



THE UNIVERSITY OF
WAIKATO
Te Whare Wānanga o Waikato

Research Commons

<http://researchcommons.waikato.ac.nz/>

Research Commons at the University of Waikato

Copyright Statement:

The digital copy of this thesis is protected by the Copyright Act 1994 (New Zealand).

The thesis may be consulted by you, provided you comply with the provisions of the Act and the following conditions of use:

- Any use you make of these documents or images must be for research or private study purposes only, and you may not make them available to any other person.
- Authors control the copyright of their thesis. You will recognise the author's right to be identified as the author of the thesis, and due acknowledgement will be made to the author where appropriate.
- You will obtain the author's permission before publishing any material from the thesis.

What is the difference?

**What factors contribute to the variation of achievement for
Year 7 and 8 *Māori* students in high decile, full primary schools?**

A thesis

submitted in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree

of

Masters of Educational Leadership

at

The University of Waikato

by

Sue McLocklan



THE UNIVERSITY OF
WAIKATO
Te Whare Wānanga o Waikato

2013

Abstract

The educational disparity between indigenous *Māori* students and those of the majority continue to be a major issue in New Zealand. Attempting to bridge the gap for *Māori* students has generated focus on *Māori* student engagement in the classroom, the actions and understanding of the teacher and the relationship and interactions between the teacher and students in their learning environment. Elements of culturally responsive pedagogy have been identified as positive contributing factors to accelerating academic achievement for secondary *Māori* mainstream students.

This small-scale cross-cultural exploratory qualitative research project seeks to identify the factors that contribute to student achievement variation for Year 7 and 8 students in high decile full primary schools and the integration of teacher's cultural competencies in high quality learning opportunities. Within a *kaupapa Māori* research process, this study uses empirical data collected from a purposive sample through a semi-structured individual interview and a for self-assessment. Voluntary research participants were twelve students and six teachers in three schools in the Bay of Plenty, Waikato and Wellington regions. This research examines the engagement of student and teacher in pedagogical practice, learning variables, cultural knowledge and practices attributable to positive academic achievement for *Māori*.

The findings reveal that when teachers place themselves in an agentic position; adopt a professional commitment and willingness to engage in effective relations, interactions and reciprocal practices to support *Māori* learners, high levels of relational trust and expectations prevail through mutual respect and interdependence to attain successful educational outcomes.

Further teacher professional learning is essential to enlighten and deepen teachers' understanding of culturally responsive pedagogy to enable *Māori* learners to reach their potential to participate and contribute in their world of choice.

Dedication

This thesis is for my parents, Walter Trevor and Suva Duckmanton (née Sanerive), for they gave me my past and the foundation to become who I am today. This thesis is also for my father-in-law Robert Sidney McLocklan who between them all give to my *mokopuna* Eliana Susan Taylor ethnicities to stand tall and strong as our *Tane Mahuta* of the future. May she and all the other children whom she represents be strong and proud in their educational pursuits and may their life's journey take them to a place in the world where they can be confidently acknowledged and celebrated as people of *Pākeha* Samoan and *Māori* heritage. This is my gift.

**He aha te mea nui o te ao?
He tangata! He tangata! He tangata!**

What is the most important thing in the world?

It is people! It is people! It is people!

Acknowledgements

I have found compiling this thesis a difficult, challenging and risk taking journey and I would like to thank the following people for believing in me.

My supervisors, Mr Anthony Fisher and Ms Vanessa Paki, your patience and unrelenting support to me at times of family illness and loss are beyond words.

To our Board of Trustees, staff, and especially our deputy principal Kerry Adams, who gave me this opportunity, time, space and encouragement.

To the students, teachers and schools who took part in this research and allowed me to be part of their world. This research would not have been possible without you.

To my dear friend Sally whose non-judgemental feedback and tenacious comment to 'just keep at it' gave me hope and belief.

To my own *whānau* who have shared my journey. To my sister Louisa for taking care of our mother and for my immediate family and Nana Mac; the love, support, time and space you have provided for me has enabled me to complete this journey.

Finally to those in spirit, my Mum and Dad and Poppa Mac, whose values and teachings have come to *awhi* me in my times of need. Each and every one of you live on through me.

Table of Contents

Abstract	i
Dedication	ii
Acknowledgements	iii
Table of Contents	iv
List of Tables	viii
Glossary of <i>Māori</i> Terms	ix
Abbreviations	xiii
Chapter 1: Introduction	1
1.1: Introduction	1
1.2: Impetus for research	1
1.3: Research questions	3
1.4: Critical detractors	5
1.5: Political steer	6
1.6: Research outcome possibilities	7
1.7: Thesis outline	7
Chapter 2: Literature Review	8
2.1: Introduction	8
2.1.1. Treaty of Waitangi	9
2.1.2. Historical impact.....	10
2.1.3. International implications	11
2.2: Strategic Intent	13
2.2.1. New Zealand Curriculum	13
2.2.2. Kiwi leadership for principals	14
2.2.3. Ka Hikitia.....	14
2.2.4. <i>Tātaiako</i>	14
2.3: Research Evidence	15
2.3.1. Effective teacher profile	16
2.3.2. Rejecting deficit theorising.....	17
2.3.3. Personal dimension	18
2.3.4. Social location and individual ideology	19
2.3.5. Disengagement	20
2.3.6. Engagement	21
2.3.7. Characteristics of an effective teacher	22
2.4: Culturally Responsive Pedagogy	24
2.4.1. <i>Te reo Māori</i> – The Māori Language	24
2.4.2. History of Te Reo	26
2.4.3. Ako	27
2.4.4. Whānau	28
2.4.5. Why constructivist learning?	29

2.4.6. Student voice	30
2.4.7. Relational trust.....	30
2.5: Rationale for Research	31
2.5.1 Chapter Summary	32
Chapter 3: Methodology.....	34
3.1: Introduction	34
3.1.1. What is research?	35
3.1.2. Traditional research	35
3.1.3. Emergence of qualitative research.....	36
3.1.4. Qualitative research	37
3.2: Researching Within Different World Views	39
3.2.1. Legacy of historical research on indigenous people.....	39
3.2.2. Indigenous research	40
3.2.3. Aotearoa/ New Zealand Context	41
3.2.4. Critical theory	43
3.2.5. Cross-cultural research in New Zealand.....	44
3.2.6 Researcher identity	45
3.3: Taking A <i>Māori</i> Perspective in <i>Aotearoa</i> /New Zealand.....	48
3.3.1. The Treaty of Waitangi.....	48
3.3.2. Kaupapa <i>Māori</i>	50
3.3.3. Critical theory of <i>Kaupapa Māori</i>	53
3.3.4. <i>Kaupapa Māori</i> research	54
3.3.5. Principles of <i>Kaupapa Māori</i> research.....	54
3.3.6. Process of <i>Kaupapa Māori</i> research.....	57
3.4: Bridging Multiple Perspectives	61
3.4.1. Determining research participants	62
3.4.2. Influence of narrative research	62
3.4.3. Semi-structured Interviews	63
3.4.4. Managing the Data.....	66
3.4.5. Transcripts	66
3.4.6. Thematic analysis	67
3.4.7. Research Ethics.....	68
3.4.8. Summary.....	69
Chapter 4: Findings	70
4.1: Introduction	70
4. 1.1 Research Participants.....	71
4.2: Connecting Cultures	73
4.2.1. Connecting participants	73
4.2.2. Insider Perspectives	74
4.2.3. Whānau influence	77
4.3. Connecting with Culture.....	78

4.3.1. Cultural knowledge.....	78
4.3.2. Cultural Support.....	79
4.3.3 Cultural confidence.....	80
4.4: Connecting Learning	81
4.4.1. Differentiation.....	81
4.4.2. Student learning	83
4.4.3. Learning is	84
4.4.4. Best ways of learning.....	85
4.4.5. Self-Monitoring	87
4.4.6. What do you need to do to keep improving in your learning?	89
4.4.7. Teacher choice	91
4.4.8. Effective learning relationships	93
4.5: Extending Connections	96
4.5.1. Is school challenging?.....	96
4.5.2. Student Self- Confidence	97
4.5.3. Reinforcing student self-confidence	99
4.5.4. Celebrating high achievement	100
4.5.5. Chapter summary	102
Chapter 5: Discussion and Conclusions	103
5.1: Introduction	103
5.2: Contextual Indicators	104
5.2.1. Belief.....	104
5.2.2. Discursive shift	105
5.3: Managing Success	106
5.3.1. <i>Whānau</i>	106
5.3.2. Relational Trust	107
5.3.3. Identifying opportunities	107
5.3.4. Focus on identity.....	108
5.3.5. Mutual respect	108
5.4: Learning Cultures	109
5.4.1 Peer support	110
5.4.2 Self-directed learners	110
5.4.3. Co-construction.....	112
5.4.4. Challenges.....	113
5.4.5. Characteristics of an effective teacher	114
5.5 Finding Culture through Culture	114
5.5.1. Position of discourse.....	114
5.5.2. Culture for culture.....	115
5.5.3. Perspectives of culture	116
5.5.4. Students succeeding as Māori.....	117
5.5.5. <i>Te Reo Māori</i>	117

5.6: Culturally Responsive Pedagogy – for whom?	119
5.6.1. Chapter Summary	119
5.6.2. Conclusions.....	120
5.6.3. Limitations	122
5.6.4. Implications of study	123
5.6.5. Areas for future research.....	124
References	125
Appendices	136
Appendix A	136
Appendix B.....	138
Appendix C.....	141
Appendix D	142
Appendix E.....	144
Appendix F	146
Appendix G	147
Appendix H	149
Appendix I.....	151
Appendix J.....	153
Appendix K	154

List of Tables

Table 3.1	Principles of <i>Kaupapa Māori</i> research (Bishop, 1996, 1997)	58
Table 4.1	Educational research sites	71
Table 4.2	Descriptors of teacher participants	71
Table 4.3	Student participant descriptors	72
Table 4.4	Student perception of cultural recognition	75
Table 4.5	Student self-confidence	98

Glossary of *Māori* Terms

<i>Āhutatanga ako</i>	<i>Māori</i> pedagogy
<i>Ako</i>	To teach and to learn; involves teachers and students learning in an interactive dialogic relationship
<i>Aotearoa</i>	New Zealand
<i>Aroha</i>	Love, sympathy, empathy
<i>Awa</i>	River, channel, gully
<i>Awhi</i>	Help/helpful
<i>Āwhina</i>	Help, assist, to respect, to embrace
<i>Āwhinatanga</i>	To help, to assist, guiding and supporting
<i>Awhinatia</i>	The helping process - interventions
<i>Haka</i>	Posture dance - vigorous dances and actions and rhythmically shouted words
<i>Hapū</i>	Extended family, sub-tribe(s) that share a common ancestor, pregnant
<i>Harakeke</i>	Flax
<i>Hinaki</i>	Eel/fish trap
<i>Huakina Mai</i>	Opening doorways
<i>Hui</i>	To gather, congregate, assemble, meet
<i>Ihi</i>	Assertiveness, power or quality that evokes emotion
<i>Iwi</i>	Tribe, tribal kin group, nation, bones
<i>I Runga I te Mannaki</i>	Pastoral care
<i>Iwitanga</i>	Cultural practices, values and views specific to a particular <i>iwi</i> , tribe, bones
<i>Ka Hikitia</i>	To step up
<i>Kai</i>	Food
<i>Kaiako</i>	Teacher, tutor
<i>Ka mau te wehi</i>	<i>Māori</i> language programme
<i>Kanohi ke te kanohi</i>	Face-to-face
<i>Kanohi kitea</i>	The known face
<i>Kapa haka</i>	<i>Māori</i> performing group
<i>Karakia</i>	Prayer
<i>Kaumātua</i>	Elder

<i>Kaupapa</i>	Theme, topic
<i>Kawa</i>	Local protocols
<i>Kawanatanga</i>	Governorship, administrative control
<i>Koha</i>	Gift, offering donation
<i>Kōhanga reo</i>	Language nest, <i>Māori</i> language preschool
<i>Korero</i>	Speak, talk, discuss; discussion
<i>Kotahitanga</i>	Collaborative response towards a common vision, goal, purpose or outcome; unity.
<i>Kuia</i>	Female elder
<i>Kupa</i>	Words
<i>Kura</i>	School
<i>Kura kaupapa Māori</i>	Primary school operating under <i>Māori</i> philosophies, custom and using <i>Māori</i> as the medium of instruction
<i>Mana</i>	Prestige, authority
<i>Manaaki</i>	Show respect or kindness
<i>Manaakitanga</i>	Kindness, caring, hospitality; building and nurturing a supportive environment, moral purpose
<i>Mana motuhake</i>	Having high expectations; developing personal or group identity and independence
<i>Mana whakahaere</i>	Control over decision making
<i>Manuhiri</i>	Visitors
<i>Māori</i>	Indigenous people of New Zealand
<i>Māoritanga</i>	<i>Māori</i> culture, practices and beliefs
<i>Marae</i>	Tribal meeting ground, village common
<i>Mārama</i>	Developing an understanding of one's own identity, language and culture in New Zealand education; developing an understanding of, and openness to, <i>Māori</i> knowledge and expertise
<i>Matariki</i>	The Pleiades, a star cluster that heralds the traditional <i>Māori</i> New Year
<i>Mātau</i>	Being able to lead and engage others in validating and affirming <i>Māori</i> and <i>iwi</i> culture
<i>Mātauranga Māori</i>	Traditional knowledge, <i>Māori</i> knowledge
<i>Mātua</i>	Parents
<i>Maunga</i>	Mountain
<i>Mihimihi</i>	Greeting; to greet

<i>Mōhio</i>	Knowing how to validate and affirm <i>Māori</i> and <i>iwi</i> culture, and applying that knowledge
<i>Mokopuna</i>	Grandchild
<i>Ngati Tūwharetoa</i>	A <i>Māori</i> tribe in New Zealand
<i>Oranga</i>	A vision of well-being
<i>Pākeha</i>	New Zealander of European descent
<i>Pepehā</i>	<i>Iwi</i> -specific saying
<i>Pono</i>	Self-belief
<i>Pōwhiri</i>	To welcome, routines and procedures associated with formal welcome
<i>Rangatiratanga</i>	Qualities of leadership, authority, self-determination
<i>Raranga</i>	Weave; weaving process
<i>Reo</i>	Language
<i>Tamariki</i>	Children
<i>Tane Mahuta</i>	Kauri tree
<i>Tangata whenua</i>	Indigenous people
<i>Tangata Whenuatanga</i>	Local people, hosts, indigenous people of the land
<i>Tangi</i>	To cry/mourn; mourning rituals
<i>Tāonga</i>	Something of value, treasures
<i>Tapu</i>	Sacrosanct, prohibited, protected, restricted
<i>Tātaiako</i>	Cultural competence.
<i>Te Aho Matua</i>	<i>Māori</i> charter that sets out principles and practise of teaching and learning in <i>kura kaupapa Māori</i>
<i>Te ao Māori</i>	<i>Māori</i> world view and values
<i>Te Kotahitanga</i>	Unison/unity
<i>Te reo Māori</i>	The <i>Māori</i> language
<i>Tiaki</i>	To guard or to keep
<i>Tikanga Māori</i>	<i>Māori</i> shared practices and principles, correct procedure, custom and social values
<i>Tino</i>	Very
<i>Tuakena-teina</i>	Mentoring, help and support from an older student for a younger one
<i>Waiata</i>	Sing, song, chant
<i>Waka</i>	Canoe
<i>Wānanga</i>	To meet and discuss; <i>Māori</i> centre of learning; a learning forum involving rich and dynamic

	sharing of knowledge
<i>Whakama</i>	Disenchanted, despondent, humiliated, shy, ashamed
<i>Whakamihi</i>	Praise
<i>Whakapapa</i>	Lines of descent, connections, genealogy
<i>Whakapiringatanga</i>	Process where specific individual roles and responsibilities are required to achieve individual and group outcomes
<i>Whakawhanaungatanga</i>	Kinship, links, ties; facilitating a more open relationship than mere researcher and researched; network of interactive links
<i>Whānau</i>	Family, extended family
<i>Whānaungatanga</i>	Relationships, kinship, sense of family connections
<i>Wharekura</i>	<i>Māori</i> -medium secondary school
<i>Whare wānanga</i>	Houses of higher learning
<i>Whenua</i>	Land

Abbreviations

<i>AIMHI</i>	Achievement in Multicultural High School
<i>AUT</i>	Auckland University of Technology
<i>ERO</i>	Education Review Office
<i>ETP</i>	Effective Teacher Profile
<i>GATE</i>	Gifted and Talented Education
<i>IBRLA</i>	Initiation, Benefits, Representation, Legitimation, Accountability
<i>KLP</i>	Kiwi Leadership for Principals
<i>MoE</i>	Ministry of Education
<i>NCEA</i>	National Certificate of Education Achievement
<i>NZC</i>	New Zealand Curriculum
<i>OECD</i>	Organisation for Economic Development
<i>OTJ</i>	Overall Teacher Judgements
<i>PISA</i>	Progress for International Student Assessment
<i>SES</i>	Social Economic Status

Chapter 1: Introduction

1.1: Introduction

This chapter describes the impetus for the research followed by the research questions, critical detractors, political stance and possible options for research findings. The thesis outline concludes the chapter.

1.2: Impetus for research

This study sought to identify the factors that contribute to the variation of *Māori* student achievement in Years 7 and 8 high decile full primary schools and those cultural understanding of teachers that impacts on their professional practice.

Internationally the New Zealand education system is recognised as a high performing system. The Organisation for Economic Development (OECD) Progress for International Student Assessment (PISA) studies indicate noticeable differences across participating countries between fifteen year old students and how they are able to apply their learning in mathematics, science and reading literacies (Telford & May, 2010). The 2009 Reading Literacy statistics indicated New Zealand students' performance was only bettered by two OECD countries and two OECD partner economies (Telford & May, 2010). However, New Zealand results show comparatively high disparities in outcomes of student achievement among high performing countries (MoE, 2010b). In every participating country girls performed better than boys, with New Zealand having one of the largest disparities between girls and boys. Although high achievement by many *Māori* and Pasifika learners is recognised, these learners are over represented at the lower end (Telford & May, 2010). Significant to this inquiry is the continuing pattern of disproportionate *Māori* and Pasifika students within this long tail of underachievement (Alton-Lee, 2008).

As a principal of a high decile full primary school, the national gap between *Māori* and *non-Māori* student achievement stimulated me to investigate my current educational context of 200 students. I focused on the disparity in achievement of our 7-15 per cent of *Māori* students compared to their *non-Māori* peers. Despite deliberate strategic interventions during a three-to-five year period, *Māori* students identified within the cohort group failed to make accelerated

educational progress. In 2010, the introduction of National Standards (MoE, 2010a) enabled moderation of achievement in Reading, Writing, and Mathematics with neighbouring high decile schools. My concern was once again highlighted when our writing data for *Māori* students equated to the achievement of *Māori* students from a decile 5 school. This raises the question of why, when we are a well-resourced school, with progressive staff representing five different ethnicities supported by an active Board of Trustees and Parent Teacher Association, our students are achieving at this level. Our students and staff are focused on high expectations of learning, and enjoy positive learning relationships. The summation by Watson, Hughes and Lauder (2003) that students from high decile schools achieve at higher levels compared with their peers engaged in lower decile learning contexts was not evident.

My attention then turned to personal knowledge, understanding and implementation of cultural competencies and their integration into the learning environment. In 2010, I was engaged in personal professional development which directed me to investigate the Ministry of Education (MoE, 2008) Kiwi Leadership for Principals (KLP) document. Identified within this text are the qualities of *manaakitanga*, *pono*, and *ako awhinatanga* as intrinsic qualities for effective leadership. In my leadership practice these abilities are influenced by my overarching key values of integrity, excellence, trust, respect and fairness. Intrinsic within these principal values are the key values of collaboration, reflection, commitment and team work. They guide who I am, what I do and how I do it, personally and professionally.

My interest in this topic weaves together both a professional desire and personal endeavour to make a positive contribution to the lives of children, families and teachers who I am responsible for. When I think back to my own background, I certainly have been influenced by the experiences and interactions I had with the people and places I encountered. My mother is a Samoan, born in Fiji and my father European, born in Christchurch. My husband's father is *Ngati Tūwharetoa* and his mother is European. My memories attending primary and secondary school in the late 1960s are ones of always being grouped with *Māori* and the assumed dark skinned stereotype of that time. The only teacher who differed was a religious intermediate teacher who engendered personal strength and academic

competence. I retained the expectation of the population status quo by excelling in sport at secondary school, while gaining enough academic achievement to enter teacher training.

Since that time, I have continued to enhance my knowledge and skills through ongoing learning opportunities, defining and selecting appropriate practices for constructive contextual application. Together, my inquiring philosophy and my continued social and academic confidence (*pono*) have given me the courage to meet the expectations of institutional guidelines and the determination to eliminate the long-time stigma of academic failure experienced at secondary school. Completing this inquiry will enable me to prove to myself and others that I can finally achieve academic stature with a cause very close to my heart.

My goal from the findings of this investigation is to engender constructive change in personal and pedagogical practice to the positive advancement of any *Māori* learners and their educators. Personally, I will be empowered to guide and influence young people to be confident in who they are, where they come from and to pursue their aspirations confidently. Our students, and in particular *Māori* and Pasifika, must be able to take risks in a safe and supported environment and to capitalise on the educational opportunities that are created. As a person of mixed ethnicity, I believe this is one form of reciprocity I can give to the cultures that identify me.

1.3: Research questions

The justification and need to understand or gain an explanation of the variation in our *Māori* student achievement is approached through this first research question:

RQ1: What factors contribute to the variation of achievement for Year 7 and 8 *Māori* students in high decile, full primary schools?

Research enables me to connect my professional goals and my personal experiences through my inquiry. The function of research is to increase our knowledge base about ourselves, our world and how we live in it. The understanding and meanings that emerge should ultimately offer opportunities to transform parts of our existence as Williams and Ormond (2010) claim that ‘knowing’ is sought through a wide scope when people use a variety of ways of

knowing to achieve meaning. It is through the creative and explorative process of research that new knowledge about phenomena is generated in a systematic way.

A systematic process of research therefore should promote discussion and question current personal teacher practice and their response to the specific learning and cultural needs of *Māori* learners, which is emphasised through the introduction of *Tātaiako* (MoE, 2011). The intent of the document is to challenge and encourage teachers to see how their own culture has shaped them and to recognise the importance of understanding the identity, language and culture of *Māori* students to assist teachers to develop more effective culturally responsive relationships, learning environments and teaching approaches and practices. To discover or gain insight as to how this could be achieved, the exploration of the culturally responsive practices of teachers is approached through my second research question:

RQ2: How are the cultural competencies for teachers (MoE, 2011) approached, implemented and sustained in high quality learning opportunities?

The exploration of teachers' culturally responsive practice; what works, what does not, how and when, will assist the current challenges of changing pedagogical practise to promote *Māori* student learning.

I am committed to advancing student outcomes. To achieve this goal I need to retain a close focus on the core business of teaching and learning and be actively involved with teacher professional development that is focused on collectively identified goals through strategic intent for all learners (Robinson, Hohepa & Lloyd, 2009). As a learner (*ako*) it is important to investigate human behaviour to seek clarification of my surrounding world, before I can add or offer (*awhinatanga*) further potential understanding to educational practice to create positive change for all people as learners (*ako*) and leaders (*manaakitanga*); in particular for *Māori*.

As a *non-Māori*, I wanted to discover what these competencies, look, sound and feel like; how are they sustained in learning environments where identity and culture are accepted as the norm and potential is realised and achieved, and to

celebrate *Māori* enjoying educational success as *Māori* (MoE, 2007, 2009a; 2013).

There has been significant increase in the past few years in what works for and with *Māori* students (Bishop, 2010; Bishop & Berryman 2010; MoE 2009a; Robinson et al., 2009). Emerging evidence from this study will show transitional links to the progressive secondary sector strategies and offer new pedagogical approaches around enhancing successful learning opportunities for *Māori* students in the primary sector.

1.4: Critical detractors

The low educational levels of *Māori* compared with *non-Māori* were expressed through various sectors of New Zealand society statistically by the 1960 Hunn Report (Hunn, 1960; Thompson, 1961) and the Progress in School Project (Nash, 2001). The findings of these reports did not portray *Māori* people positively and the aftermath of negativity and failing of *Māori* still prevails in communities and educational classrooms today (Bishop, 2003; Bishop, Berryman, Taikiwai & Richardson, 2003; Macfarlane, 2000). With the continuing social, economic and political disparities in New Zealand today “*Māori* have higher levels of unemployment, are more likely to be employed in low paying employment, have much higher levels of incarceration, illness and poverty” (Bishop, Berryman, Cavanagh & Teddy, 2009, p.734) than most of the remaining population and are not as frequent in the positive indicators of social and economic success.

Since the beginning of the twenty-first century, there has been a strategic shift away from a tendency to blame *Māori* themselves and consider the possibilities that schooling is implicated in the reproduction of inequalities in society (Bishop, 2003; 2008; Panofsky, 2000; Sexton, 2011).

In response to this deficit theorising (Bishop, 2003; Panofsky, 2000), solutions seeking to address the educational disparity have been sought through educational research studies (Bishop et al., 2003; Bishop, et al., 2007; Bishop et al., 2009). The professional development *Te Kotahitanga* project (Bishop et al., 2009) indicates that the effectiveness of addressing *Māori* student disparate achievement is affected by various discursive positions, professional development activities and the emergence of an effective teacher profile (Bishop, 2010). The role, actions

and interactions of the teacher figure significantly. *Māori* students require more than a good teacher, as identified by Alton-Lee (2003), and Timperley, Wilson, Barrar and Fung (2007). The teacher needs to make a professional commitment and take responsibility to bring about equitable outcomes by changing the learning relations and interactions in the classroom between the teacher and *Māori* students through the adoption and implementation of culturally responsive pedagogy and the rejection of deficit theorizing (Bishop, 2003).

1.5: Political steer

The Crown has made a deliberate shift to focus on realising *Māori* potential through the publication of the *New Zealand Curriculum: For English-medium teaching and learning in Years 1-13* (MoE, 2007), *Kiwi Leadership for Principals* (KLP) (MoE, 2008), *Ka Hikitia: Managing for Success* (MoE, 2009a), *Ka Hikitia: Accelerating Success* (MoE, 2013) and *Tātaiako: Cultural Competencies for Teachers of Māori learners* (MoE, 2011). These MoE publications challenge leaders of learning to respond to the aspirations of *Māori* students by achieving the vision and aims of these directives. Within these documents, indicators for expected outcomes are highlighted although a process or responsive model of how this is to be achieved is not clearly stated or defined. However, the MoE will continue to monitor implementation progress through accountability Education Review Office (ERO) reviews (ERO, 2010; 2013).

The *Te Kotahitanga* programme began in 2001 and provided many secondary school leaders of learning with professional development and educational reform models to support the implementation of culturally responsive practices to improve the achievement of *Māori* students (Bishop et al., 2003; Bishop et al., 2007; Bishop et al., 2009). *Te Kotahitanga* had a strong research base and was highly successful in showing how schooling could make the most difference by reducing disparity and accelerating achievement for *Māori* (Bishop, 2010; Bishop, Berryman, Wearmouth, Peter & Clapham, 2012; Bishop, O'Sullivan & Berryman, 2010).

1.6: Research outcome possibilities

In the primary sector, there has been a scarcity of consistent evidence to support leaders and teachers in their endeavours to encourage and sustain positive educational outcomes for *Māori* students. *Ka Hikitia* (MoE, 2009a) suggests further investigation for some Year 7 and 8 students prior to their significant escalation of disengagement at Years 9 and 10. Bishop (2008) also states while patterns for *Māori* underachievement are “more clearly exhibited in secondary schools, the foundations for these problems commence in the primary school years” (p.48). This situation illustrates the need for research that provides evidence of pedagogical leadership and practice that provides and facilitates educational success for *Māori* students in mainstream settings.

It is hoped that the information obtained from this research will provide new evidence for deliberate differentiated practices that will:

identify reliable and valid pedagogical practice for me to support colleagues;

provoke others to engage in effective strategies and deliberate actions to improve outcomes for *Māori* learners; and

accelerate the educational success of *Māori* students in mainstream education.

1.7: Thesis outline

The following chapter provides a review of relevant literature. Chapter 3 outlines the methodology, research design and process. Chapter 4 presents the research findings, which are discussed in greater detail with respect to the literature in Chapter 5. Included in Chapter 5 are the limitations of the study, and some implications for future research.

Chapter 2: Literature Review

2.1: Introduction

New Zealand educators need to accept their professional responsibility and provide a learning environment that promotes sensitivity and sensibility toward the cultural backgrounds and inherent capabilities and skills of *Māori* learners to enable students to be who they are and what they are (ERO, 2010; Macfarlane, Glynn, Cavanagh & Bateman, 2007; MoE, 2009a).

This chapter reviews literature that has contributed to the debate on the educational discrepancy of *Māori* participants in mainstream education. It is presented in four sections. The first section centres on past events and their implications for *Māori* within mainstream education. The second section outlines strategic government intervention. The third section identifies research contributions to discursive repositioning of teachers that promote culturally responsive classroom pedagogy to advance educational outcomes for *Māori* students. The fourth section discusses cultural responsive classroom practices to reduce *Māori* students' educational disparity.

The first section identifies the unique New Zealand context. It begins with the eminence of the Treaty of Waitangi, a brief view of the introduction of compulsory education for *Māori*, the emergence of *Māori* sovereignty, the current educational deficit and the predicted implications for national prominence in competitive international markets. Social and cultural differences for *Māori* student attainment are then discussed, followed by the current stance of the New Zealand Government, MoE and differing research. The second section outlines the governments' strategic intent, the purpose of the ministerial documents KLP (MoE, 2008), *Ka Hikitia* (MoE, 2009a), NZC (MoE, 2007), and *Tātaiako* (MoE, 2011) linking research to policy, and policy to practice. The third section identifies positive contributions for *Māori* learners in mainstream contexts. The focus is on teacher's personal dimensions and begins with the Effective Teacher Profile (ETP) (Bishop, 2010; Bishop et al., 2010). This is followed by teachers challenging personalities, deficit theorising, sociocultural consciousness, social status and ideology in society and their disengagement and engagement of *Māori* students. Characteristics of an effective teacher conclude this section. The fourth

section discusses inclusive cultural metaphors for classroom learning imperative to *Māori* learners' confidence, competence and cultural identity. Presented are *te reo Māori*, *ako*, *whānau*, constructivist learning, student voice and relational trust. The final section presents a rationale for research, and the chapter summary.

This first section contextualises the New Zealand landscape through the Treaty of Waitangi, presents historic events and discusses the influence and political response to these events and their international implications.

