of supervision for students and supervisors, particularly around issues of culture that arise in research methodologies and practices. This paper reports on the completed project by providing further operational background, design features, the nature of the student and supervisor samples and a summary of interview findings. The results show that there are indeed distinctive issues arising within the supervision of Māori doctoral students. Some of these are to do with both pleasures and challenges found in the supervision relationship, while others relate to the kinds of projects the students undertake. Many projects for example, push at the disciplinary boundaries of Western knowledge and are often rooted in a political desire to enhance the everyday lives of Māori. Yet others are connected to identity formation processes that concern many Māori during their years as doctoral students. A central message for supervisors from this work is that the supervision of Māori doctoral students may require unfamiliar forms of engagement but that these are likely to be deeply rewarding in many different ways.
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Introduction

For some time, anecdotal reports of distinctive supervision difficulties experienced by Māori doctoral students have surfaced in various forums. There is a small literature that raises issues related to this topic, some of which draws on the experience of Māori or non-Māori supervisors (Fitzgerald, 2005; Kidman, 2007; Pope, 2006) while other writings offer the perspective of the students themselves (Morgan, 2008; Rewi, 2006). The present research project which was introduced in a previous paper (McKinley, Grant, Middleton, Irwin, & Williams, 2007) seeks to add to the body of knowledge by conducting a more systematic investigation into the experiences of Māori doctoral research students and those who supervise them. The aim was to identify any distinctive issues regarding aspects of teaching and learning, and to produce materials that could helpfully inform students and supervisors. This second paper describes and discusses the key issues raised in the interviews with students and supervisors and also discusses other outcomes that emerged.

In Aotearoa New Zealand, there has been a recent national policy environment of intensified commitment towards Māori aspirations for higher education, as expressed in two key documents: the Māori Tertiary Education Framework (2003) and the Tertiary Education Strategy 2007-2012 (2007). In the Framework we find an outline of goals, principles and priority areas for Māori in tertiary education. Most relevant to our purposes, the report from the Māori Tertiary Reference Group identifies the importance of Māori-centred knowledge creation and sets the goal of: “Developing TEO strategies that encourage and enhance kaupapa Māori research activity, supervision and accountability for inclusion within provider charters” (Ministry of Education, 2003, p. 36).
The Tertiary Education Commission’s *Strategy* echoes this goal, albeit in more general terms: “The Strategy recognises that a key aspiration of Māori is that Māori knowledge, Māori ways of doing and knowing things, in essence Māori ways of being, are validated across the tertiary education sector” (Tertiary Education Commission, 2007, p. 4). Alongside its strategic commitments, the Government has provided two forms of targeted equity funding to tertiary education organisations to support enhanced outcomes for Māori students. Since 2001, Special Supplementary Grant (SSG) monies have been available to support institutional retention and success initiatives at both undergraduate and postgraduate levels and, more recently, Māori (and Pacific) doctoral completions have received an “equity weighting” which funds them at double the rate of non-Māori (or non-Pacific) completions (although the benefits of the latter will only now be arriving into institutions).

This shift in the policy environment is responding partly to persistent statistical evidence of the need to increase the number of Māori students in higher education at every level. It is also responding to clearly articulated aspirations from within the Māori community. A key player in profiling these aspirations at the doctoral level has been the Māori and Indigenous Postgraduate Advancement programme (MAI). First established at the University of Auckland around 2000, MAI was later incorporated into Ngā Pae o te Māramatanga (NPOTM), one of the seven national research centres funded in 2002. NPOTM took on the MAI target of securing 500 Māori doctoral graduates and registered candidates across the country within five years. This goal has since been achieved and indeed there has been a dramatic increase in Māori doctoral registrations from 77 nationally in 1994 to 275 in 2005 (Ministry of Education, 2007). The current cohort has a distinctive demographic profile with some of the features being: (a) Māori women participate in doctoral studies at a significantly higher rate than do men; (b) approximately 40% of students are aged over 40; (c) Māori have slightly higher first-year attrition rates than non-Māori; and (d) while retention rates are similar to other ethnic groups, Māori show notably longer completion rates, particularly among students above 24 years of age (Ministry of Education, 2006). There is, however, some evidence that this profile is changing to include a higher proportion of younger students going into doctoral studies straight from other degrees.

Our project, then, is set within a context of apparent growth in the cohort of Māori doctoral students nationally alongside informal accounts of supervision ‘problems’. It appears to be the first systematic study of the supervision of Māori graduate research students in New Zealand, and is probably one of the first of studies of its kind in the international indigenous context.

**Aims**

We explored how Māori doctoral students and their supervisors worked together as teachers and learners in supervision with the intention of understanding how to support better outcomes for Māori doctoral students and their institutions.

More specifically, the research aimed to:

1) identify which teaching and learning processes are most appropriate for the supervision of Māori doctoral candidates through to completion;
2) document and disseminate effective practice regarding the supervision of Māori students to practitioners (students and supervisors) through seminars and presenting preliminary findings; and
3) produce materials that can be used by teaching and learning centres in tertiary institutes that provide professional development courses for Māori students and doctoral supervisors.
Research design

We interviewed 38 Māori doctoral students from a range of disciplines and institutions in the North Island about their experience of supervision (Table 1). About half were still being supervised while the other half had either recently submitted theses or graduated. All but one participated in a one-to-one interview that lasted between 45 and 90 minutes; one student participated in a focus group discussion with two other pre-registration students.

Table 1. Number distributions of student and supervisor participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age range</th>
<th>30-39</th>
<th>40-49</th>
<th>50-59</th>
<th>60+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student</strong></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Supervisor</strong></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Male</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student</strong></td>
<td>27</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Supervisor</strong></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree</th>
<th>PhD</th>
<th>EdD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student</strong></td>
<td>36</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Supervisor</strong></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Auckland</th>
<th>AUT</th>
<th>Awanuiarangi</th>
<th>Massey</th>
<th>Unitec</th>
<th>Victoria</th>
<th>Waikato</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student</strong></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Supervisor</strong></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discipline</th>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Society &amp; culture</th>
<th>Natural &amp; physical sciences</th>
<th>Business &amp; Economics</th>
<th>Health</th>
<th>Engineering, IT &amp; related techs</th>
<th>Inter-discipline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student</strong></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Supervisor</strong></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We also interviewed 20 supervisors, again from a range of disciplines and institutions in the North Island, about their experience of supervising of Māori doctoral students (see Table 1). The supervisors, nine of whom were non-Maori, had supervised between one and 24 Māori doctoral students. All participated in a one-to-one interview that lasted between 45 and 90 minutes.

All 58 interviews were transcribed and analysed in various ways with coded data being entered into nVivo. For the purposes of this report, we focus in the following section on those issues that emerged as distinctive features in the supervision of Māori doctoral students:

a. The kind of projects that many students were working on
   o Research projects that came from the core of students’ lives
   o Tensions between Western and Māori epistemologies
   o Methodologies, ethics and complex accountabilities

b. Supervision arrangements
   o Students were strategic in ‘choosing’ supervisors
   o Wide variety in supervision arrangements
   o Changes in supervision were common
c. The importance of cultural advice
   o The role of Māori secondary supervisors
   o The role of community-based cultural advisors
   o Student identity formation ‘as Māori’

d. Teaching and learning practices
   o The benefits of active supervision
   o Reciprocity

e. Supervisory pleasures
   o Getting to know students and their whānau
   o Access to mātauranga Māori and Te Ao Māori
   o Being involved in research with social and political significance
   o Seeing first-generation students graduate as scholars

f. Supervisory challenges
   o The multiple obligations that students face and their impact on progress
   o Being on the edge of knowledge as a supervisor
   o Making judgements re progress
   o Seeing self as the coloniser (for non-Māori supervisors)
   o Navigating multiple relationships (for Māori supervisors)
   o Students who struggle to believe in their academic merit

g. The kind of commitment necessary for effective supervision
   o Being challenging and respectful
   o Being willing to go into the student’s world
   o Being willing to advocate to the institution for the student