2.1.1. Treaty of Waitangi

In New Zealand, the 1840 Treaty of Waitangi is the foundational document of the modern state and signifies the formal relationship between the British Crown and *Māori* to recognise and protect *Māori* values, traditions and practices (Orange, 2011). The Treaty of Waitangi acknowledged *Māori* as the *tangata whenua* and agreed for *Māori* and *Pākehā* to work together as partners in decision making (Orange, 2011) In Article 1 of the Treaty of Waitangi, *Māori* submitted *kawanatanga* to the Crown. The Crown, under Article 2, submitted to *Māori* *rangatiratanga* over their lands, culture, forests, fisheries and other *taonga*. In theory, *Māori* were accorded their sovereign rights to define, promote and control those treasures and resources which included creating, retaining and transmitting language, cultural knowledge (Macfarlane et al., 2007) and other cultural *taonga* (Hirsh, 1990; Orange, 2011). The Crown was accorded “the... right to settle and live in New Zealand and the government were guaranteed the right to govern” (Shields, Bishop & Mazawai, 2005, p.56). Under Article 3 of the Treaty of Waitangi, *Māori* were guaranteed the full rights of British Citizenship. Each article is associated with a specific principle: partnership (Article 1), protection (Article 2) and participation (Article 3). Fundamental to the principle of partnership is the ethical understanding of both *Māori* and European in an equitable relationship (Bishop, 2003) The principle of protection implies that the Crown has an obligation both to recognise *Māori* aspirations for self-determination and to protect the interests of *Māori*. Included in this partnership association is the protection of the interpretation of cultural knowledge and traditions, individual and collective rights, *Māori* data, values, norms, practices and language (Wilson, 2002). Participation under the Treaty of Waitangi guarantees *Māori* equality of opportunity and outcomes, partaking in decision

making as partners (Wilson, 2002). Although the Treaty of Waitangi was an exchange of promise between the two parties, the Crown did not base the development of the country on negotiation through a partnership of equal values and consideration in policy and law or adhere to the promise to maintain *tino rangatiratanga* for *Māori* of their resources (Yates & Issacs, 2000).

An assimilation process of political and social domination by the Crown was enacted by successive governments which saw the near extinction of *Māori* language, land and cultural knowledge (King, 2003). What followed was over one hundred and sixty years of colonization, exploitation and oppression of *Māori* culture, knowledge and language as practices were denied, refuted and dejected. Instead of *Māori* being full participants in the emerging economy and society of a new nation, *Māori* have continued to be disproportionately politically and socially marginalised and economically impoverished (Bishop, 2003; Bishop & Glynn, 1999; Walker, Eketone & Gibbs, 2006). Macfarlane et al. (2007) claim this domination progressed through armed struggle, unjust confiscations of land, biased legislation and successive educational policies and initiatives that have fluctuated through assimilation, integration, multiculturalism and biculturalism determined largely by the majority to the detriment of *Māori* language, culture and their own “indigenous educational aspirations” (p.67).

2.1.2. Historical impact

Missionaries introduced *Māori* to the compulsory education system at the beginning of the nineteenth century (Caccioppoli & Cullen, 2006). This system was predicated on the cultural superiority of the Western European settlers and was part of the colonial discourse that was disseminated in New Zealand mainstream society through the nineteenth century (Bishop, 2003). Bishop and Glynn (1999) argue that policies and practices through the nineteenth and twentieth centuries were based on establishing the colonising power and were founded on the supposition that it was desirable for *Māori* to become like the coloniser. The policy of cultural assimilation – part of New Zealand’s official government policy from 1844-1960- reinforced this view and portrayed cultural assimilation as a desirable goal driven by cultural superiority. Bishop and Glynn (1999) suggest that the colonisers held the view that their beliefs, values and way of life were superior, and *Māori* were encouraged to abandon their culture as

quickly as possible. Monolingualism (English the language of the coloniser) and monoculturalism (the culture of the coloniser) were viewed as appropriate and correct practices for New Zealand society. Monoculturalist policies espoused the beliefs, values and cultural practices of the coloniser and directed who, how and what was taught in schools. The Native Schools Act of 1987 (Regan, 2011) cemented the exclusion of *Māori* language, knowledge and understanding in schools. Bishop (cited in Shields et al., 2005) infers that the dominant voice in New Zealand in the latter part of the nineteenth century “maintained that *Māori* impoverishment was due to their resisting assimilation” (p. 62). This view blamed *Māori*, the marginalised victims, and ignored the land grab of *Māori* economic wealth, culture and places by colonising settlers. It reinforced the assumption of the colonising cultural superiority and the racial and cultural inferiority of the *Māori* people.

This policy of assimilation lasted into the mid-twentieth century when the 1960 Hunn Report (Hunn, 1960, Thompson, 1961) identified statistical discrepancies in educational outcomes between *Māori* and *non-Māori*. Following the Hunn Report (Hunn, 1960; Thompson, 1961), a policy of integration replaced the assimilation policy. In terms of *Māori* self-determination and aspirations, *Māori* language and cultural practices were not recognised by the dominant culture as valid for facing twenty-first century challenges. An assumption remained that *Māori* would benefit from living on terms defined by the majority culture in contrast to their own culturally located processes and aspirations (Thompson, 1961).

2.1.3. International implications

The opportunity to compete and sustain prominent participation in global international markets is critical for national and international economic viability. The focus for modern societies is finance, knowledge and social capitalism, driven by the intellectual power and economic opportunities of the national population. If education is identified as a commodity and a means of individual and national creation, it is critical for education systems to up-skill students and educate young people. Systems need to produce knowledgeable, thinking risk-takers working collaboratively to create and contribute new assets for the modern society because:

As employment becomes less labour-intensive, and more dependent on the use of technology, fewer jobs will be available for those who lack functional literacy and numeracy. The larger this group, the more difficult it will be for New Zealand to create and sustain a high-performing, international competitive economy.

(Education and Science Committee, 2008, p.11)

Governments of industrialised nations recognise the key for international economic competitiveness is a well-educated workforce (Education & Science Committee, 2008). Education systems in knowledge societies face new challenges. It is no longer enough to sort learners into those who have passed and those who have not. The quality of learning and teaching is the main provider of the workforce and:

All learners need to be well-served by their education to develop their capabilities, their sense of belonging, their wellbeing, and their abilities to succeed and contribute to wider communities. Governments are looking for education systems to rise to the challenge, to be more responsive to the diversity of their learners and to meet the higher expectations and future-focus required by knowledge societies.

(Alton-Lee, 2008, p.253)

The New Zealand Ministry of Education's current policy position is the expectation that all students will achieve, irrespective of what they bring to school. The teacher is expected to be highly skilled to create an optimum learning environment. Quality teaching is identified by Alton-Lee (2003) as a key influence on high quality outcomes for diverse students. Evidence reveals that up to 59 per cent variance in student performance is attributable to differences in teachers and classes; and up to 21 per cent is attributable to school variables (Alton-Lee, 2003). In line with Article 2 and 3 of the Treaty of Waitangi, Alton-Lee (2003) argues for diversity and difference as the core of classroom operations and calls for teaching responsive to student diversity (including high and low achievers) as the key focus of quality teaching in New Zealand. In response, the strategic intent of the Crown is outlined in the next section.

2.2: Strategic Intent

The high disparities, the relative high variance within New Zealand schools in the New Zealand PISA results, the rapidly changing demographic profiles, the impact of neoliberal political policies for those traditionally underserved by New Zealand schooling and the impact of these factors for international viability have indicated a need for educational leadership and systematic development to be more responsive to diverse learners, in particular *Māori* learners (Alton-Lee, 2008).

There has been a strategic shift at systems level and direction from the MoE to move the issues of diversity to a central focus and for everyone in the education sector to take responsibility for the educational success of *Māori* students (MoE, 2009a). The MoE has published the New Zealand Curriculum (MoE, 2007) KLP (MoE, 2008) *Ka Hikitia* (MoE, 2009a, 2013) and *Tātaiako* (MoE, 2011) to direct curriculum, pedagogical practice and teacher's cultural understanding to meet *Māori* students learning needs and aspirations through recognised successful practices. The intent of each publication for *Māori* learners is now shared.

2.2.1. New Zealand Curriculum

In 2007, the MoE launched the New Zealand Curriculum (NZC) as official policy relating to teaching and learning in English-medium schools. The NZC functions as a guide for school administrators and teachers to design their own curriculum policies and programmes to fulfill the intent of the Treaty of Waitangi and the specific teaching and learning needs identified from their own school community. Within this curriculum (MoE, 2007) there has been a deliberate shift in focus away from content coverage to developing coherent pathways for students, to enable teachers to reflect on how their students learn and adapt their teaching to meet these needs. Students are encouraged to be actively involved, confident, connected life-long learners by taking control of their learning, reflecting on what they know, how they know it and what they need to learn next (MoE, 2007). The focus on effective pedagogy in the New Zealand Curriculum (MoE, 2007) includes elements of teaching practice that can be seen as essential to *Māori* methodology and are in sync with the strategic intent of *Ka Hikitia* (MoE, 2009a) and the findings of Robinson et al. (2009) that support cultural distinctiveness in English-medium schools.

2.2.2. Kiwi leadership for principals

Within KLP (MoE, 2008) the intrinsic qualities of *mannakitanga*, *pono*, *ako* and *awhinatanga* are identified. These qualities are equally appropriate for all leaders of learning as they link leadership dimensions to positive student outcomes (Robinson et al., 2009).

2.2.3. Ka Hikitia

Ka Hikitia (MoE, 2009a) means “to step up, to lift up or to lengthen one’s stride” (p.6). The intent of this study is to further investigate “how the education system performs to ensure *Māori* students are enjoying and achieving education success as *Māori*” (p.6). The three key principles of *Ka Hikitia* are:

Māori potential: All *Māori* learners have unlimited potential.

Cultural advantage: All *Māori* have cultural advantage by virtue of what they are - being *Māori* is an asset; not a problem.

Inherent capability: All *Māori* are inherently capable of achieving success.

(p.19)

This document is explicit in how *Māori* achievement may be achieved and corresponds with developing coherent pathways for students in the NZC (MoE, 2007).

2.2.4. Tātaiako

This document serves as a guideline to assist teachers to develop culturally responsive relationships, learning environments and teaching approaches and practices through competencies at different stages of their careers. The competencies are defined in *Tātaiako* (MoE, 2011) as:

Wānanga: participating with learners and communities in robust dialogue for the benefit of *Māori* achievement (p.4) through communication, problem solving and innovation (p.5);

Whānaungatanga: actively engaging in respectful working relationships with *Māori* learners, parents and *whānau*, *hapū*, *iwi* and the *Māori*

community (p.4) through relationships (students, school-wide, community) with high expectations (p.5);

Manaakitanga: showing integrity, sincerity and respect towards *Māori* beliefs, language and culture (p.4) through values of integrity, trust and equity (p.5);

Tangata Whenuatanga: affirming *Māori* learners as *Māori*. Providing contexts for learning where the language, identity and culture of *Māori* learners and their *whānau* is affirmed (p.4) by place-based, socio-cultural awareness and knowledge (p.5); and

Ako: taking responsibility for their own learning and that of *Māori* learners (p.4) through practice in the classroom and beyond. (p.5).

The cultural location of the competencies refers to the focus of *mārama* for graduating teachers to develop an understanding of their own identity, language and culture and to develop an understanding of the relevance of culture in New Zealand education and an understanding of and openness to *Māori* knowledge and expertise. For registered teachers, the focus is *mōhio*; knowing how to validate and affirm *Māori* and *iwi* culture and being able to apply this knowledge. For school leaders, the focus is *mātau*; being able to lead and engage others in validating and affirming *Māori* and *iwi* culture (MoE, 2011). When centred in this cultural location, the intent of *Tātaiako* (MoE, 2011) is to direct educators to move the focus away from deficit problems, failure and risks, to concentrate on successful past and current work in education; and to use the latest research evidence to identify, prioritise action and target successful opportunities to focus personnel, resources, processes, communication and energies on the known evidence to maximise *Māori* student educational potential and to relate to *Māori* students through these cultural aspirations and understanding (Bishop et al., 2012; MoE, 2009a).

2.3: Research Evidence

Unless change for *Māori* students is instigated within classroom environments under the guidance and support of inclusive and culturally responsive classroom teachers, the balance of cultural domination in the classroom is based on the fact

that *Māori* students are denied their own cultural aspirations and have to adjust to the teacher's culture and perception (Bishop et al., 2003; Bishop, 1999).

Finding innovative, effective and practical ways to improve educational outcomes for *Māori* is challenging, and a complex social issue (Whitinui, 2011). Research cycles continue to provide new ways of approaching concepts to promote educational success for *Māori* (Alton-Lee, 2003, Bishop, 2008; Bishop & Berryman, 2006; Bishop et al., 2012; ERO, 2012; Macfarlane et al., 2007). Earlier research findings of culturally responsive pedagogical practices and relations known to advance educational success for *Māori* offer this study a knowledgeable platform to begin. Within continuing research cycles the outcomes from this study could query or strengthen previous outcomes, or ignite new beginnings for future investigations.

Nested within the parameters of research based evidence, this next section explores key themes around pedagogy, philosophy, research, ideology, and accountability as a consideration towards making a positive difference to the learning competence of *Māori* learners in mainstream settings.

2.3.1. Effective teacher profile

By creating a constructive narrative with students and teachers in mainstream secondary schools Bishop and Berryman (2009) developed an effective teacher profile (ETP).

At centre stage in these narratives, is the necessity for common *kaupapa* or philosophy that rejects deficit thinking and pathologising; practices that Caccioppoli and Cullen (2006) describe as extremely overt in compulsory education. Bishop (2003) also calls for culturally safe classrooms where narrative pedagogy is a means of creating interaction patterns that position teachers and students with co-joint reflections on shared experiences to form new stories and understandings. This interaction in the relationship is created on the basis of self-determination (*rangatiratanga*) by each of the parties. The sharing of these pedagogies is the location for the learner to control their destiny with the help of the teacher as co-learner. It is not a place for either party to take control. The assumption of *rangatiratanga* prompts teachers to be agentic participants; to voice their professional commitment and willingness to engage in effective relations,

interactions and reciprocal practices as fundamentals to addressing and promoting *Māori* student achievement. This positive agentic commitment enables teachers to see themselves as problem solvers able to access resources and knowledge to help all of their students. They believe that all of their students can achieve, no matter what, and create classrooms where young *Māori* enjoy education success as *Māori* (MoE, 2009a).

The ETP profile offers six terms of cultural understanding for teaching *Māori* students: *manaakitanga* (caring for students as *Māori* and acknowledging their *mana*); *mana motuhake* (having high expectations); *ngā whakapiringatanga* (managing the classroom to promote learning); *wānanga* and *ako* (using a range of dynamic, interactive teaching styles); and *Kōtahitanga* (teachers and students reflecting together on student achievement in order to move forward collaboratively). On a daily basis, effective teachers interact and relate to *Māori* students through these cultural aspirations and understandings (Bishop, 2010; Bishop & Berryman, 2009; Bishop et al., 2012) When teachers pronounce students names correctly, students are confident the teacher cares and recognises them as an individual, retaining their *mana* and respect (Bishop & Berryman, 2006).

2.3.2. Rejecting deficit theorising

Although teachers can be well meaning, they will respond negatively if they are led to believe that their students are inferior (Valencia, 1997). Bishop and Berryman (2006, 2009) identified negative, deficit thinking in the teacher as fundamental to the development of negative relations and interactions between student and teachers, resulting in frustration and anger for all involved. Within their *Te Kōtahitanga* programme, Bishop and Berryman (2009) call for teachers to adopt a positive approach by repositioning themselves to draw explanations and subsequent practise. Alternative discussions will then offer them solutions instead of reinforcing problems and barriers. This discursive repositioning (Davies & Harre, 1990) is in contrast to positioning teachers as having deficiencies or asking them to conform to a working model (Bishop et al., 2012). Evidence from teacher surveys and interviews showed an empowering approach was valued as participants saw this as an enabling process by offering activities which allowed

teachers to appreciate cognitive dissonance in a respectful manner that supports teachers as learners (Timperley et al., 2007).

Within *Māori* epistemology (knowledge and tradition) this process of discursive repositioning is aligned with *koha*. A *koha* is literally a gift that is placed on the *marae* by the *manuhiri* for the *tangata whenua*. The visitors cannot impose the gift and it is up to the hosts to decide whether or not they want to accept the gift. A *koha* is a gesture of *aroha* and respect. Within the context of education, the notion of *koha* emphasises the connectedness between host and visitor (Bishop et al., 2012). This teacher-student connection acknowledges the teacher's self-determination in the same way as teachers are encouraged to accept the self-determination of *Māori* students.

Experiences outlined in students' narratives provide teachers with the opportunity to reflect upon the experiences of others and critically consider the part they might be playing in the immediate and wider societal powers that impact on *Māori* participation in schooling. Often it is the sharing of these empathetic schooling experiences that places the teacher for the first time in a position to reflect upon their own understanding of *Māori* students' experiences and therefore their own explanations about these experiences, their pedagogy and the probable impact upon *Māori* student achievement. The vast majority of teachers described this as being an enlightening and an empowering activity (Bishop et al., 2007; Bishop et al., 2012).

Marzano, Waters and McNulty (2005) suggest many educational innovations ignore the existing framework of perceptions and beliefs or paradigm as part of the change process and assume "that innovation is assimilated into existing beliefs and perceptions" (p.162). They suggest that reforms that adopt an ontological narrative provide participants with real live realities and an experience of consciousness other than the "I embedded in their paradigms" (p.162). It is from within these reforms that teachers can experience how their conversations can define their following relationships and interactions with *Māori* students.

2.3.3. Personal dimension

Embedded within this teacher discursive repositioning are the cognitive and emotional processes teachers must engage in to become culturally responsive

(Villegas & Lucas, 2002). Teachers need to challenge their own sociocultural consciousness. Through self-reflection, teachers examine their attitudes and beliefs about themselves and others, and begin to discover why they are what they are. Teachers can then confront biases that may influence their value system. Because of the impact teachers' values have on relationships with students and their families, teachers must resolve negative feelings towards cultural, language, or ethnic groups. Teachers are often resistant to the belief that their values might reflect prejudices or perhaps even racism towards certain groups. By eliminating their biases, teachers help to create an atmosphere of trust and acceptance for students and their families and give greater opportunity for student success (Richards, Brown & Forde, 2007).

To assist in making this shift, it is crucial for teachers to explore their personal histories, their early experiences and the familial events that have contributed to their understanding of themselves as racial and non-racial human beings. These explorations can enlighten teachers about the roots of their views and the personal motivations that guide their action and interaction behaviours. Gay (2002), and Villegas and Lucas (2002) suggest the need for teachers to recognise and acknowledge the influence of their affiliation and membership with various groups in society; how belonging to one group influences how one views and relates to other groups. Gay (2002) and Villegas and Lucas (2002) stress the importance of teachers learning about the lives and experiences of other groups and how the different historical experiences have shaped attitudes and perspectives. It is through this learning about others that teachers begin to see differences between their own values and those of other groups. Gay (2002) and Villegas and Lucas (2002) agree that when teachers come to terms with the historical shaping of their values, they can relate to other individuals.

2.3.4. Social location and individual ideology

Through sociocultural consciousness teachers are led to an understanding that differences in social location are not neutral, and in all social systems some positions are regarded as having greater status than others (Villegas & Lucas, 2002). From within this status, differentiation becomes access to stratified power and, in New Zealand classrooms this has been determined by the power imbalances imposed by the *Pākehā* majority (Bishop, 1999, 2003). Teachers also

need to realise that social inequalities are realised in systematic discrimination and justified by societal ideology of merit, social mobility and individual responsibility (Bishop, 1999, 2003). Therefore, the role schools and teachers as individuals or a collective play in reproducing and legitimatising the processes of social detachments need to be critically examined. Although schools supposedly offer unlimited possibilities for social advancement, at the same time they maintain structures that severely hinder the possibility of the advancement for those at the bottom of the social scale (Bishop, 2003). There is a belief that schools are impartial, but in reality they are not. Built into schools are curricular, pedagogical and evaluating practices that advantage the affluent, white and male segments of society. It is the way in which we have been socialised that allows us to think that biased practices are impartial and natural. Our belief that we have a social system that gives opportunities and advantages to people on their ability, rather than their wealth or seniority, has a powerful impact on our thinking. The tendency then is to explain academic success on the basis of individual characteristics rather than institutional discrimination (Villegas & Lucas, 2002).

Therefore, teachers need to understand their own sociocultural identities, and the complicated connection between schools and society. In New Zealand, the organisation of traditional mainstream schooling helps to reproduce existing social inequalities which give the illusion of being fair and neutral, while still privileging some students based on race, social class, gender, language group, or any other factor (Bishop, 2003; O'Regan, 2011; Villegas & Lucas, 2002). The risk is, if teachers do not see how the so-called social meritocracy works for those already advantaged in society, by possession of their social origin or colour of skin, Villegas and Lucas (2002) believe they will fail to understand and respond to students who are socio-culturally different from themselves, especially when the students are from oppressed groups.

2.3.5. Disengagement

Throughout the last three decades, concern has frequently been expressed about the lower achievement, alienation and the higher dropout rates of *Māori* students compared with their *non-Māori* counterparts, particularly in secondary and tertiary education. Commonly in sync with student disengagement, behavioural issues arise and students and their *whānau* become disenchanted, despondent and

whakama. Students with behaviour difficulties have diverse needs, and effective teaching strategies in the alternative or regular environment are imperative, especially for *Māori*.

2.3.6. Engagement

By adopting *Māori* principles and practices in mainstream classroom management, behaviour is better understood within a cultural and community context. A combination of contemporary theory and *Māori* tradition is embraced by the Hikairo Rationale as a deliberate, systematic effort to bring cultural aspects into the educative–democratic approach for behaviour management (Macfarlane, 2000). By initiating the strategies of Hikairo: *Huakina Ma,i Ihi, Kōtahitanga, Awhinatia, I Runga I te Mannaki, Raranga* and *Oranga* a more pleasant, orderly learning classroom environment is shaped through co-operation, understanding, reciprocity and warmth. These qualities are simultaneously assertive as guiding values and metaphors from within a *Māori* world view appropriate for *Māori* and *non-Māori* students and teachers.

Macfarlane’s (2000) interviews with student participants identified how the research school valued individuals as being significant to creating opportunities for educational success. Receptive adults willingly listened to young people to sort out confusion, changing students’ perceptions of authority. This change was facilitated through contact with people who exercised authority rationally and who valued what others said or did. Programmes were built and personnel committed to basic values of caring for and helping one another.

There was evidence of collective responsibility, and respect for *Māori* concepts and values, within a pedagogically and culturally inclusive environment. This led to improved student-teacher relationships, where the effective teacher is caring and firm, genuine and assertive, empathetic and honest. The provision of a proactive educational framework increased attendance, disarmed disaffected students and reignited young people’s educational interest and opportunity to complete their basic schooling as well as move towards their aspirations by raising their self-esteem and steering clear of troublesome situations.

The importance of student-teacher relationships and successful educational attainment for *Māori* students cannot be underemphasised. An integral element

within this rapport as identified by Butterworth and Bevan-Brown (2007) is communicating praise to *Māori* students. In their small research study, findings revealed that “*Māori* students’ response to praise was a complex, multifaceted issue that was firmly grounded in a cultural framework” (Butterworth & Bevan-Brown, 2007, p.22). The model proposed and identified the values and processes of *Whakamihi*, *Whānaungatanga*, *Mannakitanga/mana-a-kiaroha*, *āwhina* and *Whānau/mātua* through a praise pathway *ngā ara whakamihi* (Butterworth & Bevan-Brown, 2007). This context for praise gives teachers a template for building a classroom and school environment which values *Māori* culture and supports *Māori* students learning via the constructive use of praise and positive feedback. Butterworth and Bevan-Brown's (2007) findings indicate that the reception of praise by *Māori* students is strongly influenced by the way they feel their colleagues and teacher value their culture and the wider classroom context. *Māori* students measure this by the way teachers treat students with respect, build and maintain positive teacher-student relationships, set and attain high expectations of their *Māori* students and integrate cultural elements within the classroom programme and outside environment.

This research advocates that teachers must be alert to the influences their own world views, beliefs, attitudes and cultural understandings have on their interpretation and reaction to *Māori* students’ response to praise. Teachers must understand students’ cultural influences to avoid misinterpretation of student responses. They must consider the possibility that some children may experience duality of feelings in respect to receiving praise. Negative response to praise cannot be viewed in isolation from the students’ cultural beliefs, values, and practices and from the classroom context with its many influences both seen and unseen. Butterworth and Bevan-Brown (2007) found “there is no doubt that in a culturally responsive, supportive environment praise can have a powerful positive effect on *Māori* students’ learning and behaviour” (p. 26).

2.3.7. Characteristics of an effective teacher

Three independent research studies in low socioeconomic institutions were established to investigate links between what teachers do, student achievement and effective practice. In the *Kaiako-toa* project, Auckland College of Education researchers worked with three highly successful teachers of *Māori* and Pasifika

students. Students did not participate in the *kanohi ki te kanohi* interviews the teachers and other adults undertook (Hawk, Tumama Cowley, Hill & Sutherland, 2002).

In the Hill and Hawk (2000) Achievement in Multicultural High School (AIMHI) project, two researchers worked in eight secondary schools with teachers and students seeking understanding of effective teaching practice in low decile schools. The primary and secondary schools were SES equivalent. Classroom observations and *kanohi ki te kanohi* individual interviews with eighty- nine highly effective teachers, and group discussion for one hundred *Māori* and Pasifika students followed (Hawk et al., 2002).

In 1999-2000, researchers from Auckland University of Technology (AUT) conducted a three phased tertiary study involving Pasifika students only (Cowley, Dabb & Jones, 2000). The themes that emerged from the interviews and group discussions of the first phase were integrated into a structured questionnaire to provide a quantitative analysis of the influence of various approaches and practices on student achievement. Like the secondary study, their student voices gave important insights into learning experiences and as young adults, their reflections drew upon a lifetime of learning experiences (Hawk et al., 2002).

Repeated in all three studies by teachers and students was the similarity of personal qualities characteristic of the kind of teacher-student relationship deemed crucial for student's educational success.

This evidence suggests it is the teacher's attitude, values, behaviours, efforts and skills that enable them to establish the type of relationship conducive to supporting learning for *Māori* and Pasifika students. Secondary investigations found a visual understanding and empathy of *Māori* and Pasifika cultures helped establish a successful working rapport, although cultural and family experiences in isolation did not build an effective relationship.

Effective teachers pronounced names correctly, enjoyed learning more about their student's culture and world, incorporated relevant experiences into their educational activities and encouraged students to talk in their first language. A climate of mutual respect, respectful communication and connectedness allowed

students to develop an internal locus of control or *kaupapa*. This was reflected in the way teachers modelled attitudes and behaviours and the energy, effort and extra mile invested to ensure educational success, based on desire and commitment.

An inclusive atmosphere allowed the students to relax and engage freely in learning activities. Humour was encouraged as students and teacher enjoyed general positivity. The way the teacher felt about each student and their ability had a decisive impact on the way they felt about their learning and teacher. Effective teachers believed in the ability of their students and were confident practitioners with high self-efficacy.

Each aspect of the relationship engendered a reciprocal response. Hard work by teachers generates hard work by students. If teachers care about their students, students will care about their teachers, creating a strong sense of mutual loyalty. Teachers who hold high expectations, model appropriate behaviours and responses, give *Māori* and Pasifika students a positive appreciation of themselves as valued educational contributors and achievers.

The next section presents recognised cultural pedagogy receptive to individual and collective *Māori* students' identity, culture and difference and educational outcomes.

2.4: Culturally Responsive Pedagogy

The previous characteristics are the result of teachers holding particular attitudes that have direct implications for their professional practice. Adding the language dimension of *te reo Māori* is a further element in shifting teachers' cultural perceptions.

2.4.1. *Te reo Māori* – The Māori Language

The introduction of *Te Aho Arataki Marau mō te Ako I Te Reo Māori – Kura Auraki: Curriculum Guidelines for Teaching and Learning Te Reo Māori in English-medium Schools: Years 1-13* (MoE, 2009b) offers schools guidelines to support and assist in planning and delivering high quality programmes for teaching and learning *te reo Māori*. With the progressions listed in year levels, the continuity of language can evolve from year to year and the inclusion of

proficiency targets establishes levels of expectations and attainments. One of the intentions of the guidelines around *te reo Māori* learning area is to reinforce the link between language, culture and identity. Language is the essence of culture and it is through the interconnection of *te reo Māori* and *tikanga Māori* that students gain access to *te ao Māori*. As students learn the language, they gain insights and experiences which enrich their understanding and extend their understanding and uniqueness and complexity of *te ao Māori*. Through *te reo Māori*, students grow to understand how culture shapes people's thoughts and behaviours and to understand both the value of cultural diversity and the importance of indigenous languages and cultures that define New Zealand and its uniqueness in the wider world (MoE, 2009b). By unpacking these understandings, students begin to think about their own cultural identity and their own place in the world. For students who identify as *Māori* and for those for whom *te reo Māori* is a second language, accessing a connection to a rich cultural heritage may be especially empowering and increasing their sense of belonging and pride, as they come to value the ability to walk in both worlds in Aotearoa/New Zealand. All students who learn *te reo Māori* deepen their knowledge and understanding of *tikanga Māori* and develop their own personal, group and national identities (MoE, 2009b).

The significance of *te reo Māori* as a *tāonga* has been established in the bicultural principles of the New Zealand Curriculum (MoE, 2007) by the statement “all students have the opportunity to acquire knowledge of *te reo Māori me ōna tikanga*” (p.9). The 2010 Education Review Office reports school leaders and teachers are finding the Treaty of Waitangi principles of participation, partnership and protection challenging to implement. In schools where the principles are evident:

Te reo Māori me ōna tikanga is valued and promoted in school management and in teaching and learning, for example, through *pōwhiri*, *karakia*, and *kapa haka*;

all students have the opportunity to learn *te reo Māori* and to understand and celebrate the place of *Māori* as *tangata whenua* in Aotearoa New Zealand; and

establishing relationships with students, parents, *whānau*, *iwi* and other community members supports *Māori* student learning.

Although, *te reo Māori* is one of the three national languages alongside English and New Zealand sign language and the core of *Māori* existence and survival, it is very much an endangered language (O'Regan, 2011). With over 75 percent of *Māori* not speaking *te reo Māori*, O'Regan (2011) agonises that the true commitment for *Māori* students to be truly successful in their education is the provision and use of *te reo Māori* in schools. This is unquestionably crucial for *Māori* survival and the promotion of their national identity as New Zealanders.

2.4.2. History of Te Reo

From 1930 through to the 1960s, *te reo Māori* was near extinction. In the 1980s, national *hui* discussed possible solutions to the language decline. *Kohanga reo* reclaimed and revitalised *te reo Māori*, identity and culture at preschool level by involving the child and *whānau*. The immediate and extended *whānau* were expected to be part of and committed to the *Kohanga reo* infrastructure by being committee members and participating in their children's learning. Parents had greater control of their children's education, and opportunities to learn *te reo Māori* and *tikanga* together. As active participants in decision-making regarding the curriculum, administration, pedagogy and learning outcomes, *Māori* were taking control of their educational expectations as students were required to meet the high academic expectations of both teacher and parent (Bishop & Glynn, 1999; Durie, 1995).

To ensure *te reo Māori* would continue, *Kura kaupapa Māori* schools, *wharekura* and *wharewānanga* were established on the same principles as *Kohanga Reo* (Bishop & Glynn, 1999). In these institutions, *te reo Māori* is the main language of instruction and the *tikanga* and *kawa* of the local *iwi* is dominant. These establishments served an important role in revitalising language and culture as knowledge by *Māori* teachers in a *Māori* context, giving *Māori* students self-confidence and legitimisation of both language and culture.

The passing of the *Māori* Language Act in 1987 (MoE, 2009b) saw the return of *te reo Māori* to the classrooms and accredited at national qualifications level. Generations of negative perceptions about *te reo Māori* and *Māori* culture have

become ingrained in many communities with stereotypical views of adopting *te reo Māori* language being:

Māori won't get you anywhere;
Māori won't help you get a job;
If you speak *Māori* then your English won't be as good;
Your *Māori* will pollute your English and it will be backward; and
People will think you aren't intelligent.

(O'Regan, 2011, p. 38)

A powerful driving force for learning *te reo Māori* is the concept of *ako*, where everyone can learn from and with each other. The value of pair and group learning approaches for learning *te reo Māori* by students interacting with their peers, teacher, tasks and resources illustrates *ako*. "Increased use of *te reo Māori* will help secure the vitality and richness of this language, secure its future as a living dynamic and rich language" (MoE, 2009b, p.12).

2.4.3. Ako

Traditionally, the concept of *ako Māori* is the interconnected act of teaching and learning that is unique to *Tikanga Māori*. It is reciprocal by nature because it infers that as a teacher you are at some point a learner, and as a learner you are sometimes an imparter of knowledge (Roa, 2004).

Āhutatanga ako specifically describes teaching and learning practices in *kura kaupapa Māori* schools. In these schools, *Te Aho Matua* clearly lays out the principles and values of many of these practices and examples like *karakia* and *tiaki* are evidence of daily practice in the *kura*. One complexity, when trying to recognise *ako*, is that teaching and learning methods and strategies may look the same as those in mainstream settings and appear universal in nature. Yet the crucial difference is that these methods, strategies, and techniques sit within a *kaupapa Māori* framework (set out by *Te Aho Matua*) and operate in ways that are often invisible to the outsider or difficult to recognise or articulate as an insider. One example is the *tuakana teina* relationship which is based on support and collaboration between students, valuing group work that is nested within their interactions, work and experiences (Roa, 2004).

The multi-dimensional nature of *ako* also makes describing pedagogical practise a multifaceted task. *Ako* is both the practices and framework of *Māori* pedagogy, and is reliant on the interaction of *Māori* cultural values, beliefs and knowledge.

The Ministry of Education (2009b) also describes *ako* as being to both teach and to learn, and it is about being part of a community of learners in which everyone has something to contribute. This is evident in the way teachers are continuing to learn alongside their students and is also shown through students teaching teachers and students taking their learning home. The knowledge that both teachers and learners bring to the learning interactions is recognised and acknowledged in such a way that new knowledge and understanding can grow out of shared learning experiences. Educational research shows that when teachers facilitate reciprocal teaching and learning roles in their classrooms, student's achievement improves (Alton-Lee, 2003).

Encompassing the principles of *ako* allows teachers to build caring and inclusive learning communities where each person's contribution is valued and they can participate to their full potential. This is achieved by building productive reciprocal relationships between teacher and students, and among students, where the educator's practice is both deliberate and reflective and everyone is empowered to learn mutually with and from each other to produce better outcomes. *Ako* also recognises that the learner and *whānau* cannot be separated (MoE, 2009b).

2.4.4. Whānau

Whānau shapes the core of *Māori* society and traditionally refers to a common ancestor who connected *whānau* members. The meaning has evolved with the changes in society and now may refer to groups of people with common interests, not necessarily through the ties of genealogy or *whakapapa* (Roa, 2004). *Whānau* can now speak of the rights and responsibilities, commitments, obligations and support that are fundamental to the group. In the classroom, *whānau* suggests warm interpersonal relationships, connectedness, collective responsibility for materials and one another, and collaborative co-operation to achieve the group ends (Bishop et al., 2007). The notion of *whānau* learning is generated from the social interaction of individuals to create a constructive learning community.

2.4.5. Why constructivist learning?

In a constructivist learning community, diversity is celebrated, encouraged and acknowledged for all learners. It is best described by Murdoch and Wilson (2005) as a learning community in “which each person is valued for who they are (*Māori* enjoying education success as *Māori*) and there is a strong sense of collaboration or ‘team spirit’” (p.4). They describe relationships between students and teachers and students as respectful, with an equitable student-centered approach (*ako*) to decision making regarding organization, behaviour management, curriculum and assessment. Risk-taking is encouraged; interaction between learners to action support for “the learning process is valued as highly as content so the teaching and learning process is transparent” (Murdoch & Wilson, 2005, p.4).

A constructivist perspective of learning depicts all learners as capable learners who make a conscious effort to make sense of new ideas and who feel valued for who they are. Their way of thinking and speaking are considered resources for further development, and not a deficit (Villegas & Lucas, 2002). This view is a vital factor identified by Macfarlane et al. (2007) as imperative to *Māori* academic success. Diversity plays a central role in learning and constructivism places educators in a position of change, to adjust learning practices to meet the diverse backgrounds of their students. In this way, constructivist teaching promotes critical thinking, problem solving, collaboration and recognition of multiple perspectives. In contrast to the hierarchical and authoritarian tendencies of transmission, the knowledge, skills, and cultural and personal experiences that students bring to learning is recognized as central. Teachers must help learners build bridges between what they already know and believe about the topic to receive new ideas and experiences to which they are exposed (Villegas & Lucas, 2002). This learning community fosters learners to collaborate, think, inquire and act more effectively. These are critical preparations for their role as active participants and citizens in their immediate and future global societies (MoE, 2007; Villegas & Lucas, 2002). Relationships are the key, both individually and collectively, to the way we feel as part of the team. They are the perilous lynchpins of our teaching and determine the type of community we have.

2.4.6. Student voice

Communication is a social process and central to an effective power sharing learning relationship. As co-inquirers in a learning environment where classroom students and teachers learn together, an authentic power-sharing relationship is promoted (Bishop & Glynn, 1999; Ladson-Billings, 1995). By including classroom students in their own learning process, the student voice reinforces the reciprocated relationships inherent to co-participation and co-constructed learning (Fielding, 2004; Friere, 1996; Robinson & Taylor, 2007) in a power-sharing educational model. Students give important insights into their own learning process and their voice is an empowering and transformational process for both teachers and students as learners (Fielding, 2004) because of the "...dialogical nature of communication" (Robinson & Taylor, 2007, p.9). Friere (1996) contends that transformational dialogue seeks to both pose and solve problems, and therefore, demonstrates how student input can critique and negotiate knowledge in ways that are extremely difficult within traditional teaching pedagogies. Direct communication with students offers perceptions of what they observe and experience to be taken into account and, as an insider's view, their personal voices are recognized and valued so that all students see the point in what they do (Bishop et al., 2007).

2.4.7. Relational trust

Robinson et al.'s (2009) flow chart (p.9) illustrates the improved academic outcomes and higher likelihood of positive social outcomes for students of high relational trust environments. This paves the way to more student-led inquiry, where there is a strong focus on learning to think, question and learn. Through teachers involving students in planning, assessing and reflecting on their learning, students become confident learners, developing the ability to know what they can achieve and what they need to learn next to achieve their potential.

When time is spent on trust, communication is improved, behavior problems are minimized and the conditions for learning are enhanced. Respected *Te Kōtahitanga* researcher, Berryman (cited in Boyd, 2008) stresses the importance of "listening to learners". She encourages teachers to take time to stand back from the learning and to talk less. In her words:

You are there to mediate the children's learning, not to dominate or overpower what the child has to offer. If you don't stand back, you fail to see some of the most amazing things that go on when children really engage with learning 'You have to learn to listen to the students' (p.2).

This can be achieved by regular checks on how students feel about their learning and experiences in class.

Nuthall (2007) fully supports approaching learning through a multilayered relationship between teaching and learning within classroom settings. By recognizing what we know about student learning and its implications for teaching, he distinguishes the three worlds of the teacher, peers and the student's private world and experience as critical influential factors for student learning; especially *Māori*. The positive outcomes for shared, peer learning are reinforced through questioning, investigation, discussion, debate, problem solving and collective guiding and supporting by leading with *Awhinatanga*. In a safe, inclusive, supportive environment, open and honest dialogue is the norm.

2.5: Rationale for Research

Changing Māori student achievement requires more than educational reforms of policy, publication directives, accountability reviews and systematic infrastructure. What is required is a concentrated focus on research evidence that changes and improves the core business of teaching practice in classroom contexts. Bishop et al. (2010) indicate it "is what teachers do that make the difference" (p.79) and suggest that the reform start with changing classroom practice, to generate changes in school structures. To support reform efforts that improve *Māori* student achievement, leaders need to be knowledgeable and committed to develop and implement culturally responsive pedagogical practices. By identifying contributing factors for student achievement variation and a deeper understanding of the impact of teacher's cultural understandings, my leadership practice will be informed, effective and responsive to lead professional pedagogical change to advance Māori student outcomes.

The chapter contents are now summarised in the next section.

2.5.1 Chapter Summary

This literature review has contextualised the different interpretations of the signatories of the Treaty of Waitangi and the disparate implications of post-colonial education for *Māori* students in mainstream education. The effects of assimilation and colonisation were highlighted following World War II when *Māori tino rangatiratanga* emerged to challenge the majority discourse and to offer educational choice between state and *Māori*-medium education in the early 1980s. However, the majority of *Māori* students continue to be enrolled in mainstream education and to achieve at a lower level of expectation than their non-*Māori* peers. Nationally, the changing demographic profile challenges the government to provide an education system where all learners are high performers, to enable the government to compete internationally with economic viability.

The expectation of the National Standards (MoE, 2010a) and the accountability placed on schools for all students to achieve these academic benchmarks, exemplifies two contrasting views for rationalizing *Māori* student achievement; the sociological view (based on unequal social economic status) and the political view which highlights the classroom teacher as the dominant school variable. The government has identified quality teaching as the key to student educational success and has introduced a holistic curriculum (MoE, 2007), KLP (MoE, 2008), *Ka Hikitia* (MoE, 2009a), and *Tātaiako* (MoE, 2011) to guide strategic leadership and culturally responsive pedagogical practice through productive partnerships.

Recent research into *Māori* student learning has identified personal teacher dimensions which make a positive difference to *Māori* students' learning. Discursive repositioning enables the teacher to investigate their own sociocultural consciousness by exploring their own attitudes and beliefs to eliminate bias or negative feelings towards people who hold different values or beliefs and to reject deficit theorising and pre-determined thinking assumed by people's social stratification. Influential elements of disengagement, engagement and the benefits of positive communication and the interpretation of praise all have an effect on the response and actions of individual understanding. The teacher's attitude, values, behaviours, efforts and skills all contribute to establishing a beneficial relationship to support the *Māori* student's learning. Elements of culturally

responsive pedagogy for *Māori* students in mainstream classrooms are the learning of *te reo Māori*, the concepts of *ako* and *whanau*, and the co-construction of learning between teachers and students. In these productive partnerships of mutual respect and relational trust, students are at the centre of the learning and their voices can be heard and responded to. The rationale for research precedes the chapter summary.

Chapter 3: Methodology

3.1: Introduction

The aim of methodology is to address the research questions of *Māori* student achievement and the cultural competence for teachers in a direct manner within an organised systematic process of inquiry to seek explanation and meaning. Methodology is determined by what methods can be used for studying this reality; and what lies behind the approaches and methods of inquiry that might be used in this piece of research (Punch, 2009). It is the link between the theoretical approach and the overarching method of inquiry and is part of the process that provides new evidence of the nature of this relationship that affects *Māori* student achievement and teachers' cultural competence (Mutch, 2005; Williams & Ormond, 2010).

This chapter will discuss the methodology through which the research questions will be addressed. The two research questions are:

RQ1. What is the difference? What factors contribute to the variation of achievement for Year 7 and 8 *Māori* students in high decile, full primary schools?

RQ2. How are the cultural competencies for teachers (MoE, 2011) approached, implemented and sustained in high quality learning opportunities?

By focusing first on the questions under investigation, the people, process and the steps within the process to represent and collect data (Punch, 2009), I have approached this research from four perspectives. The first perspective, section i, sets the context of the research study, outlining the history of traditional research, and the emergence and definition of qualitative research and methodology. The second, section ii, approaches from differing world views and incorporates the experiences of historical research and indigenous people generically and specific to *Aotearoa*/New Zealand. Indigenous research and critical theory as it sits within indigenous research is defined, and an insight to cross-cultural research contexts and the influential position of researcher identity is included. The third, section iii, is from a *Māori* perspective. The principles of the Treaty of Waitangi, their reality

within *kaupapa Māori* and a definition of *kaupapa Māori* is presented. The relationship between critical theory and *kaupapa Māori* is given, prior to the principles and process of *Kaupapa Māori* Research applicable to this study. The final perspective, section iv, is the basis for bringing these multiple perspectives together. The relevance of narrative inquiry and the preference for semi-structured interviews, and the processes for managing the data, student and teacher transcripts and thematic analysis is discussed. Ethical considerations are specified before a chapter summary concludes the section and chapter.

3.1.1. What is research?

Educational research is categorised broadly as social science research. It is distinguished by its focus on people, places and processes related to teaching and learning to improve teaching and learning systems and practices for all concerned, including society at large (Mutch, 2005). Based on Creswell's cyclical research cycle (2005, p.9) the centre of this research outcome is to improve *Māori* student outcomes in our immediate context. Undertaking a literature review of features of *Māori* student achievement in mainstream New Zealand education will enable previous practical and theoretical academic contributions to be considered. Collecting and analysing data from the lived realities of students and teachers participating in a selected context will offer current, first hand actualities of experiences. The interpretation of the data in the form of a thesis is available for critique, analysis and application as a valuable contribution to the educational community.

3.1.2. Traditional research

Traditional research epistemologies have been conducted within the framework of the researcher's interests and concerns and have been defined and made accountable in terms of the researcher's own cultural world view. Cochran, Marshall, Garcia-Downing, Kendall, Cook, McCubbin, and Gover (2008) suggest that traditional research implies that no person can be objective, in the trueness of being objective and detached. L. Smith (1999) identifies the difference between methodology and epistemology and recognises and explains epistemology as the understanding of knowledge that one adopts and the philosophy with which the research is approached. This relationship cannot be isolated from history, nor from the researcher's social societal position, held as a result of history (L. Smith,

1999). The reliability and validity of knowledge reflects the values and interests of those who create it as these values control the methods that are used and the conclusions that are made (Denzin & Lincoln, 2008). Evidence emerging from a research project is interpreted by the investigator based on their expectations, hypotheses or predictions and new findings are placed in perspective with previous judgements (Williams & Ormond, 2010). The result has been a tradition of research into minority people's lives that addresses concerns and interests of the researcher (usually from the dominant culture) and has led majority cultures to disregard knowledge that is gained through another set of worldview values.

3.1.3. Emergence of qualitative research

Qualitative research as an alternative to quantitative research has grown in prominence during the last thirty years and its history in education has been shaped by the three themes: philosophical ideas (Guba & Lincoln, 1994) procedural developments (Cresswell, 2005), and participatory and advocacy practices (Denzin, Lincoln, & Smith, 2008).

Cresswell (2005) refers to philosophers of education in the late 1960s, who called for change from the traditional approach, which they felt relied too heavily on the researcher's view of education and less on the participant's view. Their rationale was based on traditional investigations creating a contrived situation in which the participant was taken out of context and placed within an experimental situation, detached from his or her personal experience. To refute these traditional approaches, educational philosophers suggested an alternative form of research called naturalistic or constructivist inquiry. At the core of this approach was the importance of the participant's view, the contextual setting in which the view was expressed, and the value of the personal viewpoint of educational issues.

During the 1800s and early 1900s, writers' attention shifted from challenging quantitative research to writing qualitative research questions, conducting on-site interviews and observations and analysing data for themes, together with discussion about types of qualitative research design (Cresswell, 2005). By the late 1990s, the emergence of the third theme of participatory and advocacy practices to advance perspectives about inequality and marginalization was beginning to be seen in educational research.

This theme developed from an impassioned concern for the inequity and needs of individuals in lower social classes and of people of certain racial groups, such as African Americans and Hispanics and is seen by Denzin and Lincoln (2005) as an advocacy position. They claim advocacy researchers are not objective, authoritative or politically neutral, but see qualitative research as a moral dialogue and a means of bringing needed change to our society as a civic responsibility.

These ideas challenged traditional research that held firm to a neutral and objective stance and called for inquirers to report in their studies their own personal biases, values and assumptions. Research became political, as it considered the rights of women, gays, lesbians, racial groups, and different classes in society, by honouring different viewpoints in both the reading and writing of qualitative reports. In contrast to studying them, researchers sought to actively collaborate with research participants and be sensitive to the dignity of individuals within data collection procedures.

Today, qualitative research has been shaped by the merger of the three previously mentioned themes. It is applicable to this study as it supports the component of the participatory and advocacy theme for *Māori* students, it is culturally specific, and it produces contextually rich data which will be critical to providing solutions to educational challenges for positive change in *Māori* student outcomes.

3.1.4. Qualitative research

Qualitative research is that it is not a single component, or theory or paradigm that is distinctly its own (Denzin & Lincoln (2005). It is rather “an umbrella term under which many different research approaches, paradigms, traditions or philosophies could be classified” (Lichtman, 2011, p.249) to explain social phenomena.

Qualitative research allows me as the researcher to explore and absorb the experience of mainstream learning through the lived realities of our research student and teacher participants in their natural settings. Qualitative research empowers participants to voice explanations from their own experience and allows the researcher to gain an in-depth understanding and valuable insight into their perspectives from their own point of reference. (Denzin & Lincoln, 2005, p.2). This is in contrast to testing data against pre-existing theories or notions as in

traditional or quantitative research. In reality, multiple interpretations and not just one conception of reality emerge (Guba & Lincoln, 1994). The culturally rich data or knowledge that emerges will indicate why these realities are meaning-making agents and will make a difference to the learning opportunities and outcomes for *Māori* learners.

The flexibility of qualitative research design promotes this culturally specific research context. The relationships of differing cultural participants will be more consciously considered. The values, behaviours and opinions of the participant population will be integrated and upheld throughout the research process and the dissemination of research findings. Within this research process, there will be intentional and deliberate research design to accept divergent cultural perspectives; their protocols and values to be acknowledged from their own presence. These forms of expression, allowing research participants opportunity to explain phenomenon from their own perspectives, are met best through qualitative methods (Denzin & Lincoln, 2005). Qualitative research practise offers the specific tools or methods of searching and recording, selecting and interpreting and organizing and re-presenting information pertinent to participant classroom interactions. This approach relies on the views of the participants, asks broad general questions, collects data consisting largely of words and analyses these words into common themes (Cresswell, 2008). These characteristics support the aims and aspirations of this research project.

Before embarking any further into the methodological process, it is necessary to discuss the impact of historical research on populations with different world views than those of the dominant West. The impact of centuries of research by, with, and for the West to claim ownership of intellectual and cultural property rights of indigenous people to advance their own control, and the idealistic belief of advancing all of mankind has only served to cement the powerful imperialistic culture of the West (Bishop, 2003, Powick, 2003, Smith, 1999). The inheritance and injustice of racist practices, attitudes, interpretations and translations to create an assumption of social and cultural superiority, derived from the ontological (what reality is like) view of the researcher has led to hostility and oppositional research design to challenge research practices of the past (Smith, 1999). The

reality of supposed legitimate traditional research of indigenous people and their differing world views continues in the following section.

3.2: Researching Within Different World Views

This section presents researching within different world views. Included is the historical effect traditional research has had on indigenous people, an explanation to define indigenous research and the impact of historical research on the indigenous people of New Zealand. This is followed by an understanding of how critical theory is embedded within indigenous research and then the challenges of conducting Cross-cultural research in New Zealand. Concluding this section is the role of the researcher.

3.2.1. Legacy of historical research on indigenous people

The basic premise of conventional educational research methodologies has historically been linked to the maintenance and perpetuation of European imperialism and colonialism. Contained within the premise of traditional research through individual scholarly disciplines, scientific paradigms and state institutes are an underlying code of regulation and rules, evidentially grounded in the thinking and teachings of the Western World and therefore inherently culturally insensitive (Smith, 1999).

Past inappropriate research conducted on indigenous people has often served to advance these politics of colonial control. For example, during the early years of Australian colonisation research was engrossed with classifying and labelling in an attempt to manage the Aboriginal people (Cochran et al., 2008). L. Smith (1999) proposes this has now led to indigenous researchers claiming that Western research has led to continuing oppression and subordination of Indigenous Australians. In New Zealand, researchers have continued to uphold colonial values and have created a path that has inferred *Māori* people are unable to cope with human problems and suggest “*Māori* culture was and is inferior to the colonisers in human terms” (Bishop, 1999, p.1)

Undeniably, the most significant impact of insensitive research is the continuation of the myth that indigenous people represent a problem to be solved and that they are passive objects that require assistance from external experts (Smith, 1999). This dehumanising, stigmatised and antagonistic devaluing of indigenous people’s

experience within dominating conformist research has been a source of much distress. Even well-intentioned research with the promise of community change and advancement have resulted in an overstatement of negative aspects of these communities leaving them feeling isolated and disconnected from the rest of the world (Bishop, 1997).

Smith's (1999) widespread view, that the reality of creating knowledge is effectively distorted by Western researchers operating from within a Western framework has consciously accelerated international indigenous people into action to expose the underlying assumptions of Western research and the way in which this research maintains oppression, marginalisation and exploitation of indigenous peoples.

3.2.2. Indigenous research

The term indigenous appears to collectivise many distinct populations whose experiences under imperialism have been vastly different. L. Smith (1999) recognises the word as a way of embracing and encompassing the many diverse communities, language groups and nations; each having their own identification within a single group or groupings.

In response to the domination, distortion and subservience of Western research, many indigenous communities have developed research policies and methodological approaches that foreground the voices of national and local people, derived from acknowledgment and awareness of indigenous thinking and ways of being (Kennedy & Cram, 2010). By adopting these systems, ethical guidelines (Hudson, 2009; Hudson & Russell, 2009) and relevant documents (Kennedy & Cram, 2010; Powick, 2003) related to issues of control over research activities and the knowledge that the research produces, can be prioritised from the cultural integrity of the identified group, not imposed or surmised by the dominant hegemony.

Research conducted and controlled by indigenous people validates an emancipatory goal for ownership and responsibility of oppressed people, by building research capacity to prioritise the power to speak, to address social issues within the wider framework of self-determination, decolonisation and social justice (Kennedy & Cram, 2010). Procedures of being respectful, of showing or

accepting respect and reciprocating respectful behaviours develops membership, credibility and reputation (Smith, 1999). Cultural ethics, practices and codes of conduct act as an emancipatory goal by freeing indigenous people from restrictions or ways of being other than their own. It is through their protocol that entry is determined, and appropriate and effective approaches offer opportunities where research is shaped from the oral traditions, customs and standards of the indigenous people. Conducting research through accepted chosen conventions and oral traditions, customs and standards of indigenous people determine the research context and the vested safety and trust of the research participants to bring about clear benefits that can be managed and distributed fairly to the community (Kennedy & Cram, 2010).

Walker et al. (2006) argue that self-determination, valuing their own world view, and ensuring cultural practices is a critical principle for indigenous research. They claim that indigenous research assures participants' control over key aspects and the interpretation and dissemination of findings on their terms. The ultimate aim is to treasure their knowledge from the past, to capture and sustain their *taonga* for future generations, free from the propaganda behaviours of the other (Smith, 1999).

It is from these contributions, that the term indigenous is applicable to the *Māori* people of New Zealand. *Māori* have their own language, *te reo Māori*, their own cultural values and protocols, *tikanga*, and recognise and uphold a *Māori* world view of knowledge, *mātauranga Māori* (Kennedy & Cram, 2010). In common with many international indigenous people who identify with the cultural aspirations of their own way of doing, *Māori* knowledge and learning practices in research practice have been undervalued and belittled by colonial values, processes and Western ideologies (Kennedy & Cram, 2010; Bishop, 1999; Smith, 1999).

3.2.3. Aotearoa/ New Zealand Context

The history of research in New Zealand done to, on and for *Māori* has resulted in a deep distrust, anger and disillusionment among *Māori* for research and researchers (Smith, 1999). Past colonizing of research on *Māori* by the dominant Western culture has continued to portray *Māori* negatively with the generic belief

being that it is *Māori* who need to change. *Pākehā* researchers have continued to control and define the research process without consultation or reporting back to *Māori* to offer further opportunities for beneficial action. On-going deficit treatment to support public stereotyping and exploitation of *Māori*, especially in education, unemployment, criminal offences and health, has made *Māori* cautious and negative towards research projects (Walker et al. 2006; Powick, 2003; Cram, 2001). The dominant position of the Western researcher dictated research participants, experiences and methodology with results being located and based in the cultural standpoint of the Western researcher in preference to the lived reality of the *Māori* people themselves (Cram, 2001; Bishop, 1999). *Māori* understandings and ways of knowing have been misinterpreted, simplified and contrived to the advantage of the coloniser (Bishop, 1999).

The situation is clearly identified by Smith:

The word itself, ‘research’ is probably one of the dirtiest words in the indigenous world’s vocabulary.... It galls us that Western researchers and intellectuals can assume to know all that is possible of us, on the basis of brief encounters with some of us. It appals us that the West can desire, extract and claim ownership of our ways of knowing, our imagery, the things we create and produce, and then simultaneously reject the people who created and developed those ideas and seek to deny them further opportunities to be creators of their own culture and their own nations.

(1999, p.1)

Undoubtedly, this statement accentuates the view and distrust of *Māori* towards non-indigenous researchers and to the differing set of beliefs which underlie the whole philosophy of research (Smith, 1999). *Māori* people are deeply concerned about who the researcher is answerable to, who benefits from the research and “who has control over the initiation, procedures, evaluations, construction and distribution of newly defined knowledge?” (Bishop, 1999, p.1).

It is not surprising then, that *Māori* researchers argue that research into *Māori* people’s lives has contributed to the marginalisation of *Māori* people within New Zealand and has helped maintain the hierarchy of power and control that preserves

the dominant cultural values and aspirations of the coloniser (Bishop & Glynn, 1999; Smith, 1999).

The enormous lack of respect that highlights the relations between Indigenous and non-indigenous peoples, from the denial by the West of humanity, citizenship, human rights and self-determination, has forced the *Māori* people of New Zealand to introduce ethical principles to structure and control their own indigenous research. There is an urgent need for an ethical research approach based on consultation, strong community participation and methods that acknowledge indigenous ways of knowing to be applied when researching with the indigenous people of *Aotearoa*/New Zealand.

In this situation researching in an indigenous context supports the philosophy of critical theory which adopts a social-justice focus. From the traditional exploitation of researchers of indigenous people, inequalities and injustices have created class distinction and social inequalities (Kennedy & Cram, 2010).

3.2.4. Critical theory

Critical Theory is a perspective that holds that the social world is characterised by differences arising out of conflict between the powerful and the powerless” (Munford & Walsh-Tapiata, 2001, p.20). For change to occur, an understanding is required of the forces that have created the disparities so that they can be exposed, confronted and challenged. This has the goal of bringing social, economic and political change through empowering people to emancipate themselves (Munford & Walsh-Tapiata, 2001).

Carspecken (2005) recommends the researcher works together with people in contrast to just studying them. The research findings are not fixed but are a careful thought through point of view, made available for public discussion and debate, for others to respond to and therefore make a social contribution.

Critical Theory challenges both the positivist and interpretive theoretical approaches to research, aiming “to uncover and seek redress for disadvantaged and silence groups” (Mutch, 2005, p.217). Scott and Usher state:

the aim of critical theory is emancipation, so it is critical in the sense that it does not simply seek to generate knowledge of the world as it is but to

detect and unmask beliefs and practices that limit human freedom, justice and to engage in action that brings these about. (2011, p. 35)

They identify the task of educational research and practice as transformative; the need for research to be part of the process of establishing the conditions for the rational conduct “in relation to both individuals and the social world” (p. 35).

In the interest of emancipation, Habermas (1987, as cited in Scott & Usher, 2011 p.36) calls this the ‘organization of enlightenment’ or the taking of rational action on the basis of knowledge. He calls for the unmasking of ideologies that maintain the status quo by restricting access to the means of gaining knowledge, and thereby raising consciousness or awareness of the oppressive material conditions and structures that lead to the failure to fulfil basic social needs. The function of ideology critique is to transform identities so that individuals see themselves differently and the learning through the enlightenment organization relates to what needs to be done to change social contexts, self-determination and liberation.

In this inquiry, a critical theory perspective questions what is going on, whose interests are being served, how the situation can be theorised or explained, and what the researcher’s role might be in any future action. The examination of issues of race, class, gender, power relationships and the recognition of multiple views is integral if a critical perspective is taken and the struggle of the oppressed and underrepresented voice is not resisted but emancipated through critical dialogue and praxis.

The challenges of practical research and maintaining this theoretical understanding when researching in a cross-cultural context are now examined.

3.2.5. Cross-cultural research in New Zealand

Conducting cross-cultural research is challenging, risk-taking and fundamental to the outcomes of this research study. Researcher domination, participant’s voice, who determines the legitimisation of the findings, and the stature of the research participant after the completion of the research project are some of the critical elements identified in previous cross-cultural research projects (Gibbs, 2001; Spoonley, 1999).

The relationships between researcher and participant's respective ethnicities, between and across cultures will call for careful navigation by this researcher. The tension of conducting research within different ethical guidelines and protocols requires mutually respectful relationships and time to allow these to form (McNae & Strachan, 2010). With institutional time frames and single participant interviews, forming effective cross-cultural partnerships will need to be thoughtful, well designed and culturally approved throughout all stages of this research process (McNae & Strachan, 2010). Carpenter and McMurchy-Pilkington (2008) found *he kanohi kitea* interactions were a valid and empowering way to work cross-culturally to address internal and external tensions in a productive manner. This form of communication will be applied to this research context.