Issues of Māori culture and identity are woven throughout our discussion, just as they were woven throughout the interviews. Each subsection is also prefaced with some quotes from our interviews to give the flavour of our interviewees’ talk. A deeper treatment of each theme, along with more interview extracts, will be found in the Student Information Notes series that is under preparation (refer to the description of outputs below).

We also reviewed institutional websites and policies pertaining to supervision and Māori doctoral students for seven of the ten doctorate-awarding tertiary education institutions across the country. We analysed these textual sources to consider the extent to which they recognised the distinctive aspirations and needs of Māori doctoral candidates in the light of the Government’s commitment to increase research capacity within the Māori community via advanced education. These particular findings will be reported at a later date.

Summary of interview findings

The kind of projects that many students were working on

I’m much more aware with Māori students perhaps of the confidence issues, keeping them confident and engaged, and believing that what they’re doing is important and that they can do it. It’s not just that it’s important, it’s absolutely crucial in terms of creating knowledge for Māori, I mean it really is, there’s so little and there’s so few people doing it. (Non-Māori supervisor)

I would definitely say that on the whole, looking around and looking at other people’s projects, that the personal is political for Māori. The students do bring a whole lot to it
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and often what they are studying is their own communities, their own settings, right down to real specificities. Very, very close stuff. (Māori supervisor)

Research projects that came from the core of students’ lives: Almost all of the students in our study were undertaking projects that had a mātauranga Māori dimension. Often the students also had political intentions in that they hoped to contribute to improved circumstances for their iwi or for the Māori community more broadly, for example in a particular sector like health or social work. These dimensions had different kinds of implications for their work but they also contributed a great deal to the students’ motivation.

Tensions between Western and Māori epistemologies: Some students described their research projects as designed to highlight and to validate traditional knowledge. For example, one saw her doctorate as giving status to her grandmother’s teachings, while another moved between the worlds of intellectual and spiritual knowing, and yet another presented a defence of the contemporary pedagogical importance of traditional narrative forms. These examples illustrate different ways in which a Māori doctoral student’s thesis work may have to navigate not only separated and seemingly incommensurate knowledge domains, including tensions around the accessibility of certain forms of knowledge, but also potentially difficult emotions that may result from competing allegiances, such as to iwi or loved relatives, on the one hand, and to the academic disciplinary community, on the other.

Methodologies, ethics and complex accountabilities: Many students were using some form of Kaupapa Māori methodology that involved a more or less formal partnership, and various obligations, with other Māori. Sometimes this originated in the genesis of their research: for example, students described being given their thesis topic by members of their iwi, in which case complex accountabilities ensued and the ownership of the doctoral work was not simply the student’s. Sometimes the process of doing the research involved intense mentoring or grooming for leadership from a key player in the iwi and so there would be reciprocal responsibilities. Some students described getting advice and support from deceased ancestors and/or elders in their iwi who gave them confidence to pursue the work. We also heard about the importance of karakia and spirituality in students’ research process and how they located themselves and their research in tribal whakapapa, understanding this as both a spiritual and an epistemological grounding. In contrast, Western knowledge-making has set itself apart from these modes of identity: deeply subjective or spiritual aspects of the research experience have been bracketed off by the prescriptions of the scientific method and are not usually addressed in methodology or writing.