As a researcher, I am constantly aware of the privilege and honour of being invited into settings where the world view is different from my own. I believe when research participants share their experiences with you, there is an expectation of respect, trust and loyalty for protection in regard to their knowledge and well-being. It is imperative for me to be open to theoretical perspectives different from my own personal biographies to be able to break down historical deficit barriers to bring about equitable justice for those traditionally underserved in our education system (Mutch, 2005).

Before undertaking research in cross-cultural settings it is necessary to declare one's position and challenge one's own assumptions, with heightened sensitivity, defying researchers to speak for others as their position is only right to themselves (Mutch, 2005).

3.2.6 Researcher identity

I come to this research inquiry as a mature *Pākehā*/Pasifika, growing up in a state-housing area with predominately Christian values. I am a wife, mother, nana and educational leader and learner in a high decile school. I have resided in a middle class semi-rural area for the last twenty five years. This defines who I am, where I have come from and the place from where I speak.

Denzin and Lincoln (1994) argue that the researcher's personal biography is always influenced by their language, gender social class, race and ethnicity as no

observations that are objective, as they are situated in the social worlds of either the observer or the observed.

Being a researcher from neither the dominant or indigenous peoples, it is imperative that I respect the spaces between colonizing research practices and indigenous communities. L. Smith (2005) calls for careful and cautious articulation, as these spaces are fraught with uncertainty. Spoonley (1999) also highlights the anxiety of cross-cultural research, as it can be driven by particular understandings of knowledge that have important consequences for communities involved.

Denzin et al. (2008) claim the indigenist researcher resists the methodologies of Western science and their position to validate colonizing knowledge about indigenous peoples. They claim indigenist researchers adopt interpretive strategies and skills fitted to the needs, language and traditions of their respective indigenous community, emphasizing personal performance narrative and testimonies. Relevant to this research context, Bishop (1998) declares these participant-driven criteria function as resistant resources to positivist neo-conservative desires to “establish and maintain control of the criteria for evaluation of *Māori* experience” (p. 212).

L. Smith (1999) recommends that *non-Māori* researchers do not carry out *Kaupapa Māori* research in isolation and suggests various strategies for *non-Māori* researchers to conduct more culturally appropriate research. Gibbs (2001), within her collaborative approach, emphasises that the importance of the way the researcher conducts themselves, with respectful, honest, open and timely communication is of prime importance. This leads to relationships of trust between researcher and research participants and is foundational to successful cross-cultural collaborative research.

There has been a great deal of literature written about the theory and practice of *kaupapa Māori* research as a challenge to conventional research methodologies and methods. Yet there has been little attention to the *non-Māori* or *Pākehā* involvement in culture-specific research settings such as *kaupapa Māori* educational research. Tolich (2002) labels this attitude as *Pākehā* paralysis through their inability to distinguish a role in *Māori*-centred research paradigms

or in general research in New Zealand which involves *Māori* among other ethnic groups. Glynn (1992) suggests complete withdrawal of *non-Māori* will not address deficits in cross-cultural research. He promotes researcher engagement with *Māori* researchers, sharing knowledge, skills and technologies to address *Māori*-generated research questions.

Practical strategies of possibility have been presented by L. Smith (1999). As a non-indigenous researcher, the rationale strategy is to accept Smith's (1999) of avoidance "whereby the researcher avoids dealing with the issues or dealing with *Māori*" (p.197). This questions my professional accountability and my personal commitment to my *tamariki* and *mokopuna*. Professionally, the National Administration Guidelines (NAGs) are statements of intent and serve as guidelines for Boards of Trustees to operationalize within their schools. Significant to my principal role and this research project is NAG 1 (e) "in consultation with the school's *Māori* community, develop and make known to the school's community, policies, plans and targets for improving the achievement of *Māori* students" (MoE, 2010b). I am charged with discovering and making changes to implement the personalised learning needed to improve presence, engagement and achievement for *Māori* in our school. My on-going focus of Smith's (1999) second strategy of personal development to become more knowledgeable about "the ideas, issues, assumptions, practices, methods and conceptions of knowledge of being *Māori*" (Mead, 1996, pp. 200-201) is to some degree underway with developing confidence. Recent professional post graduate study, lived experiences and online language courses have aided my indigenous knowledge and understanding of *tikanga*. The third strategy considered by L. Smith (1999) of consulting with *Māori* to seek support and consent was completed by meeting ethical approval for this research project to be undertaken. In retrospect and as a form of encouragement, all the parents/caregivers of *Māori* students that I have communicated with re expectations and aspirations for their children, collectively and unanimously strive for their child's educational success. The final strategy of making space is recognised through the access to external funding, study award, internal institutional ethical approval and an in-depth study of *kaupapa Māori* research.

It could be easy to be dismissive and to let the status quo remain. Tolich (1992) Bishop (1997) and Walker et al. (2006) urge us as partners of the Treaty of Waitangi and remind us as researchers, of our responsibility to support *Māori* research and to share our knowledge for the potential benefit of *Māori* people's aspiration for self-determination. For this researcher, it is simply a moral obligation to step over a cultural divide to seek positive approaches and to “come together in a shared agenda, with a shared imagination and a new language, struggling together to find liberating ways of interpreting and performing in the world” (Smith, 1999, p.37) to change the negative predicament of educational success for *Māori*.

To address the historical and on-going power imbalances, the *tangata whenua* or *Māori* people of *Aotearoa*/New Zealand have adopted *Kaupapa Māori* as a theory and practice of reasserting indigenous cultural aspirations, preferences and practices (Smith, 1997; Smith, 1999; Bishop, 2003). This approach is presented in the following section.

3.3: Taking A *Māori* Perspective in *Aotearoa*/New Zealand

This section is based on the theory of *Kaupapa Māori*. Initially the history, principles and significance of the Treaty of Waitangi to the theory and practice of *Kaupapa Māori* are presented. Next a definition of the principles of *Kaupapa Māori* is offered with a link to mainstream education followed by an assimilation of critical theory within *Kaupapa Māori*. Concluding this section is the *Kaupapa Māori* research methodology of this research study.

The *Māori* people of *Aotearoa*/ New Zealand have identified similar issues to many indigenous peoples in research in recognition of “respect for their indigenous rights, control over research processes and reciprocity within research relationships to ensure equitable benefits are realised within indigenous groups” (Hudson & Russell, 2009, p.61). These issues can be aligned with the guiding principles of the Treaty partnership, participation and protection, inclusion of *tikanga Māori* and the acceptance of cultural concepts.

3.3.1. The Treaty of Waitangi

The Treaty of Waitangi is the foundational document of the modern state of *Aotearoa*/ New Zealand and signifies the formal relationship between the British

Crown and *Māori* to recognise and protect *Māori* values, tradition and practices (Orange, 2011). Although the intent of the 1840 Treaty of Waitangi was to provide a basis for equal *Māori* and *Pākehā* relations, it soon became clear through successive colonial governance of Aotearoa/New Zealand that the Treaty of Waitangi was to benefit the colonial settlers and the greater *Pākehā* population. What followed was over one hundred and sixty years of colonization, exploitation and oppression of *Māori* culture. Knowledge, language and practices were denied, refuted and rejected. As a result, *Māori* continue to be disproportionately politically and socially marginalised and economically impoverished (Bishop, 2003; Walker et al., 2006).

In 1988, the Treaty of Waitangi principles of partnership, participation and protection were adopted by the Royal Commission on Social Policy in response to societal inequalities that affect *Māori*. Together with the re-emergence of *Kaupapa Māori* (Walker et al., 2006), this policy created varying levels of discussion and expectation about the implications of the Treaty in modern society and began to influence education, politics and research (Durie, 1995).

In research contexts, partnerships need to reflect the ethical understanding of both *Māori* and European. As equitable partners, the parameters of the research relationship should be negotiated between the researcher and *Māori* in respect for *Rangatiratanga* of *Tikanga Māori* (Hudson & Russell, 2009). There is an expectation of amended collaboration between *Māori* and *non-Māori* through the sharing of research skills and increased protection of *Māori* data and participants (Powick, 2003).

Participation targets *Māori* participant's involvement in *Māori* research. *Māori Mana whakahaere* directs research processes to validate *Māori* concepts and incorporate *Māori* values, aligned with *Māori* goals. A shift occurs from rule-based consultation to values-based engagement consistent with *Māori* communities and their values (Bishop, 2003; Hudson & Russell, 2009).

Protection ensures reciprocity, guaranteeing mutual benefits to *Māori* in an equitable manner. *Māori* have legitimate rights (treaty partnership) to control ownership of intellectual property and research resources to support *Māori*

workforce development and build research capacity to honour *Mātauranga Māori* and significant issues for *Māori* communities.

In education, the Treaty of Waitangi is one of the eight principles that provide a foundation for decision making with the New Zealand Curriculum (MoE, 2007). The curriculum recognises the principles of the Treaty of Waitangi and the European/*Māori* bicultural foundations of Aotearoa/ New Zealand and the right of “all students to have access to and acquire knowledge of *te reo Māori me one tikanga*” (p.9). The 2010 Education Review Report indicates many school leaders and teachers are finding the Treaty principles challenging to implement. The report proposes Treaty of Waitangi principles should be evident in the interpretation and implementation of each school curriculum and individual classroom pedagogy. The findings from this inquiry could further support this view or initiate divergent data, requiring further discussion or deeper examination.

How a *Māori* research study fits within a broader social agenda has been discussed by Hudson and Russell (2009) in their ethical review. They incorporated the central issues for *Māori* people of respect, control and reciprocity within a generic framework (see Appendix xi) that aligns with the principles of the Treaty and ethical issues for *Māori*. The ethical guidelines, parameters for research practice and appropriateness of research methodology and processes presented by Hudson and Russell (2009) will support the adoption of a *Kaupapa Māori* methodology for this research project.

3.3.2. Kaupapa Māori

The establishment of *Kaupapa Māori* in Aotearoa/New Zealand grew from the rapid urbanisation movement of *Māori* people post-World War II. The revitalised wider ethnic movement of the 1970s and 1980s intensified political consciousness among *Māori* communities to increase their self-determination over culture, language and land (Glover, 2002). By the late 80s and 90s, this consciousness had repositioned *Māori* cultural aspirations, preferences and practices as a philosophical and productive educational stance and resistance to the hegemony of the dominant discourse, which was not based on a *Māori* world view (Bishop, 1998).

It has emerged and is legitimized from within a *Māori* community and is described by *Māori* educationalist G. Smith (1992) as “the philosophy and practice of being and acting *Māori*” (p.1). G. Smith’s perspective of *kaupapa Māori* is shaped by an automatic assumption of *Māori* people’s cultural legitimacy. Their social, political, historical and intellectual position is validated and accepted. It is a place where “*Māori* language, culture, knowledge and values are accepted in their own right” (G. Smith, 1992, p.13). The core of *Kaupapa Māori*, the desire of *Māori* to be *Māori* is both valid and legitimate. At the same time, the affirmation of *Māori* culture philosophies and practices builds a critique of those societal structures that work to oppress *Māori* (Pihama, Cram & Walker, 2002). This position is based on the understanding that the world is organised by power differentials as well as different cultural systems that justifiably make sense of and interact meaningfully within the world (Bishop, 1999).

G. Smith (1997) identified six integral intervention principles of *Kaupapa Māori*: *Tino rangatiratanga*, *Taonga tuku iho*, *Ako Māori*, *Kia piki ake I ngā raruraru o te kainga*, *whānau* and *kaupapa*.

Tino rangatiratanga asserts self-determination and is at the heart of *kaupapa Māori*. *Tino rangatiratanga* declares and supports the goals of *kaupapa Māori* initiatives allowing *Māori* to seek more meaningful control of their life, their culture, aspirations and destiny (Smith, 1997). The concept of struggle, to critique and transform from a by *Māori*, for *Māori*, with *Māori* paradigm (Smith, 1997) is evidenced in the establishment of *kura kaupapa Māori*, *te kohanga reo* and *wānanga* educational institutions (Bishop, 2003). In the mainstream, the critical question is how to address *Māori* aspirations for self-determination (Bishop, 2003).

Taonga tuku iho affirms the cultural aspirations of *Māori* and acknowledges the strong emotional and spiritual factor in *Kaupapa Māori*. The centrality and legitimacy of *Te Reo Māori*, *Tikanga Māori* and *Mātauranga Māori* validates *Māori* ways of knowing, doing and understanding the world (Pihama et al., 2002). The challenge for mainstream education is to create contexts where *Māori* children can be themselves; where being *Māori* is normal; and *Māori* cultural identities are valued, valid and accepted (Bishop, 2003).

Ako Māori advocates culturally preferred pedagogy to promote teaching and learning practices that are unique to *Tikanga Māori* or preferred practices borrowed by *Māori* applicable to *Māori* pedagogies (Pihama et al., 2002). The emphasis is on reciprocal learning; a relationship of sense-making processes. Teachers and students participate and share from their own realities as equal partners in a learning conversation (Bishop, 2003).

Kia piki ake I ngā raruraru o te kainga promotes socio-economic mediation to intervene, negotiate and assist in the reduction of negative pressures and disadvantages experienced by *Māori* communities, their *whānau* and children (Pihama et al., 2002). In schools, teachers deal with problems in culturally familiar ways for *Māori* and people of all cultures (Bishop, 2003).

Whānau acknowledges the structure of extended family and sits like *tino rangatiratanga* at the core of *Kaupapa Māori*. *Whānau* and *Whānaungatanga*, relationships *Māori* have to one another and the world are an integral part of *Māori* identity and culture. Pihama et al. (2002) claim cultural values, customs and practices that are organised around *whānau* as collective responsibility, are essential to survival and educational achievement. Classroom *whānau*-type relationships create commitment and connectedness and a responsibility towards the learning of others. Each context is an effective location for all learners to participate in decision making practices through the process of collaborative storying. This is explained by Bishop (1997) as the co-joint reflection on experiences to co-construct mutual understanding by sharing experiences, thoughts and reflections. A *whānau*-type classroom creates a safe and secure environment where students can be themselves, are valued, supported and can take risks.

Kaupapa assumes a collective vision of the aspirations of the community. This vision connects aspirations to constructive changes in political, social, economic, educational and social well-being for *Māori* (Pihama et al., 2002). As stated in the NZC (MoE, 2007), a common set of educational goals, principles and practices in terms of aspirations, languages and cultures to benefit all children should be evident in mainstream learning environments (Bishop, 2003).

These *Kaupapa Māori* principles acknowledge the strong emotional and spiritual factors introduced to assert the commitment and the right of *Māori* to be *Māori*, as well as building a critique of societal structures which work to oppress *Māori* (Eketone, 2008; Pihama et al, 2002).

3.3.3. Critical theory of *Kaupapa Māori*

Applicable to this research context as to identifying the difference for student achievement is the alliance of elements of critical theory within a *Kaupapa Māori* inquiry approach. If the findings from this inquiry help us to understand the forces that impact on student outcomes so they may be exposed and challenged, then the inequality and injustices of the national educational state system can be confronted and addressed (Crotty, 1998).

Smith, (1997) refers to three important connectors between critical and *kaupapa Māori* theory relevant to *Aotearoa/New Zealand* education. The first is conscientisation or revealing the reality. Investigating, analysing and evaluating the lived realities that indicate why mainstream classroom learning does not meet the learning needs of most *Māori* students, takes place within a critical theory framework.

The second connector is resistance from a dual approach, or opposing actions. The first of these is reactive realities to the dominant structures of oppression, exploitation, manipulation and containment in education. Current examples are negative student suspensions, academic underachievement, and school retention statistics for *Māori* (Bishop et al., 2010). The characteristic differences arising out of conflict between the powers of the education system and the collective *Māori* call for an understanding of the controls that have created these disparities (Munford & Walsh Tapiata, 2001) and the reasons for these power imbalances (Bishop, 2003; Bishop et al., 2009).

The second approach to resistance is Smith's (1997) proactive activities. This is a call for change brought about through collective action to engender system and teacher attitude change. Findings from the *Te Kotahitanga* research project have organised school system and pedagogical classroom practice to support positive change for secondary *Māori* achievement (Bishop & Berryman, 2010).

The third connector is reflective change. G. Smith (1997) contends this is not just about what has gone wrong, but working forward, applying what we know and have learnt. In New Zealand, the directives of *Ka Hikitia* (MoE, 2009a) and *Tātaiako* (MoE, 2011) move the focus from previous deficit thinking to responsive practice, specific to the cultural needs of *Māori* learners.

The use of *Māori* metaphors for research has repositioned researchers from the discursive space historically occupied by researchers into a *Māori* sense-making context. It seeks to increase both the expansion of *Māori* aspirations and the resistance to *Māori* control and domination by the prevailing *Pākeha* culture.

3.3.4. *Kaupapa Māori* research

Kaupapa Māori research developed as a broader movement by *Māori* to question westernized notions of knowledge, culture and research. This approach has been used as both a form of resistance and a methodological strategy (Bishop, 1996) wherein research is conceived, developed and carried out by *Māori*, and the end outcome is to benefit *Māori* (Smith, 1999; Gibbs, 2001). It is often used to challenge the prevailing and inappropriate ideologies of superiority, power relations and social practices that disadvantage *Māori* (Bishop, 2003) and can be both a political tool and a social justice practice (Walker et al., 2006).

3.3.5. Principles of *Kaupapa Māori* research

Based on the *Māori* metaphors of *kaupapa Māori*, Walker et al. (2006) have identified the principles of *tino rangatiratanaga*, social justice, *Māori* world view, *te reo Māori* and *whānau* specifically for the purpose of research.

Tino rangatiratanaga

Critical to *Kaupapa Māori* research is the principle of *tino rangatiratanaga* - sovereignty, self-determination, governance, autonomy and independence (Pihama et al., 2002). It is about a *Māori*-centred agenda where the issues and needs of *Māori* are the focus and outcomes of research. The power and control rests within *Māori* cultural understandings and practices (Bishop, 1996). Once *Māori* control of the research agenda is recognised, ways of doing and the *Māori* world view become the accepted and legitimate norm. L. Smith (1999) argues that because *Kaupapa Māori* research is localized critical theory it gives *Māori* self-determination through its emancipatory and empowerment aims where *Kaupapa*

Māori research critiques dominant, racist and western hegemonies advocating for *Māori* to become more self-determining.

Social Justice

Historic experiences of exploitation and the self determination by *Māori* to reclaim research experiences by control of participant focus, design plan, gathering, analysis; and recording of research material by *Māori* has led to the principle of ***social justice***. The need for *Māori* to maintain conceptual, methodological and interpretive control over research to address power imbalances and bring concrete benefits to *Māori* is seen by many as important. Empowering *Māori* through *Kaupapa Māori* research will develop collective agencies for *Māori* communities. *Māori* will be able to establish their own research capabilities, and benefits of previous research will be carried forward to a new generation of *Māori* researchers (Walker et al., 2006). This will enhance and sustain the quality of life for *Māori* through social justice. Bishop et al. (2010) claim schooling needs to have an overall moral purpose. They call for a system where all students learn, where there is a direct or indirect reduction in educational disparities and improved student outcomes for those underserved by the system: a direct link to the purpose of this research project.

Whakapapa - Māori world view

Kaupapa Māori research offers an epistemology based on the *Māori* world view or ***whakapapa***. How *Māori* think about and come to know the world is embedded in *Māori* knowledge and thinking patterns; their foundations, scope and validity particularly are a key principle (Walker et al., 2006; Powick, 2003). It is through *whakapapa* that *Māori* relate themselves to other significant things in their world: *awa*, *maunga marae* and *whenua*. *Whakapapa* gives *Māori* identity, a sense of location within *whānau*, *iwi* and *hapū* (Powick, 2003). L. Smith (1999) recognises the ability for *Māori* researchers to view the world and organise their research differently from a westernized approach. To adopt a *Māori* world view to knowledge, Walker et al. (2006) suggest a culturally based approach ensures specific knowledge is protected and respected as illustrated by Barnes (2010) and her local *kaumātua* who are deemed to hold traditional knowledge of the ***Hokianga*** area.

Te reo Māori

Māori world views are embedded in the language, social practices and personal characteristics (Powick, 2003). Ideally, the use of *te reo Māori* in a *Kaupapa Māori* research process has benefits for researchers. As oral communication is the traditional means of recording the historical past for *Māori*, the use *te reo Māori* of in research can provide a vital opportunity to gain information and perspectives which might otherwise be impossible to document through the histories, values and beliefs of *Māori* (Powick, 2003). Communicating in *te reo Māori* in her research study privileged Barnes (2010) to secure significant *Mātauranga Māori* for place names in the *Hokianga* area and a more detailed picture of *Māori* and their history. The use of *te reo Māori* within the research process is also seen as a pathway to revitalising the language (Powick, 2003) although, in reality, there are few *Māori* research participants who are fluent in the language and who have more than a basic working knowledge of *te reo Māori* (Walker et al., 2006).

Whānau

The principle of *whānau* or family as a collective underpins *Māori* protocol and culture (Bishop, 1996). In particular, *whānau* is inclusive of extended family and the idea of establishing relationships and connectedness between *Māori* and *whakawhānaungatanga* (Walker et al., 2006). The integrity of *whānau* as an organising and structuring concept in *kaupapa Māori* research is, in Bishop's (1996) view, important. *Whānau* through *whakawhānaungatanga* enable a shared vision of research by enabling knowledge to be defined and guarded by the group, supporting *whānau* members undertaking research; and by placing greater value on research for *Māori*. Of critical importance is the accountability for the protection and care of research findings and the possession of data by the group. *Māori* researchers talk about 'our research' in contrast to an individual claiming ownership of other people's research information. A warning is issued by Bishop (1996) that this might be seen as selfish and bad mannered as the practices of generosity, co-operation and reciprocity are also linked to the concept of *whānau*.

Whakawhānaungatanga

A central concept within the research domain of *Kaupapa Māori* is *whakawhānaungatanga*. It focuses on the researcher's connectedness, engagement and involvement with others to promote self-determination, agency

and voice. It empowers *Māori* to locate themselves with those present to enable in-depth information to be shared and entrusted to *Māori* researchers (Walker et al., 2006).

Employing *whakawhānaungatanga* as a research strategy involves three interrelated factors described by Bishop (1997) as establishing and maintaining *whānau* relationships; participant-driven approaches to power and control; and researcher involvement as lived experience. Establishing and maintaining *whānau* relationships with participants is a fundamental, sometimes extensive and ongoing part of the research process. Bishop (1997) refers to the creation of a *whānau* of interest through a process of spiral discourse. This is achieved by forming a *whānau*-like relationship among the research participants and then using collaborative storying and restorying (spiral discourse) to create a collective response. By establishing relationships in a *Māori* context, the issues of power and control are addressed through participant participatory research practices, thereby sharing the power and control and thus challenging the traditional notion of the researcher as expert that clouds the boundaries between researcher and researched (Bishop, 1997).

Researching within *whakawhānaungatanga* requires the researcher's involvement as lived experience; that is physically, ethically, morally, and spiritually and not just as a researcher concerned with methodology (Bishop, 1997).

3.3.6. Process of *Kaupapa Māori* research

Through a collaborative approach to power sharing, this study will apply *Kaupapa Māori* research methods, ensuring that ownership and benefits of the research belong to the participants. Within the methodology, the locus of power is addressed within the research by addressing the issues of initiation, benefits, representation, legitimisation and accountability (Bishop, 1996; 1997).

This study carefully considers the principles of *Kaupapa Māori* research ensuring that ownership and benefits of the research belong to the participants. Within the methodology, the locus of power is addressed within the research by addressing the issues of initiation, benefits, representation, legitimisation and accountability (Bishop, 1998).

This study carefully considers the principles of *Kaupapa Māori* research (IBRLA) described by Bishop (1996, 1997) in each step of the planning to explore the transformative possibilities applicable to this study. These principles are shown in Table 3.1 below.

Table 3.1: Principles of *Kaupapa Māori* research

Principle	Variables affected
Initiation	Whose concerns, interests, and methods of approach determine/define the outcomes of research?
Benefits	Who will directly gain from this research? What difference will this study make for <i>Māori</i> ? What benefits will there be?
Representation	Whose interests, concerns, and needs does the research represent? How were the goals and major questions of the project established? Whose voice is heard? Whose research constitutes an adequate depiction of social reality?
Legitimation	Who is going to process the data? Who is going to consider the results of the processing? What happens to the results? Who theories the findings?
Accountability	Whom are researchers answerable to? Who has control over the initiation procedures, evaluations, construction, and distribution of newly defined knowledge?

Source: Bishop, 1996, 1997

The IBRLA framework offers a shift in research whereby the process of the research is around participatory engagement as critical practitioners. The aim of processes undertaken is to ensure that the purpose and outcomes will benefit the participants. From a place of reciprocity between the researchers and participants, the researchers seek to ensure robust representations of reality and that the knowledge is legitimated through the accountability of the researchers. The IBRLA framework offers a sociocultural framework process for addressing the concerns or interests of the participants for the self-determination of their aspirations (Bishop, 1996, 1997; Bishop & Glynn, 1999).

Initiation

When speaking of initiating a research project, Bishop (1996) refers to the laying down of a *koha* and stepping away for the other to consider the gift. Participants were invited from semi-rural or rural full primary schools with a minimum ethnic Year 7 and 8 compositions of 20 per cent *Māori* and a decile rating of 8, 9 or 10. The Education Review Office data base was used to obtain this information.

Initially, an invitation was offered to possible participants via the principal by phone with a proposed follow up *hui* scheduled. The presence of a *kaumatua*, cultural representative or support person was also broached with each principal although this was for any research site.

Bishop and Glynn (1999) ask the following questions of initiation in their research model. What are the goals of the project? Who set the goals? And who set the research questions? For this research project, the overarching question has evolved from an historic inequity of educational outcomes in New Zealand. By unpacking this perennial goal and exploring the actual reality of learning through questioning, participants are then in a position to choose their contributions.

Benefits

Māori researchers claim that research on or with *Māori* people by *non-Māori* researchers has served to maintain the hierarchy of the dominant discourse, perpetuating power and control of the cultural values and aspirations of the coloniser. As a *non-Māori* researcher, the benefits of this project within a *Kaupapa Māori* framework are even more acute. It is crucial, then, to ask the questions asked by Bishop and Glynn (1999) about what benefits will there be and who will get the benefits. Bishop (1996) sees this as a personal investment, in terms determined by both the researcher and all the participants. He encourages *Māori* to seek research benefits that are reciprocal, able to make a positive difference to *Māori* and their communities.

The main benefits of this research will be to those people who desire, want to make a difference, or are committed to bringing about positive change for young *Māori* people in mainstream education. For the immediate research participants, this inquiry will give students, teachers and the school insight into the experiences of their people and the opportunity for other educationalists to critically evaluate their own practice in corresponding environments. In the wider context of building research capacity, the experience gained by this researcher carrying out research in a cross-cultural context will also be a contribution.

Representation

Representation concerns itself with looking at what constitutes an adequate depiction of social reality (Bishop, 1996). Numerous *Māori* researchers (Bishop &

Berryman, 2006, 2009; Hudson & Russell, 2009; Smith, 1999) are actively pursuing research that represents *Māori* constructively; their voice, views, concerns and social realities, for, about and with *Māori*. Through their questioning, Bishop and Glynn (1999) seek to discover whose interests, needs and concerns the project represents and whose voices are heard. Imperative within representation is the accuracy and responsibility of representing participants' views to reflect the participant voice, both individually and collectively by asserting their views. Each participating school, its community, students and staff hold the biggest interest in this research study. However, the findings and recommendations may be of relevance to other similar schools who may wish to initiate or adopt identified practices and behaviours into their educational context and the experiences of a novel researcher in different cross-cultural settings.

Legitimation

Legitimation examines what authority the text has. It focuses on what is accurate, true and complete in a text or research (Bishop, 1996). The legitimacy of knowledge is gained through the process of checking and supporting shared visions. Through collective reflections and validation, legitimacy of reality and truth are unfolding and continually being exposed to analysis and rigour. The constant subjective analysis and rigour through collective reflections of participant's narratives will legitimise *korero* and the ways of doing will become the legitimate norm (Walker et al., 2006). Bishop (1998) calls this process spiral discourse and aligns it to mutually evolving knowledge in contrast to factual truth. In reply to the question of who says this knowledge is true, Bishop responds:

The *Kaupapa Māori* position regarding legitimation is based on the notion that the world constitutes multiple differences and that there are different cultural systems that legitimately make sense of and interact meaningfully in the world. *Kaupapa Māori* research, based on a different world-view from the dominant discourse, makes the political statement while also acknowledging the need to recognise and address the on-going effects of racism and colonialism in the wider society (Bishop, 1998).

In this research, the data will be processed by the researcher. Initially, all participants will receive written transcripts of their audio conversations to change,

delete, and alter at their choice. This will uphold the *mana* of the research participants and ensure their stories are told in the way they were intended. When the transcript had been edited and verified by the research participant as accurate, the researcher looked for common understandings amongst the conversations. These understandings are offered in the form of themes in a following chapter in this thesis. Each school will be given a copy of the entire written thesis which will include the findings, discussion and recommendations. The researcher will hold an information sharing session with the staff and students of each participating school. An open invitation will also be extended to parents/caregivers and school Boards of Trustees, including any affiliated cultural groups. To meet university requirements, the entire thesis will be available through online access.

Accountability

The final phase of *Kaupapa Māori* research establishes who is accountable for the research and who the researcher is responsible to; who has access to the research findings; and who has control over the accessibility and distribution of the knowledge (Bishop, 1996). The question of access and distribution of knowledge has been addressed in the previous paragraph. Participants of each school, their invited personnel and the researcher will have the first copies of the research findings. After that the thesis will be available online through the University of Waikato website.

How this *Kaupapa Māori* perspective, differing world views and the history of traditional research are intertwined, associated and organised are presented in the next section.

3.4: Bridging Multiple Perspectives

This section will link the perspectives of the previous sections. Firstly, why narrative research, semi-structured interviews and the use of the Likert Scale (Robinson & Lai, 2007) are appropriate in this study is discussed. An account of how the data is managed, including transcripts and thematic analysis is given. Finally, a summary of this chapter highlighting the key elements is offered.

3.4.1. Determining research participants

The ERO data base was used to identify reviewed school reports for 2012 full primary schools, with a minimum ethnic Year 7 and 8 student composition of 20 per cent *Māori*, and the then identified decile rating of 8, 9 or 10. The researcher approached each school principal whose school met the criteria by phone to initiate potential participation in this research project and emailed the principal's letter, consent form and information sheet (Appendices A, D and B). Once the probability of research participation was received, the researcher emailed the student information sheet, consent form, interview questions and parent/caregiver consent form (Appendices C, F, G, E); teacher consent form and interview questions (Appendices G and I) to each principal. The researcher suggested an initial participant *hui* and the presence of a *kaumatua* and/or cultural representative was also broached, although this person was not engaged by any of the participating schools. Each school principal consulted their Year 7 and 8 classroom teacher. Confirmed participation was emailed to the researcher by each principal. Individual schools sought and processed their own verbal and written student, parent and staff consent procedures. These were reiterated by the researcher and confirmed before each participant's interview. Six teachers and twelve students comprised the purposive research sample group (Cresswell, 2005) from three full primary schools in the Wellington, Waikato and the Bay of Plenty region.

3.4.2. Influence of narrative research

Within their world view, the adoption of a narrative inquiry paradigm supports *Māori* oral tradition as a means of communicating knowledge and liberation by bringing participant's voice to the forefront through each individual story (Bishop, 1997). By telling a story from their own identity, each research participant is able to offer an understanding to this inquiry of their past, present and future. Clandinin and Connelly (2000) propose narrative inquiry as a way of portraying and investigating people's individual, social and cultural identities. It is the individual personal experiences and the social interaction with others in regard to their contribution to their own learning, teaching or the intersection of both through their own language and cultural context that is at the core of this inquiry.

To explore the depth of student and teacher research narratives, the adoption of collaborative storytelling as a focus on connectedness, engagement and involvement with other research participants moves these narratives beyond a co-operative sharing of experiences. As an outside researcher, the absence of *korero Māori* could restrict participant's contributions, interpretation and translation of knowledge in narrative storytelling. Collaborative storytelling eliminates this possibility by positioning "the researcher within co-joint reflections of shared experiences and co-joint construction of meanings about these experiences, a position where the stories of the research participants merge with those of the researcher in order to create new stories" (Bishop, 1997, p.41; Bishop & Glynn, 1999).

Through effective partnerships, the process of checking and supporting shared visions, collective reflections, validation and legitimacy of reality and truth are unfolding and are continually being exposed to analysis and rigour. Bishop (1998) calls this process spiral discourse and aligns it to mutually evolving knowledge, in contrast to factual truth. Collaborative storytelling empowers participants to explore their thinking, assumptions and expectations and to critically examine the implications of their viewpoints in relation to themselves and others.

Consequently, Bishop promotes collaborative storytelling as a model for research interviews to advance self-determination for indigenous people. He describes it as "sequential, semi-structured, in-depth, interviews as conversations, conducted in a dialogic, reflexive manner that facilitates on-going collaborative analysis and construction of meaning/explanations about the lived experiences of research participants" (1997, p.41).

3.4.3. Semi-structured Interviews

The flexibility and design of semi-structured interviews is applicable to this study. This approach enables the interviewer to have a number of interviewer questions prepared in advance, and to remain open and flexible to subsequent questions that may arise from within the interview partnership. Of equal importance in these types of interviews is the preparedness of the interviewer to improvise in response to the answers given by the participants. Jones elaborates further:

In order to understand other persons' constructions of reality, we would do well to ask them.... and to ask them in such a way that they can tell us in

their terms (rather than those imposed rigidly and a priori by ourselves) and in depth which addresses the rich context that is the substance of their meanings. (1985 cited in Punch, 2009, p.45)

Initially, I had constructed some open-ended questions on my topic prior to the interviews and distributed these to all interviewees including the caregivers and parents of the students. (See Appendices F & G). For the interview itself, I compiled an interview guide to ensure I observed protocol and process. The interview guide is described by King and Horrocks (2010) as an outline of the “main topics the researcher would like to cover, but is flexible regarding the phrasing of questions and the order in which they are asked, and allows the participant to lead the interaction in unanticipated directions” (p.35).

I saw this action as an essential element to establishing relational trust between myself and the research participants. The process and boundaries were known, open, transparent, and flexible, with no hidden agendas. Face to face or *kanohi ki te kanohi* interviewing also supports *Kaupapa Māori* processes and helps build trusting relationships and acts to empower research participants (Carpenter & McMurchy-Pilkington, 2008). These two key actions allowed me, as a beginning researcher, to attempt to develop a mode of consciousness by allowing the participant time and space to tell their story. I intentionally had to create a position of “researcher in abeyance” by being willing and able to participate in a “conversation” that is more directly connected to the intentions, concerns and agendas of the research participants (Bishop, 1997). This context allowed participants to speak freely, at their own pace and without interruption.

With twice as many student research participants as teacher research participants, the benefits and barriers of conversing with students was challenging. My own life experiences had illustrated the narrow window that students sometimes opened and the precarious reasons they based their decisions on could be risky. Consequently, the power dynamic between the researcher and the student was the most important element to address. Eder and Fingerson (2001) reiterate the position and age of the researcher holds power and control of the research process and by posing the questions, leading much of the conversation. The participants are also vulnerable because they have no control over the production or

distribution of the research. Gaining an insider view of what is going on in schools is a priority in this inquiry and student interviews were crucial to “allow them to give voice to their own interpretations and thoughts rather than rely solely on our adult interpretations of their lives” (Eder & Fingerson, p.181).

My first test was to relax the student by investing my own personality into the relationship to make the relationship non-hierarchical (Bishop, 1994). Following the protocols of *mihimihi* and *karakia* to seek guidance and support, I began the *korero* by sharing my *pepehā*, followed by their interests, hobbies and sports. I was particularly careful to articulate my brown skin was from my European/Samoan heritage and I was not an expert or *kuia* entering their space to make judgements. I took time to reiterate the purpose of the *hui* and that the sharing of their experiences was both an honour and a humble opportunity for me. I explained how our mutual contributions in this *whakawhānaungatanga* context, offered us privileged knowledge to contribute to future educational and social change.

Following my initial student interview, I adopted this approach to each consecutive interview, modifying and adapting to the personal paradigms of each interview partnership.

Using prompts and praise in the *kanohi ki te kanohi* interviews gave me opportunities to get more in-depth understanding of the topic or issue from the perspective of the participant. Ryan, Coughlan and Cronin (2009) describe these as sub-questions which encourage each participant to expand upon and answer. They are also considered a useful strategy to refocus participants on the main topic if they get side-tracked and avoid the interviewer leading or dominating the discussion. This was particularly applicable with student participants, when the conversation started to drift or they told you they could not remember the question. The importance of this approach is to ensure the voice of each participant is portrayed in their natural setting, their language and through their lens.

As part of the data gathering process, participants were asked to make a decision in relation to their self-confidence using a Likert Scale (Robinson & Lai, 2007). The question for students was in relation to their own personal confidence and for

teachers their professional competence as a teacher of *Māori* learners. Participants were asked to place themselves on a continuum using the following continuum ranging from 5 = very confident; 4 = confident; 3 = uncertain; 2 = some confidence and 1 = no confidence. In this way, the Likert scale effectively separates participants within the same group and offers a purposive sample within the research group (Cresswell, 2005).

3.4.4. Managing the Data

Narrative techniques are concerned with the content of what the participants have to say. The most complete procedure recommended by Creswell (2005) is to have all interviews transcribed. This gives an accurate account by converting the audio data gathered within the interviewing context into written text in the form of transcripts.

3.4.5. Transcripts

All of the interviews were recorded with a digital audio recorder. All recordings were then transcribed. All adult participants were emailed a copy of their transcripts and offered suggestions as to how they could edit their transcripts for verification. Participants could delete, add or change any information in their transcripts to ensure their narrative was adequately told. After communicating with the *whānau* of interest, the best way to verify student transcripts was decided. For the student participants within travelling distance, the researcher approached them personally. The researcher sat with the students as a group and explained to them why it was important the transcripts stated clearly what they wanted to say and how they could edit them if they wanted to. Each student read through and edited their transcript independently. Prior to this time, the researcher had approached staff to check whether any of the student participants needed help with their literacy. However, the researcher made it clear to students that she was there if they needed help with any words or reading. Several students laughed at the spelling attempts made by the researcher and one student changed a statement when it did not fit in with her previous and following *korero*. One caregiver requested their child's transcript to share together.

Conferring with the principal of the four remaining student participants, it was decided that as he had signed the Principal's Consent Form with the clause "I

agree that no current or potential harm should be brought to personnel from their participation in this research project” (See Appendix D) the same process and confidentiality could be permitted to the remaining student participants who Lived elsewhere. In total, all participants’ interviews were scrutinized and verified personally of their own accord, following the same procedure.

Once the participants had verified their transcripts, the researcher looked for common understandings among the conversations. Thematic analysis was the method adopted.

3.4.6. Thematic analysis

Thematic analysis gives structure to the analysis and enables the researcher to explain the data to others. It is defined by Braun and Clarke (2006) as a “method for identifying, analysing and reporting patterns (themes) within data. It minimally organises and describes your data set in (rich) detail” (p.79).

This approach is applicable to this participatory inquiry as it captures the power of speech, social behaviours and collaboration of the research participants from within their own personal and cultural reference.

The flexibility of thematic analysis, its adoption to most theoretical frameworks and the contextualised method is an adaptive approach to analysing these research participants’ data. Braun and Clarke (2006) claim the ‘contextualised method’ is typified by theories such as critical realism, and recognises how individuals make sense of their experiences and the way the bigger social context imposes on these meanings, while still keeping focus on the material and other reality limits. Thus thematic analysis can both reflect and unravel the surface of reality (p.81).

To identify themes, the researcher needs to make choices about what to include, discard and how to interpret the participant’s words. This is defined by King and Horrocks (2010) as “themes are recurrent features of participant’s accounts, characterising particular perceptions and/or experiences, which the researcher sees as relevant to the research question” (p.150).

In addition Braun and Clarke (2006) question size, and caution that frequency within each data item and across the data set does not necessarily count as a theme

or pattern. They claim the key is capturing something important in relation to the overall research questions.

To have well defined and distinct themes, a clear comprehensible thematic structure helps other people understand the researcher's thinking about the data. The structure applicable to this inquiry context is the process outlined in Appendix L.

3.4.7. Research Ethics

To ensure that research is undertaken in ways that protect and enhance the interests of the participants, the practice and behaviour of the researcher is guided by ethical principles (Hudson, 2009). Cultural ethics, and codes of conduct sourced from *tikanga* and *Mātauranga* are included in Section ii. Outlined now will be ethical approval from the academic institution, informed consent, anonymity and confidentiality.

Ethical approval

Prior to any personal contact or data gathering, an ethical proposal was submitted to The University of Waikato Education Research Ethics Committee and approval was given on 20 June 2012 for my proposal: What is the difference? What Factors contribute to the Variation of Achievement for Year 7 and 8 students in high decile, full primary schools? This ethical framework sets out processes to ensure both participants and the researcher are protected throughout the research process.

Informed Consent

Informed consent is a statement in which individuals are, after being given all the facts of the investigation; choose whether or not to participate.

Through personal email, I initially communicated with each school principal explaining the intent of the research study including collective (school) and individual rights of not participating and withdrawing from the study. The information letters served to ensure that all consent has been clearly and transparently explained and therefore any collusion has been avoided.

Following signed principal consent, individual principals sought individual classroom teacher consent. These class teachers then offered student information sheets to possible participants in sealed envelopes. Written approval from student

caregivers were returned to the class teacher or the principal prior to signed student consent for voluntary inclusion.

Anonymity

The principle of anonymity guarantees any information gathered from participants will not reveal who the participant was confirming participant's privacy. I have allocated numbers to each participant to protect their personal identity when analysing data and have adapted any statements to avoid identifying their location or school.

Confidentiality

To ensure participant confidentiality and eliminate as many risks as possible, I have kept audio recordings and transcriptions securely on my personal computer and memory stick to avoid any unauthorised access. This data will be kept secured as required by the University of Waikato for the University of Waikato for a period of five years, after which time it will be destroyed. Confidentiality also applies to data gathered and who may have access to this information. The data gathered during this study was viewed by the researcher only and codes were allocated to students and teachers in the transcripts and data analysis.

3.4.8. Summary

This chapter provides an overview of the research questions, justification of the qualitative methodology and historical factors that required a research approach based on critical theory. *Kaupapa Māori* principles and protocols underpinned the methods employed in gathering data. These principles provided a structure through which ethical considerations were culturally understood and directed my role as an outside researcher undertaking cross-cultural research.

The next chapter presents the findings from participant's responses in the form of themes.

Chapter 4: Findings

4.1: Introduction

This chapter is divided into four sections. The introduction contextualises the research. It includes the research questions, overarching theme, primary themes and a brief background of research participants and environment. The first section considers the links between people, culture and context, culture and *whānau*. The second section considers teacher's cultural knowledge, support and confidence. The third section discusses connecting with learning through teacher differentiation, student voice and reflections, and descriptions of effective learning relationships. The final section discusses the challenges of school, self-confidence, motivation and celebrating high achievement.

From the data of individual student (Appendix viii) and teacher interviews (Appendix ix) and OTJ's of student achievement in relation to the National Standards (MoE, 2010a) the researcher has identified distinguishing features of participant's accounts, describing particular perceptions and/or experiences as themes (King & Horrocks, 2010) relevant to the research questions. These are:

RQ1. What factors contribute to the variation of achievement for Year 7 and 8 *Māori* students in high decile schools?

RQ2. How are the cultural competencies for teachers (MoE, 2011) approached, implemented and sustained in high quality learning opportunities?

Initially the findings were organised in two participant groups: student and teacher. Within these two groups, common understandings were identified and when appropriate collective groups' voices were joined in an overarching theme centred on making connections. Four sub-themes have emerged: connecting cultures; connecting with culture; connecting learning; and extending connections.

Each theme will be further explained by the use of primary themes. These primary themes are used to further contextualise and expand the main theme.

Contextualising the research

Research sites are all state full primary, decile 8 mainstream schools with a Year 7 and 8 student compositions of at least 20 percent *Māori* and a decile rating of 8, 9 or 10 as shown in Table 4.1.

Table 4.1 Educational research sites

School	Feature	Type	Roll	Location	Gender %		Ethnic Mix %		
					M	F	Pākehā	<i>Māori</i>	other
A	<i>Māori</i> immersion unit	semi-rural	225	Bay of Plenty	52	47	56	44	0
B		urban	300	Waikato	51	49	49	24	39
C		urban	500	Wellington	50	50	65	23	12

4. 1.1 Research Participants

Teachers and students were the participants in this study. Their demographic data is presented in the following sections.

Teachers of mainstream Year 7 and 8 students are shown in Table 4.2.

Table 4.2 Descriptors of teacher participants

Teacher Participant	Gender	Ethnicity	Area of responsibility	Research site
T 1	M	New Zealand <i>Pākehā</i>	Class Room teacher/ Information Communication Technologies	School A
T 2	F	New Zealand <i>Pākehā</i>	Deputy Principal/ Classroom Teacher	School B
T 3	F	New Zealand <i>Pākehā</i>	Senior Team Leader/ classroom teacher	School C
T 4	F	New Zealand <i>Māori</i>	Classroom teacher/ <i>Māori</i> curriculum team	School C
T 5	M	Pasifika	Classroom teacher/ <i>Māori</i> curriculum team	School C
T 6	M	New Zealand <i>Pākehā</i>	Classroom teacher	School C

Student details in mainstream classrooms are included in Table 4.3.

Table 4.3 Student participant descriptors

Student Participants	Gender	Ethnicity	Level	OTJs of Student Achievement in relation to the National Standards (MoE, 2010a).		
				Below	Meeting	Above
S 1	F	<i>Māori</i>	7		√	
S 2	F	<i>Māori</i>	8		√	
S 3	M	<i>Māori</i>	7		√	
S 4	M	<i>Māori/Samoan</i>	7	√		
S 5	F	<i>Māori/Samoan</i>	7			√
S 6	F	<i>Māori</i>	8		√	
S 7	M	<i>Māori</i>	8	√		
S 8	M	<i>Māori</i>	7	√		
S 9	F	<i>Māori</i>	8		√	
S 10	M	<i>Māori</i>	8		√	
S 11	F	<i>Māori</i>	8		√	
S 12	M	<i>Māori</i>	8		√	

Individual student findings are presented as groups in relation to the National Standards (MoE, 2010a) in an attempt to identify factors which could possibly contribute to student achievement variation. The National Standards (MoE, 2010a) are clear expectations of what students need to meet in relation to their reading, writing and mathematics. Individual student achievement is determined by the OTJ's which are formed from evidence gathered by conversing with the student, observing the process a student uses, and gathering results from formal assessment and standardised tools. The OTJ's of student participants was used to evaluate overall individual achievement of reading, writing and mathematics in relation to the National Standards (MoE, 2010a). This is indicated in Table 4.3. In this investigation, reference to the standards is to the National Standards (MoE, 2010a) and is contained within student data.

4.2: Connecting Cultures

The current social structures extant at each site form the culture of that identified school. Both student and teacher participants bring their individual and collective culture into this existing culture. The participation structures then interact to find a common connection to contribute to an emerging or different community culture. The connection between personnel who come to school, student and teacher views of onsite cultural recognition, and the influence of *whānau* are explored.

4.2.1. Connecting participants

Common ground to link research participants was found by identifying why these people like coming to school. Social interaction was the key point identified by all participants (students and teachers) as the main reason they like coming to school.

Students

SB, SD, SF, SJ and SL like seeing, being and playing around with their friends. In reference to all personnel who participate in school, SA, SE and SH, like kind, nice and helpful teachers, peers and support staff within their school. SA, SB, SE and SH value learning and are helped with their learning: SI said because “we have a good education and learn in a good way”. For SK, “there are so many opportunities: whether it is sports leadership, culture all that sort of stuff.”

Teachers

Teachers come to work with students and the collegiality of staff and students is illustrated by TF:

What I enjoy about coming to school is the students and that there is always something different to do and we are lucky here; after being in different schools I know that the teachers are very supportive and it’s a fantastic school to work in. So, I would say the students and the school.

TE reinforced this by adding:

I don’t feel like people are climbing over each other to get ahead. I feel like people are here because they want to teach, and they enjoy being a teacher and they enjoy kids.

Incorporated in working with students is valuing learning for students, making a difference to their learning and building relationships is TC's pleasure in coming to school. She likes:

... seeing the children succeed. Especially when the light goes on or you see the smile on their face and they've made the connection. That's probably the most important thing I enjoy about coming to school, and knowing that I can make a difference to their learning. The interaction is also really good, with both colleagues and students as well.

Creativity and knowing that every day is different is another contributing factor for TA and TF. TA values:

... the opportunity to do creative stuff with the kids, to help sow seeds for them so they can go off and explore their own areas that they are passionate about. It's the working with the kids.

The best thing for TE is being with a family member and:

... one day or even during any part of the day, you could be teaching and it might be a bit flat, but in the next breath, a kid might get what you are saying and when you see they get it, it really sparks me to a different avenue. Sometimes, I might give it back to the kids, and one kid might come back with a whole different idea that I never planned for and we just run on that tangent. So, that's what I love about coming to school, is that every day is different.

Participant's perception of cultural presence within school life was explored.

4.2.2. Insider Perspectives

Students

Table 4.4 shows student's reality of how their culture is recognised and celebrated in school.

Table 4.4 Student perception of cultural recognition

Culture recognised in your school	Achievement of National Standards	Achievement of National Standards	Achievement of National Standards
	Below	Meeting	Above
Yes	√	√ √ √ √ √	
No	√	√ √	
Don't know	√	√	√

SA, SB, SC, SH, SJ and SL believe their culture is recognised and celebrated in their school. The presence of a *Māori* pattern, *waka* puzzle and lots of things *Māori* in the environment told SA their culture was valued. Their class studied *Māori* History and *te reo Māori*. SB at the same School A expressed their desire to be in the *Māori* unit, but the mother would not give permission. SB said her mother had been in a total immersion unit and had told the daughter that it did not really take you anywhere or help you learn much in your English, or the basic things you need to know. The student felt the kids in the *Māori* unit were not really that smart and always sang *waiata*.

SD, SF, and SK believe their culture is undervalued and based their reasoning on:

not knowing where the *Māori* things were;

how to get into the *Māori* things;

students not knowing what their culture is;

students not recognising cultural learning; and

fairness.

SE believes, in respect to the many cultures in School B, to have a focus on one or two like *Māori* and Samoan would be racism. The ousting of a proposed Culture Day for a Talent Quest was an indicator of other students' possible reception.

SE, SG and SI could not decide if their culture was valued or not. Contrasting views based on participation and non-participation in the GATE *Māori* extension programme was more significant in their decision than *Māori* cultural lessons, *Matariki* or *Māori* Language Week.

All students are offered access to *kapa haka*. Outside tutors lead groups with voluntary participation. SH did not know why they did not attend *kapa haka*.

Student's recognition of learning *te reo Māori* varies. SB, SC, SE SG, and SH do not mention *te reo Māori*. SF would replace the Spanish teacher for a *te reo Māori* teacher. The classroom *te reo Māori* teacher received mixed student feedback. SA said the teacher chooses leaders for the groups; people who are really good at *Māori* and people who are *Māori* and strong at the language. She says it makes her feel cool "how we learn about our culture."

The following comments are from students at School C. SI said they sometimes had *te reo Māori*. It was only basic, quite boring, as they just shared with each other in groups. SJ believed *te reo Māori* started about two weeks previously. SK suggested offering *te reo Māori* as one of the languages, as they seldom had *te reo Māori* in class. SL named *Māori* Language Week when they did not really do anything.

Teachers

All teachers felt their school acknowledged different cultural groups. TB, TC, TD, TE, and TF recognised these cultural differences through their school curriculum in consultation with community *whānau*. At School C, a *Māori* curriculum team was also influential in systems, programmes and processes. Their next step was to translate school and citizenship goals into *Māori*. School B was:

still on a learning journey, trying to find ways where they've got input into the school. We're trying hard to listen to others... we could do a lot better, but we are getting there. The *Māori* parent group were particularly disaffected and shy to come forward; unlike the Pasifika parents who had formed their own committee and meet regularly onsite to discuss issues.

TC, TD, TE and TF felt their school valued every child and promoted positive individual ethnicity; "it's cool to be Indian, *Māori*, and Pasifika." The student leadership programme is based on the actual person and not predicated on race or gender. TC, TD, TE and TF credit their school's supportive atmosphere that encourages students to be leaders in their own right, demonstrating citizenship values underpinning school-wide goals. An outside facilitator provided a positive

practical scenario for students to apply their leadership skills, reflect on their independence, decision making and social skills, as a group or individually. The pinnacle of the leadership programme is a school student councillor. Participants felt that the responsibilities of road patrol, peer mediators, librarians in Years 5 and 6 through to House leaders obligations in Years 7 and 8 prepared students for the ultimate student role. This allowed them to step up to the councillor role, confident and competent as a person of their own being (*Ka Hikitia*, 2009a).

Te reo Māori and *tikanga Māori* are accessible to all students across the curriculum. All schools offered *te reo Māori* and *kapa haka*. Schools B and C integrated *siva, sasa* Pasifika dance components. Each school organised *kapa haka* differently. All *kapa haka kaiako* were from outside each school, influencing student choice and programme retention. At School C, a male and a female teacher support senior student's participation. At School B, either *te reo Māori* or *kapa haka* are offered to the students. At School C, the value of school-wide *te reo Māori* and the guidance of the *Māori* Curriculum Team are available, particularly for:

Teacher's like me who aren't that confident have a breakdown of what each year level should be learning in terms of *te reo Māori* and what we need to cover. It's a basic programme...but it's reassurance for a teacher who is not that confident in *te reo Māori*; it's a backup resource. (TC)

In *Māori* Language Week, at School C, the curriculum leader shares ideas, knowledge and checks with *iwi* elders for correct pronunciation.

4.2.3. Whānau influence

Outside of school, SA participates in regular cultural activities. SA and SB have consistent contact with *korero Māori*. SA speaks some *Māori* with the tutors at the *kapa haka* group, their mother and little sister who attend *Kohanga Reo*. Dad, Mum and Nan also speak to SB in *Māori*. Mum is a fluent speaker and a past member of the *Māori* unit. SH and SI knew the protocol when they returned to their *whānau marae* for celebrations and *tangi*. SH remarked "Yes, it's quite interesting, but the funny and annoying thing is I don't understand them". SC, SD, SE, SF,SG, SJ, SK and SL are not involved with any cultural activities beyond school.

4.3. Connecting with Culture

Tātaiako (MoE, 2011) distinguishes the cultural competencies for teachers of *Māori* learners and their behavioural indicators as related to different stages of teaching experience. Findings of teacher understanding and recognition that seek to tailor teaching and learning needs to meet *Māori* learner's inclusive cultural needs are now considered.

4.3.1. Cultural knowledge

Ako

TB, TD, and TE shared their understanding of *ako*. TC and TF consulted references and TA had no understanding.

An understanding of *ako*, or supporting each other in their learning, was endorsed by TD:

I know some of the programmes that they've put into high schools where they do the *tuakana teina* thing is really important for *Māori*. I find that way of learning is important for cultures all over. We try to have that in our classrooms, whether it's Yr. 7 & 8, but it's at their learning level as well.... having someone who is really good at reading, helping someone who is not so good in things like that. A lot of the different things they say to include where they are doing things with their hands and group things, I think those are important. Not just for *Māori*, but also for all cultures. Although *Māori* students seem to thrive in it, I also think *Māori* students cop out with it too, because they all tend to rely on other people, so it is getting the mix of both right.

TE described *ako* as the relationship between the student and the teacher; the way the teacher teaches and the way the student learns. Their perception was based on an environment which fosters good relationships for both the students and teacher because I learn just as much from the kids as what I try and teach them. What I teach them is curriculum stuff, what they try and teach me is incidental stuff. I've discovered the more I know about the child, the more I can cater for their needs, the more the child gets to know you on a personal level. When the kids get to know me, they know when it is time to play and when it is time to work.

TB's perspective is the focus on the total picture of the learner including academic, social and family life. Making sure you were aware of:

all aspects of the learner and how the learner fits with which ever community they are working with. It's a lot of give and take as well. It's being open, being open to what the learner is bringing to it and vice versa. It is not just the one way of looking at it.

TB summarised *ako* as that reciprocal aspect of learning; the learning of both the teacher and the student, the learning from each other.

Mana motuhake

All teachers had no initial understanding of *mana motuhake*. The following comments exemplify the general comments made in the interviews:

I know that mana means proud, but I didn't know about the academic success;

And:

stretching *ako* to success; how well the kids do academically.

All teachers knew basic *Māori* terms: *tikanga*, *iwi*, *hapū*, *whānau*, *tapu*, *kōhanga reo*. Five of the six teachers were respectful of the culture and TF had taught himself to pronounce the words as best he could. At School C, connecting school values to cultural competencies like *manaakitanga* in relation to kindness, respect and behaviour as well as staff discussions was an example of extending understanding. The school's strong values programmes identified a concerted effort being placed on eight values during the year and then understanding the associated values for *Māori* which the school is still developing.

4.3.2. Cultural Support

All teachers were aware of *Ka Hikitia* (MoE, 2009a). At School B, an impending ERO visit had initiated investigation, but no further activity. The school has a *Māori* Strategic Plan, but it was unknown whether *Ka Hikitia* (MoE, 2009a) had been consulted in the proposal. At School A, it was not known if *Ka Hikitia* (MoE, 2009a) had not been explored in four years. TD said "if you don't understand what the *Māori* initiatives are then, you can't pinpoint it - do you know what I mean?"

TC and TE had investigated *Ka Hikitia* (MoE, 2009). At School C, staff was accountable for reporting and monitoring *Māori* achievement data for different areas. Teachers at School C spoke of staff meetings to discuss and identify how *Māori* students learn and what teachers can do to help their achievement. Discussions included the *te reo Māori* programme *ko ma te whei* and the student leadership programme integrating *Ka Hikitia* (MoE, 2009) to support local curriculum.

Staff from School C involved in the *Māori* Curriculum Team spoke of their GATE learning for *Māori* students, the school's action plan for *Māori*, self-review and the recent completion of another draft. Previous staff meetings had discussed *Māori* giftedness and student opportunities for this learning. TE spoke of the hard work of the *Māori* Curriculum Team to improve academic, social and spiritual elements of *Te Ao Māori* following a previous ERO visit.

TE knew and understood the cultural competencies for things *Māori* in *Tātaiako* (MoE, 2011). From their curriculum leader's explanation, they understood that children would do much better if the culture were more immersed in their learning, rather than just alongside the key competencies. These competencies were applicable for the student through the way the teacher presents them.

4.3.3 Cultural confidence

Pursuing professional competence as a teacher for *Māori* learners, research participants were asked to rate themselves on a scale of 1-5, with 5 being the highest. In respect to academic confidence, all teachers rated themselves between 3 and 4. The range for cultural competence spreads from 1-4. TD and TE both rated as 4s, based on *Māori* identity and close affinity with *Māori* through Pasifika heritage. TB and TF cited limited cultural understanding and ability, lack of knowledge and confidence to speak the language and carry out *Māori* protocols without offending anyone as obstructions. TC felt she did her best to understand and respect the culture, follow protocol and were aware *Māori* students learn in different ways. Teacher A did not see *Māori* as a group within a bigger group and wondered if a staunch stand should be taken or a shift in thinking was required.

4.4: Connecting Learning

Creating a supportive learning environment is recognised to have a positive impact on student learning and is inseparable from its social and cultural context. Teaching as inquiry requires review of effective pedagogy and of the impact of the teaching on the students (MoE, 2007). Therefore, an investigation into learning and its process from the position of the learner is required. Firstly, teacher reflections of positive learning scenarios are presented. The student voice expresses whether students are learning, what is learning, how learners learn best, self-monitoring, improving learning and descriptions of the perfect teacher. Concluding this section are teacher descriptions of an effective learning relationship.

4.4.1. Differentiation

In response to retelling of successful teaching of *Māori* students, teacher participants were asked to differentiate their teaching practice and to identify how it made a difference. People and relationships in many and varied forms inform their replies.

Individual needs

TA states there is no differential. Their teaching is needs based, inclusive of extension, or remedial and not ethnicity. As *Māori* students are coming through with good basic knowledge, the teacher is able to set the children up with skills to work independently. This environment fosters opportunities for some students to fly and to support those who need more structure. A creative own-pace holistic approach is used with few parameters and students have a clear understanding of the task. The learning context determines who chooses the working groups. These comments support TA's initial statement.

Forming and extending relationships

The lynchpin for TB was developing a relationship with the teacher and other children. By praising what they had done well and building self-confidence through these relationships' "together we worked to help him to recognise the special qualities of him" and this student became a quiet leader.

Relishing opportunities

Forming a student relationship founded on sport preference and capitalising on an established family relationship enabled TC to shift low self-esteem. From initial participation in *kapa haka*, the student went from being a *kapa haka* leader to securing a councillor's role. Together with these leadership opportunities, TC made the learning more meaningful incorporating the student's interests and making him consciously aware of his capabilities. Praise from the classroom teacher and colleagues developed further relationships to make little steps of self-confidence along the way.