Supervision arrangements

It was really important for me to have a supervisor that I did not have to enter into a debate with about everything, not at the early stages where I was really exploring things. I didn’t want to have to defend my complete and utter belief that Māori theory actually exists in those aspects of traditional Māori knowledge. I wanted somebody to say, “That’s a logical idea. Okay now, how are you going to demonstrate that?” (Student)

I chose him because he had the strength that I lacked. He had the theoretical knowledge and he is a very pedantic detail-conscious person, which I’m not, so I knew that we would be a very good balance for each other. (Student)

Students were strategic in ‘choosing’ supervisors: The students described in some detail the thinking they had gone through in ‘choosing’ supervisors. Many were aware they had a lot to lose if they didn’t have someone who was sympathetic to their goals. Sometimes students were approached by potential supervisors or departments looking to recruit Māori students. In such cases, if the student didn’t know the individual, they were often quite cautious about agreeing. All our interviewees talked about how few Māori supervisors there are, with almost none in some disciplines, and how overworked the existing ones are. Non-Māori supervisors
who had successfully supervised a Māori student often found they were subsequently approached by others who had heard about them through the student. This was even when their academic expertise was not particularly relevant.

Wide variety in supervision arrangements: Our data showed a wide variety of successful supervision arrangements. This variety applied to the composition of supervisory ‘teams’, most of which were a mix of Māori and non-Māori supervisors, often with quite different roles and from different disciplines. Variety also applied to the basic working arrangements of supervision such as frequency of meetings. Most supervisors thought that the best arrangements were those that responded to the needs of the individual and their project. In this sense Māori students did not feature in our research as a ‘group with special needs’ but rather as individuals with individual projects that presented distinctive requirements for supervision.

Changes in supervision were common: Many of the students we interviewed had experienced changes in supervisors. Often this was for factors outside of the student’s control: for example, the supervisor had changed institutions or had serious health problems. At other times the student had ‘dropped’ a supervisor because they found them unhelpful. In such cases, the student usually tried quite hard not to put that supervisor off-side; sometimes by not telling the person they had been dropped but just working around them. Senior Māori academics were sometimes sought out for guidance on such matters.

The importance of cultural advice

I also have a couple of kaumātua who I have conversations with. One of those relationships is relatively formal, he’s like a mentor, and he will come over and talk things through. And another one, Auntie Ani, is more informal but we spend a lot of time talking about just things, including in that my research. I take a lot out of those conversations. I’m not related to either of them in a blood sense, but they’re just committed to supporting me. (Student)

We set up an advisory team. A lot of it was around both the cultural safety aspect for her but also protection for her, because, you know, she’s looking at Māori and health. We wanted to ensure that she was protected in her process as well and that she had a strong group of Māori practitioners and tikanga specialists. (Māori supervisor)

The role of Māori secondary supervisors: In many situations where Māori students had a non-Māori main supervisor, the supervisor (or the student) sought to include a Māori secondary supervisor, either in a highly active (almost co-supervising) role, or in a more background role providing support on an ‘as needed’ basis. In some cases, the Māori supervisor stepped up to play a stronger role if there were difficulties between the main supervisor and the student. This meant that the supervision loads of some Māori supervisors were very high and that they often found themselves involved in supervision in academic areas in which they had little or no expertise.

The role of community-based cultural advisors: Many students, especially those who were undertaking mātauranga Māori projects, sought occasional or ongoing advice from members of the wider Māori community, sometimes of their iwi or whānau. In most cases the student took the lead role in setting this up by drawing on existing relationships or obligations. In other cases, for example if there were potential professional implications emerging from the research, the supervisors assisted, perhaps helping to form an external advisory panel. Sometimes the supervisor fronted up with the student before their advisory group or iwi, especially in the early stages of developing the research proposal. When the arrangement was more one-to-one, the supervisor usually had no involvement. Some supervisors thought the student had a right, as an adult, to involve whomever they wanted in getting advice for their research. Issues of recognition and compensation came up in our research – some supervisors for example talked about planning for koha (gifts) as a budget item.
Student identity formation: While many students undertook their doctoral research from a position of considerable strength and maturity ‘as Māori’, this was not the case for all. Some, especially younger, students described undertaking a slow and demanding journey towards becoming more secure in themselves as Māori at the same time as they were doing their research and, indeed, for some through their research. This identity formation not only required significant time and commitment (for example to learn te reo) but was also sometimes accompanied by strong emotions, such as excitement, anger and anxiety. In these circumstances, access to steady cultural guidance and support from either Māori supervisors or community-based advisors was essential. Such students carry a double burden of identity work: that of ‘becoming a scholar-researcher’ carried by every doctoral student, but also that of ‘becoming Māori’.