Honesty

By being honest about the situation, TB was able to offer one student a final chance to change their behaviour if they wanted to be considered for a possible councillor's role. This ignited a positive behaviour flip, behaviour which spread into maths and then further into other curriculum areas. TB proposes that from finding something students enjoy, you can build them up as a person and you can help them learn anything.

Self-confidence

TF identified self-confidence and respect as two crucial elements for *Māori* learners. Success changes student attitude and work ethic is TF's philosophical approach. To gain self-confidence, drama and physical activities in small groups were engineered. The ethos that it is all right to make a mistake, that you learn from your mistakes and no one is going to laugh at you if you make a mistake, leads to nurturing and celebrating mistakes.

Fairness

Although TE's personal cultural philosophy and heritage directs his initial responses when dealing with parents and students, his biggest learning is "that the kids understand being fair". TE treats the A+ students and the D- students the same because "the rat bags appreciate that more than the other students, because they understand that if they get in trouble, they know I back up what I say."

Humour

TE identified humour as an element essential to creating mutual respect, especially when speaking about misbehaviour. Asking them to "man up and suffer

the consequences because once it's done, it's done ... male *Māori* and Pacific Islanders understand that". TE explains to the student that "it is not me you have let down, but yourself."

Networking

TF named sensitive one-to-one networking and maintaining these networks consistently by many people as being instrumental in their successful scenario. The length of time it took to find a sport that the student could connect with, up-skill the student, find the adult support to get the student down to the field, and the additional time it took for the student to participate in a peer supported recreational sporting activity was sensitive and complex. This effort culminated in the student's positive behaviour and making choices independently, and was viewed as successful social learning.

4.4.2. Student learning

All students could recall something that they have learnt recently. SA, SB, SC, SD, SE, SF, SG, SH, SJ, SK and SL, named a curriculum area. SI named a social encounter when on camp, they were blamed for stuff they had not said and were spoken to about the power of the tongue. This means saying nice things to others and not put downs. The student changed their behaviour by being more careful about what they said to others to get a positive response.

SE, achieving above the standard, demonstrated how to change a mixed fraction into an improper fraction, made a comparison between the two and explained how you might use this knowledge if you were an accountant.

SD and SG, achieving below the standard, gave generic responses, "We've been learning about fractions." When asked how, SD's response was of management organisation "we have little groups of five or six" and SG's response was "I like maths." When asked why maths appeals, SG replied "I don't know, I just like numbers." When asked for something specific, fractions, algebra and BEDMATHS was offered.

SH, achieving below the standard, gave a detailed and specific example:

You have a thing on the protractor called a vertex. It's a little dot in the middle. If you have an angle like that, you put it on the pointy bit. You measure the zero line

up and where the other line is you read it. If it is below 90° you read the little number and if it is above 90° you read the big numbers. Do you get what I'm saying?

When asked how they knew when an angle was below 90° , the answer was:

Because a right hand angle of a pizza is 90° .

When asked what an angle that is less than 90° is called, the response was

Oh what is it called, an acute angle, and one that is more than 90° is obtuse.

To determine whether students are learning, it is necessary to understand how learning is defined by these students.

4.4.3. Learning is ...

All students spoke of gaining new knowledge. Their reasoning follows.

SE, achieving above the standard, said:

it is when you know something you didn't know before.

SA, SB, SI, SJ and SK, who are meeting the standard, based their judgement on the number of answers they could give to random questions or quizzes; and demonstrating their learning.

SK's example was:

I've learnt how to infer. It means reading between the lines. It means the author gives clues to the text, but does not actually state it. You have to use your knowledge and the clues. [I know its learning] because I had no idea what it was before and now I can do it easily and it's become clearer to me.

For SD, SG and SH, achieving below the standard, it was listening to instructions, working hard on their paper to get most things right; the number of correct questions; and knowing more stuff.

More important for SD was their need to connect with others to discuss socialising issues at their weekly meeting with management.

4.4.4. Best ways of learning

Knowing how and why different learning strategies are more effective for students was sought from their understanding of what is the best way to learn.

Working with the teacher

SE, SG, SH, SK and SL learn best working with the teacher. How each student works with the teacher differs for every individual.

Student E, achieving above the standard, learns best when the teacher:

gives examples;

lets students try examples;

allows independent application; and

leaves us alone to get on with it.

SG, SK and SL, who are achieving at the standard, learn best when the teacher:

makes them listen;

makes them work;

writes it down for them;

sits down beside them; and

explains step by step.

All students spoke of understanding and not process in isolation.

SH, achieving below the standard, learns best when the teacher:

sits beside them;

explains when they don't understand;

follows a step by step process;

helps them until they got it;

gave them clues;

encourages them positively; and

believes they can get it right.

SH felt really great and important when getting it right after the teacher said “Come on, you can get it.” Additionally, knowing the teacher does it in all subjects and to the best of their ability with all of the children, was a key reason for their description of “an enjoyable, fair class and if you do something wrong, there is a fair punishment for it...” “In this class it’s all about fairness” (SH).

Listening

SA, SC and SI, who are meeting the standard, learn best by listening. They retain their focus within their peer group by:

telling their friends to be quiet;

moving away; and

trying to get on with their work.

Student C referred to people distracting him by talking and his choice of whether to join in or just listen. He knew when he was daydreaming or listening to their peers, his learning was going down.

Peer support

SF, who is meeting the standard, learned best when their peers help them to:

work though it;

overcome anxiousness;

calm nerves; and

offer comfort.

SD, achieving below the standard, preferred peer support because they:

help me when the teacher is busy;

help me when I don’t understand;

tell me when I forget the strategy;

give up their time for me;
give me extra help;
make me feel good; and
help me when I struggle with certain things.

Independence

SA and SJ, meeting the standard learn, best through independent learning with:

quiet space;
no interruption; and
no distractions from peers.

SJ moves to another seat or onto the floor. In partnerships, SJ felt it was too easy to get distracted, compared to independent work when they could focus and get more information. SA's comment was:

Concentrate means I'm doing my work without being distracted by other things around me. It helps me focus on what I'm doing.

Referring to writing samples was an example of helping them think about things they have to write about.

4.4.5. Self-Monitoring

What action students take when they need help with their learning and how they know it makes a difference was investigated.

SE, achieving above the standard,
asked the teacher first; then
asked anyone near if the teacher was busy.

In writing, when they got blocked and could not think properly, they took a break to get their mind working again by going outside to have a little breath of fresh air. The teacher allowed this, and SE felt they needed a break as they had been working too hard; and they did not know...the writing just stopped.

SC, SF, SJ and SK, who are meeting the standard, sought help:

first, from the teacher; and

second, from peers.

Their actions are influenced by different context, subject and personal confidence.

SK described his approach:

I ask questions, either the teacher or the student teacher. If it's not a big thing you can ask a buddy. I ask the teacher more because they give me more information about it, than the student. I probably trust the teacher more than the kids. They don't explain it, they just tell you what to do and you don't have the understanding. No, it probably has something to do with the teacher having more knowledge.

SA, SB and SL, meeting the standard, sought help from either the teacher or peers. The advantage of peer support was:

simpler language compared to the teacher's confusing words;

explanations easier to understand;

buddy checks for writing; and

confidence.

SI, who meets the standard, approached peers first because:

we all work together;

don't need to ask the teacher; and

saves them getting up.

SI summarised the practicality of the situation:

Whether I ask the teacher or my peers, the difference is I know what to do to get it completed, because I know what I need to do.

SD, SG and SH, achieving below the standard, each had personal preferences.

When Student D could not hear and the teacher was busy, who they approached was influenced by their peer's potential response. In their words:

... before I go to someone I try and think how they will respond to me and treat me because that is important to me. Sometimes, when I ask they just tell me I should have listened to the teacher and that makes me feel sad, that's why I choose a sort of cousin, we always help each other.

SG either asks someone else or understands the teacher and just does it. He admitted he was too shy to ask the teacher for help or to repeat it. When his friends told him, he was just doing it without understanding. SG said when he did ask the teacher, he got through his work much faster. His resulting behaviours seemed to stem from:

... if the teacher is talking the whole time, then I just sit there and be annoying, talking, distracting the other kids from their learning because I don't understand.

SH asks the teacher first, because the teacher is usually sitting beside them. The teacher encourages us to ask for help and tells us "if you don't ask for help you are never going to get anywhere."

4.4.6. What do you need to do to keep improving in your learning?

SE, achieving above the standard, asks anyone near who:

gives examples either easy or hard; or

makes a decision based on activity.

The teacher also gives advice on how to make stories better; giving feedback on what she liked and what she did not understand. When the teacher read it out to the class to get class and individual feedback, they felt a bit awkward having their story read out, but felt proud as well.

S A, SC and SF, who are meeting the standard, identified the following actions:

Listening;

retaining focus; and

not getting distracted.

Since arriving at School A, SA spoke of their behaviour change and the impact on learning. In their words:

I just ignored the people that were trying to distract me. If someone is trying to call me I just keep doing my work instead of doing that. I know it helped me with my learning, because the teacher gives us total scores in our work each month. I can see I have been improving in maths, reading and spelling. It makes me feel proud of myself that I've done well. I tell my parents and they say 'that's good'. My friends say 'you're smart as'. It makes me feel good inside.

SI, SJ and SL, who are meeting the standard, need to improve their learning by reading to:

improve understanding; and

increase reading mileage.

SJ has it written on the whiteboard at home, with Mum encouraging him to stay home and read daily for thirty minutes. SL's teacher's impromptu monitoring was encouraging and a reminder to keep reading.

SB and SK, achieving within the standard, needed to improve in:

asking more questions.

SK's reflections were that:

I need to keep asking until I understand. I need to tell them I haven't got it and ask them to keep explaining it to me. I need to speak up and tell them when I'm not sure.

SD, SG and SH, achieving below the standard, identified the improvements they needed to make as:

improving listening;

improving concentration;

asking for help;

speaking up when they don't understand; and

keep trying.

Student D improving by:

overcoming shyness;

increasing confidence to speak up; and

telling the teacher when they couldn't hear.

SG talked about not talking back and how the current teacher says 'Be good or I'll take you out of the classroom.' Then he is naughty and it doesn't happen. At a previous school, the teacher was really strict and I learnt.

SH appreciated all the good teachers who are helping them learn more so they can get a good job.

4.4.7. Teacher choice

When asked to choose their perfect teacher SD, SE, SJ and SK choose female; while SB, SC, SH and SI choose male. For SA, SF, SG and SL, gender was irrelevant.

There is no correlation between student gender and preferred teacher gender.

SB, SC, SE, SJ and K wanted a nice teacher.

SE, achieving above the standard, also wanted a teacher who:

has time for all students;

doesn't pick favourites; and

went around to everyone.

This teacher is:

not [only] looking at the person who is struggling and then not helping anyone else.

SB, SC, SJ, SK and SL, who meet the standard, wanted a teacher who:

you could talk to;

you could tell anything to;
helps you;
knows their stuff;
is smart;
knows what's going to happen next;
is in a good mood;
is creative;
does cool activities; and
plays sports.

SI, SJ, SK and SL, who meet the standard, wanted a teacher with humour who:

will have a laugh every now and then; and
let's you know what the expectations and boundaries are.

SI felt:

They pushed you; they kept an eye on us. They always used to joke with us, but they knew when it was time to put our head down to work. They had a sense of humour, not strict, but firm. We knew what we were expected to do and yes, I got a few of my goals.

A key feature for SK, who meets the standard, was:

being patient;
giving students the correct answer;
never backing down if they ask you again and again; and
telling you when they are having a bad day.

SD, achieving below the standard, wanted a teacher who:

looked out for bullies;

talks to both the bullies and the victim; and
is able to mediate.

SH wanted a teacher who:

joins in sport, most teachers take you out to play and then they just yell out the instructions.

4.4.8. Effective learning relationships

All teachers identified mutual respect created by:

getting to know each child individually;

students getting to know you;

giving praise;

sharing things about you;

knowing the teacher likes them;

using humour;

having fun;

having creative times together; and

having individual and class conversations;

A genuine caution from TF in building respect is the manner in which you speak to someone. He suggests:

...you ask, before you jump in and tell them what they should have done [as often it did not happen the way you thought it had. From his personal experience,] by taking the time to listen to the students, read what they've written, write some feedback, or make a comment about a certain part, or even talk them through what they've done; they've seen that I've understood what they've said and how we can move forward' All these sorts of things build respect.

Co-construction by working together gave students opportunities to be leading learning, self-managing and self-monitoring for TA, TB and TF to:

come up with the best outcome;
negotiate the learning;
agree on timeframes;
agree on goals;
reflect on goals;
rationalise attainment;
critical evaluation; and
offer student learning choice through:
independent learning;
structured learning; and
individual tuition.

Trust was a prominent factor for TA, TB, TD and TF, as students:

decided on social interactions;
were honest about their understanding, where and why;
know goals and expectations;
know boundaries; and
know appropriate consequences.

They noted that:

when it's learning time; we're focused on our learning.

TD described their relationship built on respect, trust and consistency by:

Respecting them and gaining their respect by respecting them as a person, regardless of their little hiccups. You have to also have a relationship with their parents.

A relationship with parents is important because:

it helps with their learning and in different areas.

Teacher D described a behaviour scenario; when the parents were asked via email to have a little chat with the student in respect to class activities. The parents responded positively, thanking the teacher for letting them know. The student apologised and is trying to self-manage by commenting:

I've had a good day today, haven't I miss?

For the student, TD feels:

It gains a respect for them that I care enough to talk to their parents about what they need to improve on.

TA and TB saw trust and consistent actions for negative responses as cohesive partners when:

consequences are known;

students know predicted behaviours; and

students trusted predicted behaviours.

The students trust in the teacher. They know they will not be put in any harmful situation.

TA, TB, TC and TF recognised a willingness to improve learning for both students and teachers, as individuals and within groups by:

continuing to learn;

identifying what has been learnt;

identifying what could improve, change or be done differently;

responding to feedback;

reflecting on practice; and

making students and teachers feel good about their work-praise.

Progress was recognised, irrespective of student's place on the learning continuum. Keeping up with professional development, finding out new things and putting them into learning contexts was an important contribution.

TE emphasised pushing students and their boundaries to achieve at a higher level showed:

positive learning gains;

confidence to ask for help;

high self-confidence; and

high expectations.

He noted that :

Half the battle is the kids coming to school. If they enjoy coming to school, then it's going to be a good day...same as the teacher.

4.5: Extending Connections

For *Māori* students to enjoy educational success as *Māori* (*Ka Hikitia*, 2009a) access to student's thoughts to find out how school is challenging and what contributes to self-confidence was required. Corresponding teacher talk to develop student self-confidence and celebrating high achievement was also explored. The findings are described in the following section.

4.5.1. Is school challenging?

SA, SB, SE, SJ, SH, SI, SJ and SK found school challenging.

SE, achieving above the standard, found being pushed and having things a bit tougher than normal was sometimes challenging. Her example involving basic facts was

I do stage 8 when I'm on stage 7; because I get half of them right on Stage 8, so it gets me thinking. If I can do half of these I should be able to get stage 7 and I know what I'm getting into when I get to stage 8.

SA, SB, SC, SH, SI, SJ and SK, achieving within the standard, identified individual differences to the demands of school. Some of these are:

reading with understanding;

writing with understanding;

learning and understanding new things;

trying to listen, hear and respond;

needing to do extra work when they really want to achieve something;

doing their best work and setting an example as a student councillor;

finishing first; and

being motivated to participate in speeches and learning languages.

SD, SF and SG who are achieving below the standard found school challenging when:

interacting with bullies;

given opportunities for privileged positions; e.g. leading Pasifika and production;

stepping up and trying new things; and

trying to do really well in their work;

SA, SB, SC, SD, SE, SF, SH, SI, SJ, SK and SL named potential careers that involved tertiary education. SL named accounting and said:

Mum tells me I'm going to University. I want to go too.

SG, student achieving below the standard, had no plans or thoughts after leaving school.

4.5.2. Student Self- Confidence

Active student engagement is centred on individual self-confidence. On a scale of 1-5, with 5 the highest, student self-assessment of their self-confidence is shown in Table 4.5.

Table 4.5 Student self-confidence

Student gender	Below	Meeting	Above
Female		3-4, 4, 4, 4, 4	3
Male	2, 4, 4	3, 5, 5	

SE, achieving above the standard, self-assessed at three because they do not like sharing out loud, they know many people, and like big crowds

SC and SL, who are meeting the standard, self-assessed at five because, they say:

I'm proud to be me;

the only one in the world;

special;

really good at following instructions;

reliable;

organised;

self-managing;

able to get the job done; and

able get on with others.

SA, SB, SF, SI, SJ, SK and SL, who are all meeting the standards, self-assessed at three-four because:

They:

are not good at speaking in front of class;

have more friends than last year;

are able to speak to friends better now;

get nervous when they have lots to do;

are a confident speech speaker; and

try new things.

SI and SK felt they could not be a 5 as there was some self-doubt and room for improvement. SK talked about the need to think in the positives, and the need to always look on the bright side. As a student councillor, SI liked the challenge, responsibility and kudos of trying to meet people's expectations.

SD and SG, achieving below the standard, based their 4 rating on:

cultural leadership; and

confidence in cultural activities.

SH, achieving below the standard, based their 2 on:

not doing what other people do;

being unable to speak in front of a big group;

being shy; and

having received verbal putdowns.

4.5.3. Reinforcing student self-confidence

All teachers mentioned interacting and valuing students by:

getting to know them;

listening to their ideas;

looking into areas they are interested in;

looking at themselves as learners;

creating opportunities for them to excel in; and

looking into things they need to work on

TA and TB talked about children being excited in learning; allowing children to create and run with their ideas. TC remarked on inclusiveness, making them feel valued, being part of the whole school, in addition to praise and positive feedback.

TD links fairness and trust with:

[them knowing] what they expect from me, they know that whatever I expect from them, I expect from everyone else in the classroom. I think that gives them trust, I suppose to know that I try to be consistent in that way they know what to expect so it's not really any big surprise. I think I reinforce things.

TD illustrates her use of non-verbal cues and expectations:

Sometimes with *Māori* students I just tell them to do it and walk away, they know I expect them to do it, so there is no one there for them to have a confrontation with.

TF spoke about how respect and self-confidence are created by the way you talk to the students and vice versa; generating a classroom atmosphere where students: are able to stand up in front of their peers;

express their view;

celebrate success; and

hear no put downs.

This also created class discussions of indifferent individual behaviours and how to initiate individual respect, build self-confidence, and build team confidence.

4.5.4. Celebrating high achievement

All teachers named national and international competitions: ICAS Tests, Otago Maths, Science Fair, Technology Challenge, National Video, Full Primary Competitions and individual sporting success, as high achievements which could be attained.

All schools celebrated high achievement at assemblies, in newsletters, or both. School A uses regular video, online Facebook and Youtube channels to extend audience capacity. School C has a designated area for student photos and personal profiles relaying achievement credentials; citizenship with excellence (school virtues), principal and class term academic and service awards recognise values behaviour and high performance.

School B has optional homework challenges, highlighting the key competencies for each year level as further excellence opportunities. Expectations are tiered at bronze, silver and gold levels. At assemblies, medals and certificates recognise personal attainment.

School C includes a specific programme for *Māori* students within their Gifted and Talented Education (GATE) programme which offers learning extension. Flax weaving and *Māori* visual arts are previous specialities. Parent availability would determine a possible carving unit.

Staff at School C highlighted their willingness to give up lunchtimes and share their gifts. An example was watching Youtube hip hop dances with *Māori* and Polynesian males and then giving them the physical opportunity to create their own. Another feature was the commitment of syndicate staff members to support the classroom teacher and Year 7 and 8 students participating in interschool competitions.

At School B, drama, leading production roles, *kapa haka*, singing, band and percussion are school-wide activities that *Māori* students excel in. According to TB, the key is giving them opportunity to join in things they are good at. Things:

like the Arts programme, having their art work up around the school. We've had a lot of *Māori* and Pasifika art work going up, because we realised that the art work we had didn't really say who we were. So that's an opportunity for children who are really good at art and perhaps happen to be *Māori* to achieve in.

All teachers operated class rewards. Generally, students received verbal affirmations when sharing work with their teacher or peers. Regardless of individual ethnicity, the key indicator was recognition based on the quality of the work, with TF promoting students explaining what they had done well to peers.

TA showed students how they had moved in their learning, and how their work standard had improved.

TE saw a connection between improved learning and better behaviour; as the learning advances the behaviour corrects.

TB sometimes extends a student by placing them in a higher group instead of “just putting them in a pot and keeping them there.”

All teachers conveyed positive feedback to parents through one or more media: formal three way interviews, the student, the teacher, a special invitation, or regular school-wide communication processes.

TB observed the reluctance of *Māori* parents to come to school because of prior experiences. The use of humour and telling jokes as encouragement to ease tension and leave their baggage behind was being trialled.

4.5.5. Chapter summary

This chapter contains findings from research participant interviews within the overarching theme of making connections. The four primary themes of connecting cultures, connecting with culture, connecting learning and extending connections are presented in four sections. The introduction sets the scene and identifies research participants. Connecting culture, by looking at commonalities between research participants, cultural presence from insider’s perspectives and *whānau* follows. Connecting with Culture through teacher cultural knowledge, support and confidence is then presented followed by Connecting Learning through teacher diversity; student reflection of learning strategies, best practice, evaluation and teacher preference; and teacher descriptors of effective learning relationships. Extending Connections by identifying student challenges of school, self-confidence and teacher views of building confidence, plus celebrating high achievement is presented in the final section.

Chapter 5: Discussion and Conclusions

5.1: Introduction

According to Hargreaves and Fink (2006), addressing educational disparities is a matter of improving learning for those currently missing out on what education has to offer and for all students “learning that matters, that lasts and that engages students intellectually, socially and emotionally” (p.3). That is learning about learning, by creating and developing lasting improvement in learning which is signified in measurable student achievement and reduced educational disparity. Until this happens, we will continue to see increased disparity and maintenance of the status quo (Hargreaves & Fink, 2006).

This chapter discusses the findings of the study, based on the research questions:

RQ1. What’s the difference? What factors contribute to the variation of achievement for Year 7 and 8 *Māori* students in high decile, full primary schools?

RQ2. How are the cultural competencies for teachers (MoE, 2011) approached, implemented and sustained in high quality learning opportunities?

The discussion is considered in three major themes: managing success, learning cultures, and finding culture through culture in relation to the research questions and the literature reviewed for this study. These sections are then followed by chapter summary, conclusions, limitations and implications of this study. The chapter concludes with suggestions for future research.

Initially, contextual indicators, personal belief and a shift in educational theory to support the research complete the introduction. The first theme, managing success, embraces *whānau*, relational trust, identifying opportunities, focus on identity and mutual respect. The second theme, learning cultures, includes learning, peer support, self-directed learners, co-construction or *ako*, challenges and teacher characteristics. The third theme, finding culture through culture, covers the position of discourse, culture for culture, perspectives of, and culturally aspirational, *te reo Māori* and culturally responsive pedagogy for whom?

5.2: Contextual Indicators

Research has shown that high quality teaching is the most important influence on high quality outcomes for diverse students (Alton-Lee, 2003; Hattie, 2003; MoE, 2009a). Secondary education research emphasises strong, respectful, culturally informed and responsive relationships that recognise the distinct learning conditions whereby *Māori* students are in control of their learning (Bishop, 2010; Bishop & Berryman, 2006; Bishop et al., 2007; Hattie, 2003; MoE, 2009a). This study is contextualised in the primary sector to explore factors contributing to *Māori* student's achievement variation. Once identified these elements are correlated with student's achievement in relation to the National Standards (MoE, 2010a) to seek components attributable to achievement variation for Year 7 and 8 students in mainstream learning.

Honouring the political intent of the Treaty of Waitangi (<http://gg.govt.nz/aboutnz/treaty.htm>), the vision of NZC (MoE, 2007), the goals of KLP (MoE, 2008), and the potential of *Ka Hikitia* (MoE, 2013; MoE, 2009a) requires classroom teachers to create learning contexts where the aspiration of culturally responsive teaching is achieved through a pedagogy of relations (Harker, 2007).

Understanding and integrating cultural identity into learning settings is most effective when it contributes directly, deliberately and appropriately to shaping teaching practices and learning experiences for specific students (Alton-Lee, 2003). Weaving culture and education requires teachers to adopt effective teaching practices and identified metaphors fundamental for appropriate pedagogy which improves student engagement and achievement (Alton-Lee, 2003; Macfarlane, 2004). *Māori* students are more likely to achieve when they are able to be *Māori* and understanding how these *Māori* cultural metaphors are distinguished in practical terms for teachers is sought through the second research question.

Why and how this investigation emerged will now follow.

5.2.1. Belief

Prior to undertaking this research, my professional and personal experiences had predicted the emergence of new evidence in the form of strategies, processes and

implementation approaches of deliberate differentiated practices that would identify positive and negative outcomes for *Māori* students in mainstream classrooms. I held an expectation that new “points of difference” would emerge as obvious reliable and valid pedagogical practice for me to lead and coach teachers in my educational context to achieve a shift for improved positive outcomes for our *Māori* students.

The achievement of *Māori* students in the three research schools does not match my predictions. One out of twelve of the students were achieving above, eight students were meeting, and three were achieving below the standards in reading, writing and mathematics. Unlike our *Māori* students, the majority of these students were meeting and achieving national expectations. My predicted hypotheses were incorrect. In contrast to our *Māori* students, most of these students were successfully achieving. I needed to investigate why and how. What were the indicators and how could I and others use these to accelerate educational outcomes for *Māori* mainstream learners? Could these findings contribute to further evidence for engagement/disengagement of Year 7 and 8 students pre-secondary school? (MoE, 2009a).

5.2.2. Discursive shift

Adopting a *Kaupapa Māori* model addresses both the concerns and limitations of the culturalist and structuralist positions as educationalists are able to critically reflect on the wider power plays that mediate *Māori* participation for beneficial achievement in mainstream (Smith, 1997) Based on the Smithfield and Progress at School Studies, Harker (2007) suggests it is futile to argue whether it is the schools or family that make the most difference. Instead, he recognises recent discursive shifts in New Zealand educational theories recommend focusing on the function of the interactions between two sets of players as explanations of achievement variation and possible solutions to educational disparity problems. This relational theory places *Māori* aspirations for self-determination in relation to others at the centre of the framework (Bishop et al, 2010). To enable emerging aspirations, an autonomous voice and successful participation in mainstream society, Bishop (1994), Durie (1998), and G. Smith (1997) call for those involved in education to reposition themselves away from places of subordination and dominance. By restructuring power relationships and positioning partners as being

autonomous and interactive, *Māori* are able to determine, define and pursue their destiny (Bishop et al., 2010). Or, as Young (2004) explains, indigenous peoples' aspirations for self-determination are relational; acknowledge interdependence and "are better understood as a quest for an institutional context of non-domination" (p.187).

Evidence from students and teachers commonalities is presented in three themes: managing success, learning cultures and finding culture through culture.

5.3: Managing Success

Ka Hikitia – Managing for Success: The Māori Education Strategy 2008-2012 (MoE, 2009a) promotes a *Māori* potential approach. *Ka Hikitia – Accelerating Success 2013-2017* (MoE, 2013) advocates building on the latest evidence and data of the previous potential approach to achieve the vision of *Māori* enjoying and achieving education success as *Māori*. Contributing factors identified from the research participant responses, actions and interactions follow.

5.3.1. Whānau

In this discussion, the term *whānau* refers to those who share a common interest or philosophy (MoE, 2009a). Contained within the family or the learning group, all research participants were tied or connected to and with each other through the social process of learning. Some students enjoyed interacting with their friends outside of the classroom; others identified personnel who were supportive and caring of their learning. These students valued a culture of care and the many, varied learning academic, cultural, sporting and leadership opportunities they were offered. Equally for teachers, the process of socialisation enabled them to make a difference to student learning. Their purpose of teaching in an environment, where students were valued, student learning was prioritised and the positive interaction between and within teachers and students engendered collegiality, creativity, choice and difference were all factors contributing to their daily presence. These associative links connecting prior knowledge, procuring knowledge from outside the classroom, and bringing these into new classroom learning supports Alton-Lee's (2006) call to connect instructional experiences to students' memory processes.

5.3.2. Relational Trust

Identified in these interconnected learning contexts is the interdependence of trust. In these environments, students and teachers discussed this interdependence and how the success of one person's efforts depends partly on the contribution of others. These connections highlighted the function of the *whānau* as a collective team with a common *kaupapa* or philosophy. The freedom from competitive colleagues was identified as an important factor for teachers offering, sharing and giving of self to and for others. Relational trust is the foundation of a *whānau* such as this and involves a willingness to be vulnerable as one has confidence that others will play their part. In these school and classroom contexts, the collective efforts of many teachers and the success of each individual depend partly on the efforts and skills of others to gain significant shifts in student achievement and well-being (Robinson et al., 2009). Behaviours and qualities that engender relational trust are respect and personal regard for others, competence in role and personal integrity.

Teachers described how and whether they differentiated their practise for *Māori* students by focusing on the individual within the collective learning group by identifying opportunities.

5.3.3. Identifying opportunities

When students entered Years 7 and 8 with good basic knowledge, the teacher was able to create a supportive environment and adopt a creative holistic approach focusing on individual needs, irrespective of ethnicity. Students knew what the task was, and the few parameters promoted independence, enabling the teacher to support and extend students as required. This approach supports the research findings of Bishop et al. (2007) who learnt from detailed interviews with over 350 *Māori* secondary students that it was the simultaneous happening of both relationship and task orientation by the teacher that engaged them in their learning and fostered their achievement. Student feedback identified the absence of either task or relationship orientation hindered learning and it was only the immediate location of both, by the teacher on a daily basis that demonstrated they cared for the learning of their students.

5.3.4. Focus on identity

Several teachers shared how their focus on the uniqueness of the students enabled them to engineer a positive shift in student self-confidence. By concentrating on getting to know the student's special qualities, the teachers found they were making a conscious effort to listen to their ideas and to use the student's interests and strengths to capitalise on the depth of each student's engagement within their generic learning context. Different teachers spoke about taking advantage of sporting strengths; intentionally exciting students with their learning context and deliberately showing students what and how these opportunities can work for them as learners to define teacher's relationships and interactions with *Māori* students (Marzano et al., 2005).

When a teacher took time to be honest and explain an opportunity for a councillor's role; the student appreciated their honesty and choose to change their behaviour and accept the responsibility of the role. The student displayed their respect and care through their reciprocal responsibility by adopting a positive work ethic in all areas of the curriculum (Bishop et al., 2012). Teachers also found by praising the students for what was going well, their colleagues also did, and in time, some members of the student peer group followed this active role-modelling. These actions changed student self-esteem, shared and built professional collegial networks and peer support through a praise pathway (Butterworth & Bevan- Brown, 2007; Macfarlane, 2000).

Teachers spoke about the need to find something that the student enjoys and using this as a platform to build them up personally so teachers could help them learn anything. By experimenting with different activities like drama and physical activities, students were offered avenues to take risks and to have a go outside of their comfort zone. Coupled with this risk-taking is building a culture of learning from one's mistakes. Strongly emphasised with developing this attitude of having a go is the reciprocal...what did we learn? ... and if we made a mistake...what did this tell us?

5.3.5. Mutual respect

In a climate of mutual respect, teachers incorporated relevant experiences into their learning by getting to know the child as an individual and allowing the

students to get to know them. One teacher said that if he had an unsettled night with his young family, he told the students why and what had happened. The students appreciated this honesty and the opportunity to get to know their teacher more and were therefore receptive to the situation. The teacher, in turn, changed their approach and management when unplanned events occurred for students. Respectful communication also helped foster mutual respect. Together with taking the time to listen to students, teachers talked about the need to communicate with students in a respectful manner. This was illustrated by asking the student first to seek clarity before jumping in and approaching from your own prediction. Extending respectful communication generates connectedness and joined with mutual respect allows students to develop their own *kaupapa* or internal control, central to their own wellbeing and self-respect (Hawk et al., 2002).

This managing success section will now be followed by the second theme, learning cultures.

5.4: Learning Cultures

Murdoch and Wilson (2005) assert that no one learns in isolation and that learning is mostly a social activity that is heavily influenced by the *whānau* or context in which it takes place. They argue that when teachers deliberately work to create a physical, social and emotional environment that actively supports learning and learners, a significant difference can be made to student achievement and wellbeing.

Learning for eleven of the twelve participating students in this investigation was gaining knowledge, as it was defined as something they did not know before in cognitive and social contexts. For some of the students, their learning was defined by the number of correct questions they could answer, on the paper and in quizzes. Students were also able to share the specifics of their learning; where and how they could use it. For just under half of the students, learning is best when it is with the teacher and the teachers makes them listen and work. These students favoured the teacher modelling and giving examples so students knew what the expectation was and then leaving them alone to get on with it. The teacher's step-by-step process scaffolds the learning, and writing it down and explaining it gave the students understanding in a meaningful context. It was not just a process in

isolation. For one of the students achieving below the standard, his teacher preference was based on the physical presence of the teacher beside him, together with the step-y -step process the teacher took to help him work from what he knew, to help him find out what he did not know. The teacher's clues and positive encouragement, saying "You can get it," makes the student feel really important and great and in this context not "one of the least effective means of raising social efficacy" as Sewell and St George, (1999) propose. That the teacher did this consistently with all students displayed fairness in a culture of care where *manaakitanga* was a dominant feature (Bishop et al., 2010). Three of the twelve students learnt best by listening and the degree of listening was determined by their own behaviour and therefore their own responsibility.

5.4.1 Peer support

Peer support was the best way one student meeting and one student below the standard preferred to learn. Particularly when the teacher was busy and they needed extra help, supportive peers could help overcome anxiousness and calm the nerves. By working through scenarios with peers, these students felt they had better understanding; their peers had time to tell them when they forgot and could help when they were struggling with certain things. For three of the students, the advantage of peer support was they used simpler language than the teacher's confusing words and could explain things easier. By working together, these students felt more confident in the *whānau* context, learning to, from and with each other, fostering co-construction, *ako* and *tuakana-teina* (Nuthall, 2007).

A quiet place with no distractions or interruptions is the best place for learning for three of the students meeting the standard. Students talked about the difference in group work where it was too easy to get distracted compared to independent work when one could focus and get more information. When the teacher supported the students with examples of writing expectation, the student could make the choice and decide to sit with the group or move away.

5.4.2 Self-directed learners

Taking responsibility for seeking help with their own learning was directed for students by the different learning contexts, subject and personal confidence. Some students asked the teacher first and then their peers if the teacher was busy.

The teacher was preferred as they probably had more knowledge and could give the student more information than fellow students; plus the teacher could be trusted more. Fellow peers do not explain it, they just explain how or what to do and with no understanding.

Two of the students achieving below the standard spoke of their lack of confidence to tell the teacher when they did not understand. One student based his decision to seek assistance on how he predicted others may respond to his request. This student's preference was to seek out a member from their *whakapapa* as their lineage directed a natural non-judgemental response to help each other. One student was too shy to ask the teacher for help or to repeat information when he could not hear and depended upon his friends to tell him. However, when he did ask the teacher, he did understand his work and completed it more quickly. His decision was also influenced by the length of time the teacher talked and his frustration with his lack of understanding was shown by irritating, disruptive behaviour. This example matches the earlier student narratives in the *Te Kotahitanga* project (Bishop & Berryman, 2006) which called for teachers to make a change in teaching and learning strategies from merely transmitting knowledge to some learners into ways of engaging and interacting with their students to form effective relationships (Bishop et al., 2010). For the third student, achieving below the standard, the teacher's persistent cliché "If you don't ask, you'll never get anywhere" consistently gave him the confidence to talk to the teacher and seek assistance.

Student responsibility, self-direction and the next steps to improve their learning was individual with some small group commonalities. The student achieving above the standard liked both easy and hard examples and their decision depended upon the activity. Students meeting the standard identified listening to retain focus and not getting distracted. An increase in correct scores in tests and regular teacher feedback were important indicators for encouragement and identifying the next learning step. To improve their reading mileage, one student spoke of the teacher's monitoring and encouragement together with their mother writing it on the whiteboard at home which reminded the student to keep reading. Five of the students (two within and five below the standard) identified asking more

questions and to keep pursuing until they understood. All felt they needed to speak up, but lacked the confidence to do this.

The three students achieving below the standard recognised their need to improve their listening and concentration and to keep trying. Overcoming shyness and hearing difficulties were two further deterrents, as was the teacher keeping their word when the child was naughty. This student spoke of teacher threats for misbehaviour but nothing changing. With a previous teacher, the teacher had maintained the guidelines and parameters and this student had learnt. Highlighted in this case is the student's struggle with the inconsistency between what the teacher said and did. When conflicts of interest arise between the teacher and the student, the moral and ethical principles of the teacher underpin their actions and their integrity is put to the test (Bryk & Schneider, 2002).

5.4.3. Co-construction

Leading learning, self-managing and self-monitoring was created for students through co-construction situations with their teacher. Negotiating learning and agreeing on the best outcomes, timeframes, goals and reflecting on goals to rationalise attainment through critical evaluation offered students choices for learning through independent, structured and individual tuition. Teachers talked about students being excited in their learning and allowing students to create and run with their ideas. This inclusiveness allowed students to enter the learning conversation feeling valued from positive feedback and praise. Teachers and students recognised the presence of trust, responsibility and respect as students decided on social interactions, communicating their understanding honestly, recognising goals and expectations within boundaries with appropriate consequences. These learning created contexts recognise reciprocal learning or *ako*, the *Māori* principle for teaching and learning. *Ako* positions the teacher as both a teacher and a learner and necessitates a repositioning of the power relations characteristic in traditional understandings of classroom teachers as the 'teacher'. In these previously described learning contexts, the teacher is not the font of all knowledge and has created contexts for learning where students can enter the learning conversation and co-construct learning outcomes. Students can participate using their own sense-making processes as together with the teacher they story and re-story their realities (Bishop, 2003). Teachers spoke of students

knowing when it is learning time and the expectation to concentrate on learning and maintaining these consistently so students were able to participate in learning environments where they were accepted, recognised and validated for themselves (Bishop & Glynn, 1999). Trust and consistent actions for behavioural consequences guaranteed students a safe environment and the known consequences applied to everyone (Macfarlane et al., 2007).

Instrumentally in co-constructing learning is the teacher's willingness to improve learning for themselves and their students. In their responses, four of the teachers spoke of their personal commitment to continue learning, to help students identify what they had learnt, could change, do differently and how they could improve by responding to feedback and reflecting on their practice. Emphasised by these teachers was the need to make students feel good about their work and up-skilling their own professional practice to strengthen their pedagogical practice. Teachers could extend a student's achievement to a higher level by showing the student positive gains, encouraging self-confidence to seek assistance and demonstrating progressive shifts on the learning continuum. One student described how being extended could sometimes be challenging; however, when she rationalises the situation and finds some success at a higher level, this feedback is enough to show her that it is achievable:

... because I get half right on Stage 8, so it gets me thinking. I should be able to get Stage 7 and I know what I'm getting into when I get to Stage 8. (SE)

5.4.4. Challenges

Nearly all of the students found elements of their learning difficult. Students shared understanding reading and writing; concentration and listening; hearing and communication; extra responsibilities, finishing first and speech making. Stepping up and being a role model as a councillor, leading Pasifika and production and trying new things and to do really well in their work was also challenging for others. Only one of the students achieving below the standard spoke of social issues.

Central to students meeting challenges and realising their potential is student self-confidence. Contributing influential elements for student self-confidence was managing self in relation to others, personal organisation, communicating, self-

perception of own identity, and risk-taking in social contexts. These elements align with the key competencies of the NZC (MoE, 2007). As successful learners, these students could make use of these competencies not only as a goal in themselves, but also as the means by which eleven of the twelve students could achieve possible careers that involved tertiary education and being contributing community members.

5.4.5. Characteristics of an effective teacher

These were described by the students as competence in their role. Essential was curriculum knowledge and confidence; knowing how to direct the student in their learning and knowing where the teacher wanted to take them was important for students. The teacher knew what was coming and from the teacher's feedback the student was able to move forward. Embedded in the teacher's portfolio was creativity when the teacher did cool things and played sports, and did not just sit and yell out instructions. Students wanted a teacher with a sense of humour, expectations and boundaries, so students knew when to work and when to have a laugh. Equally, students needed a teacher who pushed, was firm and ensured that the students understood the tasks and achieved their goals. Patience to enable students to seek answers to repeated questions and mediation skills to deal with bullies were also sought.

The following section will discuss finding culture through culture.

5.5 Finding Culture through Culture

Compounding for *Māori* students is in effective schools a climate in which *te ao Māori* with its values, traditions and practices were recognised, respected and valued (ERO, 2010). For *Māori* to succeed as *Māori*, their identity and culture are recognised as essential ingredients of success through a culturally responsive pedagogy of relations (Bishop et al., 2010; Smith, 1997; MoE, 2009a). Elbaz (1981, 1983) states that understanding what teachers see as the relationship between their learners and learning is fundamental to teacher's being agentic.

5.5.1. Position of discourse

Unlike the *Te Kotahitanga* teacher narratives (Bishop, 2003; Bishop et al., 2007; Bishop et al., 2008), the teachers in this research group were not isolated or frustrated by the attitude and actions of their students and viewed themselves from

agentic positions. Even though they drew from a variety of discourses, as individuals they positioned themselves within the teacher-student relationship in a place of action, sharing individual and collective experiences that are making a difference to academic and social learning of their *Māori* students. By shifting the power imbalance from a position of dominance to one of partnership, these teachers made sense of the experiences they have when relating to and interacting with *Māori* students. Their actions also demonstrated their commitment and conscious effort to narrow the power differentials that Bishop (2003), Bruner (1996), Macfarlane et al. (2007) and G. Smith (1997) assert are so prevalent and dominant in mainstream education.

Within these classrooms, the collective vision of addressing *Māori* student achievement is visible. The research participants did not see it as secondary or subversive; nor was it seen as preferential, but is approached equally for all students. These teachers held an expectation that their students could and would learn. Students knew their teachers believed in their ability to achieve. They could describe their learning and knew what they needed to do to improve as self-directed learners (MoE, 2007). The interactions, collaborations and interdependence power-sharing relationships formed and sustained these *whānau*-type relationships and must be recognised as having a positive impact on *Māori* students individually and collectively. In this pedagogy of relations, culture did count and students could bring who they are to the learning interaction, feeling safe, accepted and legitimate (MoE, 2013; MoE, 2009a; Bishop 2003; Bishop & Glynn, 1999).

5.5.2. Culture for culture

Tangata Whenutanga (MoE, 2011) supports *Māori* learners as learners through their cultural locatedness within their learning contexts. According to Bishop et al. (2007) culture can be described in terms of both its visible and invisible elements. The visible elements are the signs, images and iconography that are immediately recognisable as representing that culture and that theoretically create an appropriate context for learning. The invisible elements are values, morals, and problem solving processes along with the worldviews and knowledge producing processes that assist individuals and groups with meaning and sense-making.

Culturally responsive learning contexts need to allow the creation and existence of both visible and invisible elements.

5.5.3. Perspectives of culture

Teacher's felt their schools were inclusive of different cultures evidenced by the school curriculum, guidance of the *Māori* Curriculum Team, specific opportunities and the onsite *Māori* immersion unit. In contrast, student's recognition and valuing of cultural elements was mixed with no definite agreement among the student participants or positive affirmation by the total student group. These students just took the things *Māori* as a given and named the things that they could see and elements that were part of their regular programme. Some things *Māori* were identified environmental features; not knowing where or how to access things *Māori* were equally deterrents. For some students, being unable to recognise cultural learning stemmed from not knowing what their culture is. Webber (2008) refers to this individual as the hybrid person; one who is in between two distinct races and yet a part of both. The difficulty for students determining dual status is based on the inability to fit into society racial categories. If the hybrid student can be required to fill in between positions and navigate many boundaries, could this shape further marginalisation for a minority student and result in complex difficulties articulating an ethnic identity?

One student's response highlighted "fairness," as to focus on *Māori* or Samoan would be seen in their terms as being racist. Alton-Lee (2005) warns against the assumption of the normal group and other as damaging or misinterpretation of the need to constitute diversity and difference as a central practice to educational practice. These subconscious behaviours can position dominant discourses that establish ways of thinking and behaviours benefiting particular groups over others (Bishop & Glynn, 1999).

To alleviate the potential for creating further anxiety, it is critical to understand that diversity is more than difference. Diversity is closely related to identity and refers to groups of people, differences between groups of people and the individuals who make up these groups (Timperley et al., 2007). It is the individual identity of one's identity: one's origins, language, behaviours, experience, values and beliefs and it is how these differences that are perceived and valued that is the

challenge for “how we as educators engage with culture, as a preferred teaching and learning practice” (Whitinui, 2011, p.8). The challenge for all educators is trying to implement and sustain diversity in a system that advocates including diversity into a one size fits all educational system.

5.5.4. Students succeeding as Māori

Roles, responsibilities and challenging opportunities as an individual and as *Māori* framed student success. Highly prized is an invitation to participate in the holistic *Mātauranga Māori* Gifted and Talented (GATE) programme tailored to *Māori* culture, language and identity. Students eagerly sought interaction with community personnel and described programme content as validating *tikanga Māori* and themselves personally as *Māori*.

Students spoke with pride of their prestigious student councillor roles; leadership responsibilities within the school; lead production roles; and leading the *kapa haka* group at the regional concert. Students identified expected internal aspirational roles, reiterating specific personal conversations with the principal and teacher. In these conversations, expected roles, behaviour guidelines and achievement outcomes were discussed: for example...Mr P (principal) said we had to step up... and we did.

The honour of personal profiles displayed in a strategic position to celebrate academic achievement, citizenship, school virtues and sponsored principal awards held *mana* as these were inclusive of the whole student population. These students were affirmed as *Māori* enjoying educational success as *Māori* (MoE, 2009a, 2013).

5.5.5. Te Reo Māori

Central to one’s identity is the transference of knowledge. For *Māori*, *te reo Māori* is the means of accessing the uniqueness and subtleties of *te ao Māori* (Durie, 1998). Learning *te reo Māori* in research mainstream settings was not affirming most *Māori* students as *Māori*. Internal and external school personnel determined the success and approval of *te reo Māori* programmes. Students felt the delivery of *te reo Māori* by homeroom teachers was variable, sporadic, tiring and did not reaffirm their identity or respect for *Māori*. The one exception was the teacher who built on what students brought to school through *tuakana-teina* peer

tutoring and included *Māori* history in the content (MoE, 2009a). The students saw no transfer of the teacher's ethnicity in regards to their professional competence to deliver *te reo Māori* language.

Student timetabled choices between *te reo Māori* or *kapa haka* caused frustration and negativity. Students found learning a different second language irrelevant. My student's indifferent attitudes of classroom *te reo Māori* language programmes matched those found by Tito's (2011) secondary research students. In both studies, the inclusion of *te reo Māori* language to validate and reinforce cultural knowledge and *tikanga* was not reiterated through the student voice. Equally, dedicated activities within *Māori* Language Week were viewed as tokens or added extras and reinforce Bishop et al. (2010) who allude to *tikanga* or customs, and cultural iconography displayed in classrooms as insufficient evidence of cultural responsive pedagogy (Bishop & Glynn, 1999).

The experiences of *kura kaupapa Māori* education confirms that students achieve better when there is a close relationship between home and school in terms of aspirations, languages and cultures. According to Bishop (2003) and Whitinui (2011) the most powerful influence in a child's life is the home; including the wider *whānau* relations. It was important to identify the transmission of *te reo Māori* from the school environment to the home to gain an indication of the significance of the language within the family. Only one student engaged in *te reo Māori* at *kapa haka* and with a younger *kohanga reo* sibling. Limited understanding caused frustration for another student when participating in their *marae* protocol. This evidence substantiates O'Regan's (2011) fear for *te reo Māori* as an endangered language and the difference in parental participation, expectation and involvement in mainstream and *kura kaupapa Māori* education. In the *kura kaupapa Māori* structure, the student *whānau* learnt with, to and from each other, transmitting their learning from the formal educational context to the social settings of the home *whānau*. Little evidence of the home/school communication and transmission of language and cultural protocols were found in this study.

5.6: Culturally Responsive Pedagogy – for whom?

Culturally responsive teaching positions the student at the centre of learning and seeks to align the cultural practices of the home with the classroom practice (Ladson-Billing, 1995; Irvine, 2010). Bevan-Brown (2003), Bishop et al. (2010) and Irvine (2010) insist culturally responsive teaching moves beyond practices that could be interpreted as tokenism and achieves more than just making students feel good. Moving teachers to acquire a form of cultural capital has been politically prioritised by the MoE publications of *Ka Hikitia - Managing Success* (MoE, 2009a), *Ka Hikitia - Accelerating Success* (MoE, 2013), and *Tātaiako* (MoE, 2011). Investigating teachers' cultural knowledge showed that all teachers recognised common terms: *tikanga*, *iwi*, *hapu*, *whānau*, *tapu*, *kohanga reo*. Specific inquiry into the understanding and application of the terms *ako* and *mana motuhake* showed broad, mixed, indecisive and non-conclusive understanding of the terms. *Ako* was described as reciprocity; the togetherness of learner and teacher; learner and learner and learning from and with each other in the learning community they are working in. Teachers talked about their willingness and openness to capitalise on what the child brings to the learning and capturing their behaviours to get to know the child more to cater for their holistic needs.

I found teacher's cultural understanding of *Māori* learners was sparse, erratic and of concern. Teachers' own voices reiterated their need for professional learning. Most teachers cited lack of confidence and understanding of *Māori* cultural knowledge, *te reo Māori* and their uncertainty in carrying out *Māori* protocols without being offensive as obstructions to cultural responsive pedagogy. Some teachers spoke of their own initiation to develop cultural understandings as the absence of professional learning opportunities had hindered examining their own sociocultural consciousness (Villegas & Lucas, 2002) in respect to cultural responsive pedagogy (Villegas & Lucas, 2002).

5.6.1. Chapter Summary

This chapter has identified research findings, legislative documentation, the researcher's personal reasons for undertaking the research and recent shifts in educational research as contributing elements relevant to this research study. The findings of the study were then presented in the discussion through three themes: managing success, learning cultures and finding culture through culture.

Discussed in the first theme is the interconnection of people through social action to form different *whānau* within an overarching collective *whānau*. These connections demonstrated the crucial elements of relational trust, the necessity of concurrent task and relationship orientation to engage and shift student learning, valuing the uniqueness of each individual, and the benefits of developing mutual respect. Discussed in the second theme is defining learning, the different processes for students, preferential learning and assistance processes. Also discussed is the impact of self-confidence, learner responsibility, collaboration through changing teacher-learner roles, personal challenges and character traits of an effective teacher. Discussed in the third theme is finding the student's meaning and sense making (culture) through the learning culture that they participated in, shifting the power imbalance, interpreting culture within culture, whose view of culture and the potential culture offered to the students. *Te reo Māori* cultural responsive pedagogy and personal thoughts conclude this theme. The conclusions of the three discussion themes follow.

5.6.2. Conclusions

This study has sought to answer the research questions:

RQ1. What are the factors that contribute to the variation in achievement for Year 7 and 8 *Māori* students in high decile, full primary schools; and

RQ2. How are the cultural competencies for teachers (MoE, 2011) approached, implemented and sustained in high quality learning opportunities.

The following conclusions can be drawn.

Māori students expect to be successfully engaged in learning activities that are relevant and meaningful.

Māori students expect to be encouraged to take risks to achieve goals within an environment that offers support, independence and choice.

Each student is recognised as an individual with their own interests, strengths and needs participating, contributing and supporting to and from different cultures.

Each student holds their own understanding of being a learner and *Māori*, within, yet separate from differing collective influential *whānau*; family, peer and learning environments.

Whānau classroom and school culture allow students to build relationships with each other to co-exist and give every student a place to stand.

Strong respectful and responsive relationships prioritise connections in any *whānau* and determine the motivation, participation and contribution of both learner and teacher through a mutually enhancing bond, in a reciprocal relationship through communication, trust empathy and challenge (*ako*).

Relational trust between student and teacher is the lynchpin for successful learning relationships.

These relationships allow teachers to promote culturally generated sense making processes and accept the knowledge, learning styles and sense-making of the participants as acceptable or legitimate (MoE, 2011, 2009a; Bishop & Glynn, 1999).

An effective teacher displays the following pedagogical strategies which reflect relational trust:

interpersonal respect;

personal regard for others;

competence in their role; and

personal integrity.

These attributes communicated to the students the degree of the teacher's trustworthiness and their competence for the role of leading learning (Robinson et al. 2009).

Teachers displayed an ETP (Bishop, 2010; Bishop et al., 2003; 2007) by: caring for their students as *Māori*;

holding high expectations for student performance;

managing their classrooms competently to promote learning;

using a range of discursive learning interactions with students - *ako*;

having knowledge of a range of strategies to facilitate learning interactions; and

reflecting on their practice to judge the impact of their teaching on student outcomes.

5.6.3. Limitations

One limitation was the researcher's novice experience in *kura kaupapa Māori* research protocols. I found it extremely difficult to extend teacher research participants responses when seeking their understanding of the terms *ako* and *mana motuhake* through my own limited understanding of the terms and my own inability to respond safely, yet still seeking further interpretation to gain knowledge and understanding.

Undertaking an interview with one of the teacher participants, I felt very much an outsider in a space that was fraught with uncertainty. In this particular situation, I did not feel I was in a position of co-joint construction or able to merge the storying of participant and researcher to create new stories through my inability to make connections between one world and the other (Bishop, 1997; Bishop & Glynn, 1999).

Each student's overall achievement was ascertained by taking the most common level of their national standards (MoE, 2010a) achievement in maths, reading and writing. The decision to take this approach, together with the natural subjectivity of the teacher's OTJs, questions the reliability and validity of whose judgement is legitimate and on whose criteria or terms the students are being assessed.

If the number of New Zealand *Māori*, personnel in mainstream is 5,140, compared to NZ European of 39,073 of the total 53, 238, the questions emerge of what constitutes learning, and the type of interactions that take place within schools and classrooms and on whose terms.

Research participants are only a snapshot in time and the findings are limited to one interview. Events may have been presented as they occur but there is an inability to gain a full understanding of the student's thinking at that point in time from narratives only. Therefore, the findings are not generalizable but may be transferable to other contexts.

Parents declining the opportunity for their child to participate in this research project may indicate that the historical mistrust of *Māori* of past colonizing research could still be prevalent.

Voluntary participation of students may exclude those students who are *Māori* but did not want to identify as *Māori*.

There was a limited response to initial participation from potential participating schools. Principals stated work load, pressure on teacher and teacher's own teaching philosophy as reasons for declining the opportunity.

Limited teacher and student participants affect validity of research. Teacher participant responses may be inaccurate, based on perception and not actuality of practice and may have only captured those people who are already operating a culturally inclusive learning environment.

Time constraints limited to one interview lessens validity of data and the availability of personnel to participate in the research may be restricted by time.

5.6.4. Implications of study

The number of *non-Māori* teachers in mainstream education would suggest that for teachers to gain confidence in *te reo Māori*, and integrate clear and practical methods to incorporate *te reo Māori* in their classrooms, curriculum areas and within their practices, opportunities to learn *te reo Māori* must be made available. Therefore, each school's policies, documentation and overall commitment must reflect their commitment to learning and including *te reo Māori* as part of their common culture (Tito, 2011). As indicative support, student response would suggest that if this aspirational outcome is going to be achieved, strategic action, regular self-review and student monitoring at each delivery site of the *te reo Māori* programmes will be an integral element for self-review.

5.6.5. Areas for future research

- How effective has the *Māori* Education Strategy 2013-2017 (MoE, 2013) been in creating improved *Māori* student outcomes in mainstream?
- How are primary principals leading and supporting their teachers to ensure educational success for *Māori* learners?
- What does a confident competent teacher of *te reo Māori* look like for the twenty-first century learner?

What constitutes successful schooling for Māori students in mainstream education must continue to be explored and debated. This study has reveal that when teachers place themselves in an agentic position; adopt a professional commitment and willingness to engage in effective relations, interactions and reciprocal practices to support *Māori* learners, high levels of relational trust and expectations prevail through mutual respect and interdependence to attain successful educational outcomes.

Further teacher professional learning is essential to enlighten and deepen teachers' understanding of culturally responsive pedagogy to enable *Māori* learners to reach their potential to participate and contribute in their world of choice.

More not less is needed to connect Māori learners to educational success. As educators, we need to keep learning and moving forward by listening to the voices of our Māori learners to ensure we stay on the right path.

References

- Alton-Lee, A. (2003). *Quality teaching for diverse students in schooling: Best evidence synthesis iteration*. Wellington, New Zealand: Ministry of Education.
- Alton-Lee, A. (2005). Quality Teaching for Diverse Learners: How an evidence based approach can help. Key note address to the ACSA (Australian Curriculum Studies Association) forum *Quality Teachers: Quality Teaching- Creating a New Agenda for Action by Practitioner's, Researchers and Policy Makers*. Melbourne, VIC, Australia.
- Alton-Lee, A. (2006). How teaching influences learning: Implications for educational researchers, teachers, teacher educators and policy makers. *Teaching & Teacher Education: An International Journal of Research and Studies*, 22(5), 612-626. Retrieved from <http://ezproxy.waikato.ac.nz/login?url=http://search.proquest.com/docview/62107705?accountid=17287>
- Alton-Lee, A. (2008). Making a bigger difference for diverse learners: The Iterative Best Evidence Synthesis Programme in New Zealand. In G. Wan (Ed.), *The education of diverse student populations: A global perspective* (pp. 253-271). Athens, OH: Springer.
- Barnes, M. (2010). *The oral transmission of Mātauranga Māori in regard to traditional Hokianga stories and the revitalisation of significant place names* (Master's thesis, the University of Waikato, Hamilton, New Zealand). Retrieved from <http://hdl.handle.net/10289/2241>
- Bevan-Brown, J. (2003). *The cultural self-review: Providing culturally effective inclusive, education for Māori learners*. Wellington, New Zealand: NZCER.
- Bishop, R. (1994). Initiating empowering research. *New Zealand Journal of Educational Studies*, 29(2), 175-188. Retrieved from <http://psycnet.apa.org/psycinfo/1995-27100-001>
- Bishop, R. (1996). *Collaborative research stories: Whakawhānaungatanga*. Palmerston North, New Zealand: Dunmore.
- Bishop, R. (1997). Interviewing as collaborative storying, *Education Research and Perspectives*, 24(1), 28-47. http://scholar.google.co.nz/scholar?q=interviewing+as+collaborative+storying&btnG=&hl=en&as_sdt=0%2C5#

- Bishop, R. (1998). Freeing ourselves from neo-colonial domination in research: A Māori approach to creating knowledge. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, 11(2), 199- 219.
doi:10.1080/095183998236674
- Bishop, R. (1999). *Kaupapa Māori* research: An indigenous approach to creating knowledge. In N. Robertson, (Ed). *Māori and psychology: Research and practice*. (pp.1-6). Hamilton, New Zealand: Māori and Psychology Research Unit, University of Waikato.
- Bishop, R. (2003). Changing power relations in education. *Kaupapa* message for 'mainstream' education in Aotearoa/ New Zealand. *Comparative Education*, 39 (2), 221-238. doi:10.1080/0305006032000082443
- Bishop, R., (2008). *Te Kotahitanga: Kaupapa Māori* in mainstream classrooms. In N.K. Denzin, Y.S. Lincoln, & L.T. Smith (Eds), *Handbook of critical and indigenous methodologies* (pp. 439-458). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Bishop, R. (2010). Effective teaching for indigenous and minoritized students. *Procedia Social and Behavioural Services* 7(C), 57-62.
doi: 10.1016/j.sbspro.2010.10.009
- Bishop, R., & Berryman, M. (2006). *Culture speaks: Cultural relationships and classroom learning*. Wellington, New Zealand: Huia Press.
- Bishop, R., & Berryman, M. (2009) The *Te Kotahitanga* Effective Teaching Profile. *Set: Research Information for Teachers*, 2, 27-33.
- Bishop, R., & Berryman, M. (2010). *Te Kotahitanga: Culturally responsive professional development for teachers*. *Teacher Development*, 14(2), 173-187. doi:10.1080/13664530.2010.494497
- Bishop, R., Berryman, M., Cavanagh, T., & Teddy, L. (2007). *Te Kotahitanga Phase 3 Whānaungatanga: Establishing a culturally responsive pedagogy of relations in mainstream secondary school classrooms*. Wellington, New Zealand: Ministry of Education.
- Bishop, R., Berryman, M., Cavanagh, T., Teddy, L., Clapham, S., Lamont, R., & Jaram, D. (2008). *Te Kotahitanga: Towards sustainability and replicability in 2006 and 2007*. Wellington, New Zealand: Ministry of Education.
- Bishop, R., Berryman, M., Cavanagh, T., & Teddy, L. (2009). *Te Kotahitanga: Addressing educational disparities facing Māori students in New Zealand*. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 25(5), 734-742.
doi:10.1016/j.tate.2009.01.009

- Bishop, R., Berryman, M., Tiakiwai, S., & Richardson, C. (2003). *Te Kotahitanga: The experiences of Year 9 & 10 Māori students in mainstream classrooms. Final Report to the Ministry of Education*. Wellington, New Zealand: Ministry of Education.
- Bishop, R., Berryman, M., Wearmouth, J., Peter, M., & Clapham, S. (2012). Professional development, changes in teacher practice and improvements in indigenous students' educational performance: A case study from New Zealand. *Teaching and Teacher Education* 28, 694-705.
doi: 10.1016/j.tate.2012.02.02
- Bishop, R., & Glynn, T. (1999). *Culture counts: Changing power relations in education*. Palmerston North, New Zealand: Dunmore Press.
- Bishop, R., O'Sullivan, D., & Berryman, M. (2010). *Scaling up education reform*. Wellington, New Zealand: New Zealand Council for Educational Press.
- Boyd, S. (2008). An interview with Mere Berryman. *Set: Research Information for Teachers*, 3, 2-3.
- Braun, V. & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 3, 77-101.
doi.org/10.1191/1478088706qp063oa
- Bruner, J. (1996). *The culture of education*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University.
- Bryk, A., & Schneider, B. (2002). *Trust in schools. A core resource for improvement*. New York, NY: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Butterworth, V., & Bevan-Brown, J. (2007). Praising Māori children: Getting it right. *Set: Research Information for Teachers*, 1, 36-41.
- Caccioppoli, P., & Cullen, R. (2006). *Māori education*. Auckland, New Zealand: Kotahi Media.
- Carpenter, V.M., & McMurchy-Pilkington, C. (2008). Cross-cultural researching: Māori and Pākehā in *Te Whakapakari*. *Qualitative Research*, 8(2), 179-196. doi: 10.1177/1468794107087480
- Clandinin, F., & Connelly, M. (2000). *Narrative inquiry: Experience and story in qualitative research*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Cochran, P.A.L., Marshall, C.A., Garcia-Downing, C., Kendall, E., Cook, D., McCubbin, L., & Gover R.S. (2008). Indigenous ways of knowing: Implications for participatory research and community. *American Journal of Public Health*, 98(1) 22-27.
- Cowley, E.T., Dabb, H., & Jones, B. (2000). The academic experience of Pasifika students in the New Zealand Diploma of Business Economic environment 120. Auckland, New Zealand: Auckland University of Technology.