Teaching and learning practices

I think the supervision relationship is absolutely a teaching and learning one and sometimes roles switch around. (Māori supervisor)

I’ve used the term before. I view it as an apprenticeship. It’s an odd apprenticeship though, it’s a collegial apprenticeship. I say this to students invariably at the outset, that by the end of this process they will be more expert than myself in their topic, in the skills and knowledge that they have developed around that topic. So I see that as almost an expectation, a deliberate statement of intent, so that’s how I supervise. (Non-Māori supervisor)

The benefits of active supervision: Most supervisors did not think they worked differently, in any systematic way, with Māori doctoral students. However they, and even more so the students that we interviewed, described in some detail a wide range of successful teaching and learning practices that were employed inside supervision. This data (which are too numerous and detailed to be included here) will be incorporated into a series of Information Notes for students (that will also be made available to supervisors), as well as into a resource written specifically for supervisors of Māori doctoral students. Collectively, however, these practices highlight the benefits of active (although not necessarily directive) supervision. That is, an approach to supervision that does not leave too much up to the student and that is strategically interventionist and problem-solving, although always with an eye on the goal of promoting the student’s transition towards scholarly independence.

Reciprocity: A feature of both supervisors’ and students’ accounts of supervision was descriptions of reciprocity in teaching and learning, partly linked to ideas about the student’s growing independence and partly to distinctive kinds of projects the students were undertaking. One of the features that supervisors expected and enjoyed in their doctoral supervision was learning from their students, and Māori students had things to teach that came from a very different worldview and life experience. Likewise, students valued being able to teach their supervisors, and this experience confirmed the value of their work and their sense of themselves as Māori and scholars.

Supervisory pleasures

What’s most enjoyable? Oh, the learning. It’s such a privilege. I’ve supervised quite a few students, and with Māori students you do get taken into another world and there are things that are constantly outside your realm of experience and knowledge. It’s a constant reminder that there are limits and that’s great. I find that refreshing. (Non-Māori supervisor)

The great joy is seeing those students come across the stage and knowing that they’re going to go out and change the world. Because one of the things I try and insert in all of my students’ projects is a sense of the contribution to others. That transformative
element, that they’re gonna make a difference, gonna make change, that this work is gonna mean something. (Māori supervisor)

Getting to know students and their whānau: The supervisors we talked to found the experience of supervising Māori students immensely satisfying because of the personal connections formed, not only with the student but also with their whānau or iwi. It seemed that the richness of the personal and social relations involved was a distinctive reward of supervising Māori doctoral students.

Access to mātauranga Māori and Te Ao Māori: Supervisors, especially non-Māori, also described the pleasure of entering the student’s world and the kinds of experiences and knowledges that became available to them. They found that they saw aspects of the history and politics, contemporary life indeed, in our society differently as a result of supervising their students.

Being involved in research with social and political significance: Both students and supervisors spoke about the excitement and motivation that arose from the kinds of projects that students were pursuing. In many cases, students were addressing issues of significant concern to particular communities or Māori people at large (such as health or education issues). Students were often laying the groundwork for academic and empirical literatures that did not yet exist. In that sense their work was often not only discipline-boundary crossing but also pioneering.

Seeing first-generation students graduate as scholars: Knowing that their students were among the first in their families to achieve a doctorate was deeply rewarding, especially in terms of anticipating the follow-on effects for the student’s whānau or iwi. Students also talked about the importance of making a pathway for their children or mokopuna (grandchildren). For some, this was the primary motivation for undertaking advanced education. In this sense the award of the doctorate, regardless of the research undertaken, is seen to be a vehicle for social change within families and communities.

Supervisory challenges

My supervision relationships with Māori students are always much more formal than with Pākehā. Much more formal and much more structured. Because I am a Māori supervisor, when I am working with Māori Students, it’s really important for me to keep in mind that my job is to guide them through an intellectual journey. And I have to keep emotional boundaries because otherwise I risk disappearing into their needs. (Māori supervisor)

I think almost without exception that Māori doctoral students have those delays, those frustrations, those interruptions, those terrible things that might have happened in the family. I think in my experience they’ve happened more with Māori students than with my Pākehā PhD students. (Non-Māori supervisor)

The multiple obligations that students face and their impact on progress: Our interviewees described the complex networks of obligations that the students were often enmeshed within. This was partly a function of the age and gender of many of the students: they were parents (mostly mothers) and grandparents (mostly grandmothers), often working, and often held leadership positions within various iwi-based and other organisations. When crises arose, they felt bound to respond even though this often involved journeys of considerable distance. Such obligations impacted on most of the students we talked to and had clear effects on their timely progress. Supervisors were cognisant of this and were also aware of their limitations in assisting students meet their obligations and continue to make progress. This aspect of the supervision of Māori doctoral students highlighted the unspoken student norm that underpins
current time-to-completion requirements in particular: one without significant personal commitments. Most of the students in our study did not fit this description.

Being on the edge of knowledge as a supervisor: Many supervisors, both Māori and non-Māori, described being sometimes uncomfortably on the edge of their academic knowledge and expertise. This was partly a function of the shortage of qualified supervisors, especially in some disciplines, for the kind of work that students were doing, and the fact that the work was often interdisciplinary in the sense of bringing academic knowledge and mātauranga Māori into dialogue with each other. It was also a function of what students were looking for in choosing supervisors: many of them were very conscious of finding someone they could work with, who they could trust to support their goals and be comfortable with. This may be particularly salient in a socio-historical context in which many Māori have had negative educational experiences. Being on the edge of your knowledge as a supervisor can be difficult, especially if you are not experienced. Some supervisors did describe actively seeking advice from other colleagues, including Māori ones.

Making judgements re progress: Some, particularly Māori, supervisors talked about the challenge of making judgements regarding adequate progress and standards of academic work. They emphasised the importance of having entry standards and processes that recognised the non-traditional academic backgrounds of many Māori students and that also upheld academic excellence. In addition, they talked about the need to demand excellent academic work from students and the difficulty sometimes in getting students to commit their ideas to writing. (This issue may well be connected to the struggle some students experience to gain academic confidence.)

Other issues: There were other challenges mentioned by our interviewees such as the pain of seeing yourself as the coloniser and the effects of colonisation upon Māori communities (mentioned by some non-Māori supervisors) and that of navigating multiple relationships that occur when you supervise students connected with your iwi or hapū (for Māori supervisors). There was also the issue of students who, after a long history of educational marginalisation, still struggled to believe in their academic merit. This struggle undercut their progress at times.

The kind of supervisory commitment necessary for effective supervision

There was the sense of being drawn into a world, in order to supervise properly. The topic is part of it but it’s more to do with coming to understand the student’s perspective and rationales as well as this sense of their Māoriness, I guess. (Non-Māori supervisor)

It’s not like supervising Pākehā students. Right from the start, if this student gets his doctorate, it will make a difference to not just him, but his whole hapū, his whole iwi probably. The doctorate doesn’t just become one person’s thing, it becomes something that everybody in that whānau, the hapū, that marae, they all celebrate and they all own it. So, you’ve got to really hold him, you can’t just send him off and then expect he’ll meet the deadlines and, if he doesn’t, you just forget about him. You gotta stay in touch with him, you’ve got to look at stuff and give him really good feedback and encourage him. You gotta make a trip down to his town, visit him, meet his mum, meet his family, get into his life, become part of it. Because not only will he appreciate it, but you will learn so much about what you’re trying to do. I think a lot of academics don’t like getting involved with students like that. They think it’s inappropriate or something. They kind of just want this academic relationship over this piece of work. They don’t want the rest of it. But I don’t think you can do a really good job with Māori students unless you have got part of the rest of it. (Non-Māori supervisor)

While most supervisors did not think that there were particular differences in the kinds of teaching and learning practices they used when supervising Māori doctoral students compared
to non-Māori, most did think that a special kind of commitment was required. This was particularly the case in the accounts of non-Māori supervisors who found aspects of this commitment challenging and uncomfortable at times, but also deeply rewarding.

**Being challenging and respectful:** One element of this special commitment was the ability to challenge the student’s thinking and writing while at the same time showing them respect so that a relationship of trust was maintained. This is a tricky balance to strike in any supervision but it requires particular attention in the context of cross-cultural supervision where misunderstandings and incomprehension are likely elements. It also requires careful attention when supervising Māori students who are working out issues of Māori, as well as academic, identity and/or who have previously experienced struggle or marginalisation in the education system. Some supervisors emphasised the importance of listening attentively to students and to others during events such as hui. Students valued supervisors who were good listeners.

**Being willing to go into the student’s world:** The nature of the commitment also had to do with a willingness on the part of the supervisor to engage with the whole person of the student. This at times, included meeting whānau and iwi, sometimes at venues far from institutions. It also required standing behind or beside the student (sometimes silently, sometimes speaking in support) while they accounted to their communities for their research. This could be quite hard for a non-Māori supervisor who finds themselves outside of their comfort zone, however both supervisors and students spoke about the importance of this role.

**Being willing to advocate to the institution for the student:** The commitment to supervise also sometimes required advocating for the student to the institution when complex obligations and life circumstances meant the student was not progressing as they might have been. This was a common thread in the interviews and was seen by some to be connected to the fact that many Māori doctoral students are mature women with significant and diverse responsibilities.

**Outputs from the project**

Along with this report and several scholarly papers that will engage with the data from a variety of theoretical perspectives, resources will be produced for the various ‘practitioners’ associated with the supervision of Māori doctoral students. These are for:

- Students: a *series of Information Notes* on various topics that emerged from our data and *seminars* at national conferences and writing retreats to be published via the *MAI Review*.
- Supervisors (Māori and non-Māori): a *document summarising collegial advice* from experienced supervisors we interviewed.
- Academic advisors who provide professional development for supervisors: *seminars* at relevant conferences and national forums.
- Learning advisors who provide professional development for students: *seminars* at relevant conferences and national forums.
- University administrators (e.g. Deans and Directors of Graduate Studies): a *summary report* drawing on relevant findings to make recommendations for institutions.

**Conclusions**

This report has offered some descriptive findings from the TLRI-funded project *Teaching and Learning in the Supervision of Māori Doctoral Students*. Our inquiry shows that there are indeed distinctive issues arising within the supervision of Māori doctoral students. Some are directly to do with the pleasures and challenges found in the supervision relationship itself, whether with Māori or non-Māori supervisors. Others are connected to the kinds of projects
the students are undertaking, many of which push at the disciplinary boundaries of Western knowledge and are often rooted in a political desire to enhance the everyday lives of Māori communities. Yet others are connected to the complex kinds of identity formation processes that go on for many Māori during their years as doctoral students. A central message for supervisors coming through our inquiry is that the supervision of Māori doctoral students may require unfamiliar forms of engagement but that these are likely to be deeply rewarding in many different ways.
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