- Cram, F. (2001). *Rangahau Māori: Tēna tika, tēna pono* - the validity and integrity of Māori research. In M. Tolich, (Ed.). *Research ethics in Aotearoa New Zealand: Concepts, practice, critique*. (pp. 35-52). Auckland, New Zealand: Pearson Education.
- Cresswell, J. (2005). *Educational research: Planning, conducting and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research* (2nd ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Education.
- Cresswell, J. (2008). *Educational research: Planning, conducting and evaluating qualitative and quantitative research* (3rd ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson/ Merrill Prentice Hall.
- Crotty, M. (1998). *The foundations of social research: Meaning and perspective in the research process*. Chicago, IL: Sage.
- Davies, B., & Harre, R. (1990). Positioning: The discursive production of selves. *Journal of the Theory of Social Behaviour*, 20(1), 43-63.
doi:10.1111/j.1468-5914.1990.tb00174.x/abstract
- Denzin, N.K. & Lincoln, Y.S., (Eds.). (1994). *Handbook of qualitative research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Denzin, N.K., Lincoln, Y.S., (Eds.). (2005). *The Sage handbook of qualitative research* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Denzin, N.K., Lincoln, Y.S., & Smith, L. T. (Eds.). (2008). *Handbook of critical and indigenous methodologies*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Durie, M. (1995). Principles for the development of Māori policy. Paper presented at the *Māori Policy development AIC conference, Wellington, New Zealand*.
- Durie, M. (1998). Te mana, te kawanatanga: *The politics of Māori self-determination*. Auckland, New Zealand: Oxford University Press.
- Eder, D., & Fingerson, L. (2001). Interviewing children and adolescents. In J.F. Gubrium & J.A. Holstein (Eds), *Handbook of interview research* (pp.181-202). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Education and Science Committee. (2008). *Inquiry into making the school system work for every child. (1.2A)*. Retrieved from http://www.parliament.nz/en-NZ/SC/Reports7/f/3/48DBSCH_SCR3979_1-Inquiry-into-making-the-school-system-for.htm.
- ERO (Education Review Office). (2010). *Promoting success for Māori students: Schools' progress*. Wellington, New Zealand: Author.

- ERO (Education Review Office). (2013). *Accelerating the progress of priority learners in primary schools*. Wellington, New Zealand: Author.
- Eketone, A. (2008). Theoretical underpinnings of *Kaupapa Māori* directed practice. *MAI Review*, 1, 1-11. Retrieved from www.review.mai.ac.nz
- Elbaz, F. (1981). The teachers' 'practical knowledge': Report of a case study. *Curriculum Inquiry*, 11, 43-47. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1179510>
- Elbaz, F. (1983). *Teacher thinking: A study of practical knowledge*. New York, NY: Nicholas.
- Fielding, M. (2004). Transformative approaches to student voice: Theoretical underpinnings, recalcitrant realities. *British Educational Research Journal*, 30(2), 295-311. Retrieved from <http://ezproxy.waikato.ac.nz/login?url=http://search.proquest.com/docview/62119564?accountid=17287>
- Freire, P. (1996). *Pedagogy of the oppressed* (reviewed ed.). London, England: Penguin Books.
- Gay, G. (2002). Preparing for culturally responsive teaching. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 53(2), 106-116. http://mrc.spps.org/uploads/preparing_for_crt_geneva_gay-2.pdf
- Gibbs, M. (2001). Toward a strategy for undertaking cross-cultural collaborative research. *Society and Natural Resources*, 14(8), 673-687. doi:10.1080/08941920120547
- Glover, M. (2002). *A literature review and commentary on the use of Kaupapa Māori approach with a doctoral study of Māori smoking cessation*. Auckland, New Zealand: University of Auckland.
- Bishop, R. & Glynn, T. (1992). *He kanohi kitea: Conducting and evaluating educational research*. *New Zealand Journal of Educational Studies*, 27(2), 125-135. Retrieved from <http://psycnet.apa.org/psycinfo/1993-39144-001>
- Guba, E.G., & Lincoln, Y.S. (1994). Competing paradigms in qualitative research. In K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds), *Handbook of qualitative research* (pp.105-117). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Harker, R. (1995). Further comment on "Do schools matter?" *New Zealand Journal of Educational Studies*, 30(1), 73-76.
- Harker, R. (2007). *Ethnicity and school achievement in New Zealand: Some data to supplement the Biddulph, Biddulph & Biddulph. (2003) Best Evidence Synthesis: Secondary analysis of the progress at School and Smithfield datasets for the iterative Best Evidence Synthesis Programme*. Wellington, New Zealand: Ministry of Education.

- Hattie, J. (2003). New Zealand education snapshot: With specific reference to the years 1-13. Paper presented at the *Knowledge Wave, 2003: The leadership forum, Auckland, New Zealand*.
- Hargreaves, A., & Fink, D. (2006). *Sustainable leadership*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Hawk, K., Tumana Cowley, E., Hill, J., & Sutherland, S. (2002) *Set: Research information for teacher, 3*, 44-49.
- Hill, J. & Hawk, K. (2000). *Making a difference in the classroom: effective practice in low decile multicultural schools*. Wellington, New Zealand: Ministry of Education.
- Hirsh, W. (Ed.). (1990). *A report on issues and factors relating to Māori achievement in the education system*. The Ministry
- Hudson, M. (2009). Think globally, act locally: Collective consent and the ethics of knowledge production. *International Social Science Journal, 60*(195), 125-133. doi: 10.1111/j. 1468-2451.2009.01706.x
- Hudson, M.L., & Russell, K. (2009). The Treaty of Waitangi and research ethics in Aotearoa. *Bioethical Inquiry, 6*, 61-68. doi:10.1007/s11673-008-9127-0
- Hunn, J. (1960). *Report on the department of Māori affairs*. Wellington, New Zealand: Government Print.
- Irvine, J. J. (2010). Culturally relevant pedagogy. *Education digest: Essential readings condensed for quick review, 75*(8), 57-61. Retrieved from
- Kennedy, V., & Cram, F. (2010). Ethics of researching with *whānau* collectives. *Mai Review, 3*, 1-8. Retrieved from www.review.mai.ac.nz
- King, M. (2003). *The Penguin history of New Zealand*. Auckland, New Zealand: Penguin.
- King, N., & Horrocks, C. (2010). *Interviews in qualitative research*. London, England: Sage.
- Ladson-Billings, G. (1995). Toward a theory of culturally relevant pedagogy. *American Educational Research Journal, 32*(3), 465-491.
- Litchman, M. (Ed.). (2011). *Understanding and evaluating qualitative educational research*. Los Angeles, CA: Sage.
- Macfarlane, A. (2000). Listening to Culture: *Māori* principles and practices applied to support classroom management. *Set: Research Information for Teachers, 2*, 23-30.

- Macfarlane, A. (2004). *Ka hiwa ra: Listen to culture: Māori students' plea to educators*. Wellington, New Zealand: New Zealand Council for Educational Research.
- Macfarlane, A., Glynn, T., Cavanagh, T., & Bateman, S. (2007). Creating culturally –safe schools for Māori students. *The Australian Journal of Indigenous Education*, 36, 65-76.
- Marzano, R. J., Waters, T., & McNulty, B.A. (2005). *School leadership that works: From research to results*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- McNae, R., & Strachan, J. (2010). Researching in cross cultural contexts: A socially just process. *Waikato Journal of Education*, 15(2), 41-54.
- Mead, L.T.R. (1996). *Ngā aho o te kākahu māturanga: The multiple layers of struggle by Māori in education*. Unpublished PhD thesis, University of Auckland, Auckland.
- MoE (Ministry of Education). (2002). *Learning Languages: A guide for New Zealand schools*. Wellington, New Zealand: Learning Media.
- MoE (Ministry of Education). (2007). *The New Zealand curriculum: For English–medium teaching and learning in Years 1-13*. Wellington, New Zealand: Learning Media.
- MoE (Ministry of Education). (2008). *Kiwi leadership for principals. Principals as educational leaders*. Wellington, New Zealand: Author.
- MoE (Ministry of Education). (2009a). *Ka Hikitia- Managing for success: The Māori education strategy 2008-2012: Updated 2009*. Wellington, New Zealand: Author.
- MoE (Ministry of Education). (2009b). *Te Aho Arataki Marau mō te Ako I Te Reo Māori – Kura Auraki: Curriculum guidelines for teaching and learning te reo Māori in English–medium schools: Years 1-13*. Wellington, New Zealand: Author.
- MoE (Ministry of Education). (2010mMoe). *National standards*. Retrieved from <http://nzcurriculum.tki.org.nz/nationalstandards>
- MoE (Ministry of Education). (2010b) *PISA 2009*. Retrieved from http://www.educationcounts.govt.nz/topics/research/pisa_research/pisa_2009
- MoE (Ministry of Education). (2011). *Tāitako: Cultural competencies for teachers of Māori learners*. Wellington, New Zealand: Author.
- MoE (Ministry of Education). (2013). *Ka Hikitia – Accelerating success: The Māori education strategy 2013-2017*. Wellington, New Zealand: Author.

- Munford, R., & Walsh- Tapiata, W. (2001). *Strategies for change: Community development in Aotearoa/ New Zealand* (3rd ed.). Palmerston North, New Zealand: School of Social Policy and Social Work.
- Murdoch, K., & Wilson, J. (2005). *How to succeed with creating a learning community*. Victoria, Australia: Curriculum Corporation.
- Mutch, C. (2005). *Doing educational research: A practitioner's guide to getting started*. Wellington, New Zealand: New Zealand Council for Educational Research Press.
- Nash, R. (2001). Models of *Māori* educational attainment: Beyond the 'class' and 'ethnicity' debate. *Waikato Journal of Education*, 7, 23-36.
- Nuthall, G. (2007). *The hidden lives of learners*. Wellington, New Zealand: New Zealand Council for Educational Research.
- Orange, C. (2011). *The Treaty of Waitangi*. Wellington, New Zealand: Bridget Williams Books
- O'Regan, H. (2011). "I've Lost My Voice"- A look at the role of *Māori* language competency and accessibility in the lives of our *tamariki* in compulsory education. In Whitinui, P. (Ed.), *Kia tangi te tūi. Permission to speak: Successful schooling for Māori students in the 21st Century* (pp.146-160). Wellington, New Zealand: New Zealand Council for Educational Research Press.
- Panofsky, C. P. (2000). Examining the research narrative in early literacy; the case of parent child book reading activity. In M.A. Gallego, & S. Hollingsworth (Eds). (2000). *What counts as literacy: Challenging the school standard* (pp. 190-212). New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
- Pihama, L., Cram, F., & Walker, S. (2002). Creating methodological space: A literature review of *kaupapa Māori* research. *Canadian Journal of Native Education*, 26(1), 30-43.
- Powick, K. (2003) *Māori research ethics: A Literature review of ethical issues and implications of Kaupapa Māori research and research involving Māori researchers, supervisors and ethics committees*. Hamilton, NZ: Wilf Malcolm Institute of Educational Research, School of Education, University of Waikato.
- Punch, K.F. (2009). *Introduction to research methods in education*. London, England: Sage.
- Richards, H.V., & Brown, A.F., & Forde, T.B. (2007). Addressing diversity in schools: Culturally responsive pedagogy. *Teaching Exceptional Children*, 39(3), 64-68.

- Roa, R.K. (2004). *How teachers develop effective learning relationships with Māori students in the classroom* (Unpublished master's thesis). Hamilton, New Zealand: University of Waikato.
- Robinson, V., Hohepa, M., & Lloyd, C. (2009). *School leadership and student outcomes: Identifying what works and Why: Best Evidence Synthesis Iteration (BES)*. Wellington, New Zealand: Ministry of Education.
- Robinson, V., & Lai, M.K. (2006). *Practitioner research for educators*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- Robinson, C., & Taylor, C. (2007). Theorizing student voice: Values and perspectives. *Improving Schools*, 10(1), 5-17.
- Ryan, F., & Coughlan, M., & Cronin, P. (2009). Interviewing in qualitative research: The one-to-one interview. *International Journal of Theory and Rehabilitation*, 16(1), 9-15.
- Sexton, S.S. (2011). Transformative praxis in teacher practice: One tauria finds her place in education. *British Association for International and Comparative Education* 41(1), 59-74. doi:10.1080/03057925.2010.517662
- Sewell, A., & George, A. (1999). "I'll have a go at that": Developing efficacy beliefs in the classroom. Paper presented at the *AARE/NZARE conference, Melbourne, Australia*.
- Scott, D., & Usher, R. (2011). *Researching education; Data, methods and theory in educational enquiry* (2nd ed.). London, England: Continuum International.
- Shields, C., Bishop, R., & Mazawi, A.E. (2005). *Pathologizing practices: The impact of deficit thinking on education*. New York, NY: Peter Lang.
- Smith, G. (1992). *Tane-nui-a rangi's legacy...propping up the sky: Kaupapa Māori as resistance and intervention*. Paper presented at the *Aotearoa/New Zealand Association for Research in Education/Australia Association for Research in Education Joint Conference*, Deakin University, Australia.
- Smith, G. (1997). *Kaupapa Māori as transformative praxis*. Unpublished thesis, Auckland, New Zealand: University of Auckland,
- Smith, L.T. (1999). *Decolonizing methodologies: Research and indigenous people*. Dunedin, New Zealand: University of Otago Press.
- Smith, L.T. (2005). On tricky ground: Researching the native in an age of uncertainty. In N. Denzin & Y. Lincoln (Eds). *The Sage handbook of qualitative research* (3rd ed.) (pp. 85-107). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

- Spoonley, P. (1999). The challenge of cross-cultural research. In C Davison & M. Tolich (Eds.), *Social science research in New Zealand: Many paths to understanding* (pp. 51-61). Auckland, New Zealand: Longman.
- Telford, M. & May, S. (2010). *PISA 2009: Our 21st century learners at 15*. Retrieved from Ministry of Education, website: <http://www.educationcounts.govt.nz/publications/series/2543/pisa-2009our21stcenturylearnersat15>
- Thompson, R. (1961). The Hunn report. *New Zealand Quarterly Review*, 8, 8-10.
- Timperley, H., Wilson, A., Barrar, H., & Fung, I. (2007). *Teacher professional learning and development: Best evidence synthesis iteration..* Wellington, New Zealand: Ministry of Education.
- Tito, J. (2011). The use of *te reo* in mainstream secondary schools: Issues, ideas and implications. In P. Whitinui (Ed.), *Kia tangi te tīti. Permission to speak: Successful schooling for Māori students in the 21st Century: issues, challenges and alternatives* (pp.146-160). Wellington, New Zealand: The New Zealand Council for Educational Research Press.
- Tolich, M. (2002). Pākehā paralysis: Cultural safety for those researching the general population of Aotearoa. *Social Policy Journal of New Zealand*, 19, (164-178). Retrieved from <http://www.msd.govt.nz/documents/about-msd-and-our-work/publications-resources/journals-and-magazines/social-policy-journal/spj19/19-pages-164-178.pdf>
- Valencia, R. R. (Ed.). (1997). *Evolution of deficit thinking: Educational thought and practice*. London, England: Falmer.
- Villegas, A. M., & Lucas, T. (2002). *Educating culturally responsive teachers: A coherent approach*. New York, NY: State University of New York.
- Walker, S., Eketone, A., & Gibbs, A. (2006). An exploration of *Kaupapa Māori* research: Its principles, processes and applications. *International Journal of Social Research Methodology*, 9(4), 331-334. doi:10.1080/136455570600916049
- Watson, S., Hughes, D., & Lauder, H. (2003). “Success” and “Failure” in the education marketplace: an example from New Zealand. *Journal of Education Change*, 4(1), 1-24. doi:10.1023/A: 1023040119945
- Webber, M. (2008). *Walking the space between: Identity and Māori/Pākehā*. Wellington, New Zealand. The New Zealand Council for Educational Research Press.
- Whitinui, P. (Ed.).(2011).*Kia tangi te titi: Permission to speak: Successful schooling for Māori students in the 21st century: Issues, challenges and alternatives*. Wellington, New Zealand: New Zealand Council for Educational Research.

- Williams, L.R.T., & Ormond, A. (2010). What is research? *MAI Review*, 3, *Research development workshop 1*, 1-6. Retrieved from <http://www.review/mai.ac.nz>
- Wilson, K. (2002). The Treaty of Waitangi; Preparing beginning teachers to meet the expectations of the new professional standards. *Waikato Journal of Education* 8, 27-42. Retrieved from <http://edlinked.soe.waikato.ac.nz/research/journal/view.php?article=true&id=210&p=8>
- Yates, B., & Issacs, P. (2000, July). Strategies for treaty implementation. Paper presented to the *Treaty Conference, Auckland, New Zealand*.
- Young, I.M. (2004). Two concepts of self-determination. In S. May, T. Mahood, & J. Squires (Eds.), *Ethnicity, nationalism, and minority rights* (pp.176-192). Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.

Appendices

Appendix A

Name of School

Physical Address

Date

Dear Principal ofSchool

Thank you for agreeing to meet with me on (date) at (time).

I am a Masters in Educational Leadership student, of the Waikato University of Education seeking initial permission to undertake a research project involving your Year 7 & 8 *Māori* students and their teachers.

The purpose and process of the research project and ethical details are outlined in the following:

- research information sheet and student information sheet
- consent forms for parents/caregivers of students, students, teachers and principal
- interview questions for students and teachers

Previously there has been research conducted through the *Te Kotahitanga* programme in secondary schools and further research in low decile primary schools. This is an opportunity to conduct research in semi-rural full primary schools by exploring the uniqueness of each participating school and the collective elements we identify together to support our teachers and students of *Māori* ethnicity. Participation in this research project will give you an opportunity for self-review by gathering student and teacher voice through cultural consultation.

I am more than happy to meet with parents, students and teacher's following my meeting with you. Please contact me if you have any further question or queries. I look forward to discussing this project further with you in person.

Yours sincerely

SJ McLocklan

Sue McLocklan

principal@ohaupo.school.nz

Home ph: 078278309

Mobile ph: 027 586137

Supervisors: Senior Lecturer: Mr Anthony Fisher Lecturer: Ms. Vanessa Paki

(07) 83834466 ext.7836

afish@waikato.ac.nz

(07) 8384466 ext.7704

paki@waikato.ac.nz

Appendix B

Research Project Information Sheet

Date

A warm greeting to you.

You are being invited to participate in a research project. Before you decide whether or not to take part, it is important for you to understand why the research is being done and what it will involve. Please take time to read the following information carefully.

You are being invited to participate in a research project conducted by Mrs Sue McLocklan a Master of Educational Leadership student enrolled in the Faculty of Education at the University of Waikato. This research study is made possible as a result of the Ministry of Education Study Award and the support of my Board of Trustees.

As principal of a full primary school, I am interested in visiting other full primary schools to try and identify the factors that consistently contribute to the variation of Māori student achievement in high decile schools for Year 7 & 8 students. The research project will involve interviewing teachers and students from 8 schools who either identify themselves as Māori or are teachers of these students. The data collected in the interview will look at common factors, themes or issues and prepare a thesis by analysing and collating details and findings from these interviews.

You were selected as a participant because your school met the following criteria:

- 10%-20% of Māori students in Years 7 & 8
- high decile full primary school.

Your principal in consultation with the Board of Trustees has given permission for me to conduct this research in your school and he/she has assured me that your decision to participate will not impact on your future role in this school.

It is up to you to decide whether or not to take part. If you decide to take part you will be given a copy of this information sheet to keep and be asked to sign a

consent form. As a participant you are free to withdraw from the study at any time and your data may be withdrawn up until you have signed your transcript, but not after analysis. You can withdraw without giving any reason, in a communication form of your choice.

If you decide to take part, you will be asked to participate in one structured interview, which could take up to one and a half hours to complete. The interview will be recorded. During the interview you will be asked about learning experiences; who, what, why and how. Your aspirations and goals, self-confidence and relationship with others in your learning environment will also be included. You can choose to decline any or all, questions during the interview.

Once you have completed the interview, you will be provided with a transcript (written record) of the interview to check and sign as a true record of the interview. You can withdraw permission to use the information from the interview up to the signing of the transcript, but not after analysis.

The information that you provide during the interview will be analysed and used to write a research thesis to be submitted for a Master of Educational Leadership at the University of Waikato. One of the requirements at the University of Waikato is that a digital copy of the Master's thesis must be lodged permanently at the University's digital repository: Research Commons, and therefore, will be accessible for the public to read. It is also possible that this research study may be adapted and used for publications in academic journal or used as the basis for a presentation after the thesis is completed.

Any information that is obtained in connection with this study and that can be used to identify you will remain confidential and will only be disclosed with your permission, or as required by law. Data identifying you personally will be destroyed at the conclusion of the research project. Pseudonyms will be used to protect your identity in the analysis of the interview data. Interview transcripts and data generated as a result of the research project will be conducted in accordance with the University of Waikato's *Ethical Conduct in Human Research and Related Activities Regulations 2008*.

This research project has been reviewed and approved by the University of Waikato's Human Research Committee of the Faculty of Education. Any questions about the research project or the ethical conduct of the interview can be made to my supervisors using the contact details below.

Thank you for taking the time to read this information sheet.

S.J. McLocklan

Mrs Sue McLocklan

Researcher 078278309 or principal@ohaupo.school.nz

Supervisors:

Senior Lecturer: Mr Anthony Fisher

(07) 83834466 ext. 7836

afish@waikato.ac.nz

Lecturer: Ms Vanessa Paki

(07) 83844466 ext. 7704

paki@waikato.ac.nz

Appendix C

Student Information Sheet

Date

Hi

You are invited to participate in a taped interview for a research project to find out what influences Māori students the most with their learning in Year 7 & 8. The research is conducted by Mrs Sue McLocklan.

- Your participation is voluntary.
- No one will find out who you are.
- Nobody else will find out what you have written.
- Your parents/caregivers and principal have said it is ok for you to participate.
- If you don't feel happy, you can get out of this at any time.
- Once your answers to the questions have been collected and your information has been looked at, the information becomes the property of the researcher.

I am available to answer any questions you may have, or discuss anything you are not sure about.

Thank you for your time and consideration of this research project. If you wish to participate please sign the student consent form and return to the researcher.

S. J. McLocklan

Mrs Sue McLocklan

Researcher

ph: 07 8278309

mobile: 0277586137

Appendix D

Principal's Consent Form

You are deciding whether or not to allow your students and staff to participate in the research project stated below. Your signature indicates that you have decided to allow their participation having read the information provided on the information sheet.

Research Title: To identify the factors that contributes to the variation of achievement for Year 7 & 8 Māori students in full primary high decile schools

Researcher: Mrs Sue McLocklan, Masters of Educational Leadership
Postgraduate Student, University of Waikato.

- I confirm that I have read and understand the information sheet for the above study and have had the opportunity to ask questions.

YES / NO

- I agree that invited personnel from this school may choose to participate in this research project outlined in the information sheet

YES / NO

- I agree that no current or potential harm should be brought to personnel from their participation in this research project.

YES / NO

- I agree that participants may withdraw from the study at any time and their data may be withdrawn up until they approved their transcript, but not after their analysis.

YES / NO

- I agree to the audio-recording of interviews

YES / NO

- I agree to the anonymity of this school in all written communications and publications

YES / NO

- I agree to access of data gathered in this study (after it has been anonymised) in a secure manner (password protected computer) and it may be used for future research

YES / NO

- I agree that data gathered in this study, or parts thereof, may be used for future publications and/or presentations

YES / NO

- I wish to receive an electronic copy of the research thesis once it is completed.

YES / NO

Principal _____ **Date** _____ **Signature** _____

Researcher _____ **Date** _____ **Signature** _____

Appendix E

Parent or Caregiver Student Consent Form

You are making a decision whether or not to participate in the research project stated below. Your signature indicates that you have decided to participate, having read the information provided on the information sheet.

Title: To identify the factors that contributes to the variation of achievement for Year 7 & 8 Māori students in full primary high decile schools.

Researcher: Mrs Sue McLocklan, Masters of Educational Leadership Postgraduate Student, University of Waikato.

- I confirm that I have read and understand the information sheet for the above study and have had the opportunity to ask questions.

YES / NO

- I understand that my child's participation is voluntary

YES / NO

- I understand my child is free to withdraw at any time, and their data may be withdrawn up until they have approved and signed their transcript, but not after analysis.

YES / NO

- I agree to my child taking part in the research project outlined in the information sheet.

YES / NO

I agree to my child's interview being audio-recorded.

YES / NO

- I agree to the use of anonymised quotes in publications.

YES / NO

- I agree that my child's data gathered in this study may be stored (after it has been anonymised) in a secure manner (password protected computer) and may be used for future research.

YES / NO

Appendix F

Student Consent Form

I
have read the information sheet and **AGREE** to participate in the Research
Project conducted by Mrs Sue McLocklan.

Date.....

Year Level:.....

Male/Female (please circle)

Signed By
.....
(student please sign here)

The consent form will be kept confidential by Mrs Sue McLocklan

Appendix G

Consent Form for Teachers

You are making a decision whether or not to participate in the research project stated below. Your signature indicates that you have decided to participate, having read the information provided on the information sheet.

Title: To identify the factors that contributes to the variation of achievement for Year 7 & 8 Māori students in full primary high decile schools

Researcher: Mrs Sue McLocklan

Post graduate Student, Masters of Educational Leadership University of Waikato.

- I confirm that I have read and understand the information sheet for the above study and have had the opportunity to ask questions.
YES / NO
- I understand I am free to withdraw at any time, and my data may be withdrawn up until I have approved and signed my transcript, but not after analysis.
YES / NO
- I agree to take part in the research project outlined in the information sheet.
YES / NO
- I agree to the interview being audio-recorded.
YES / NO
- I agree to the use of anonymised quotes in publications.
YES / NO
- I agree that my data gathered in this study may be stored (after it has been anonymised) in a secure manner (password protected computer) and may be used for future research.
YES / NO

- I agree that my data gathered in this study, or parts thereof, may be used for future publications and/or presentations.

YES / NO

Name of Participant

Date

Signature

Name of Researcher

Date

Signature

Appendix H

Initially, the researcher will welcome the student and share their pepehā with them. The student and support person (if present) will then be invited to do the same. To establish a participatory rapport, the researcher will then initiate some generic questions re their interests, sporting involvements and social activities.

The student information sheet will then be revisited and an opportunity for further questions or clarification will be given. Once the student is happy, a semi structured interview based on the following questions will follow.

Student Questions

Q1. What do you like about school?

Q2. Tell me about something you have learned recently?

Q.3. How do you know you are learning?

Q.4. What do you think is the best way for you to learn?

Q.5. What happens when you need help with your learning?

How do you know this makes a difference?

Q.6. What happens or what do you do to keep improving in your learning?

Q.7. Does school challenge you?

Q.8. Tell me about your perfect teacher.

Q.9. On a scale of 1-5, with 5 being the highest: how would you rate your self-confidence?

What made you choose that number?

Q.10. What do you want to do when you grow up?

Q.11. Tell me a bit about your culture and what you do outside of school?

Q.12. How is your culture recognised in your school? Do you think it is valued?
Why?

Q.13. Are there any questions you would like to ask me?

Thank you for participating in this interview.

Appendix I

Initially, the researcher will welcome the teacher and share their pepehā with them. The teacher will then be invited to do the same. To establish a participatory rapport, the researcher will then initiate some generic questions re their family, interests, sporting involvements and social activities.

The teacher information sheet will then be revisited and an opportunity for further questions or clarification will be given. Once the teacher is happy, a semi structured interview based on the following questions will follow.

Teacher Questions

Q1. What do you enjoy most about coming to school?

Q2. How does your school recognise and celebrate cultural differences?

Q3. Tell me about one of your successes teaching Māori students with their learning?

What did you do differently? How do you know this made a difference?

Q4. How is high achievement recognised in your school?

How is this recognised for Māori learners in your; a). school b).
classroom

Q5. What do you do school wide and in the classroom to engender student self-confidence?

Q6. How would you describe an effective learning relationship?

Q7. Can you share with me your understanding of the cultural terms ako and mana motuhake? How are these reflected in your current pedagogical practice?

Q8. Do you have knowledge or understanding of any other cultural terms? How are these evident in your professional practice?

Q9. On a scale of 1-5, with 5 being the highest; how would you rate your professional competence as a teacher for Māori learners? Why did you give yourself this rating... what do you base this on?

Q10. Can you tell me about any Ministry of Education initiatives to support Māori learners?

Q, 11 Which M.O.E. initiatives have you been involved in recently?

Do you have any questions?

Thank you for taking part in this interview

Appendix J

Table J.1 Treaty based framework for engaging with Māori in research,

Indigenous ethical themes	Revised Treaty Principles	Ethical Issues for Māori	Potential Implications for Research
<p>Respect- recognition of Indigenous groups as sovereign entities and respect for their cultural knowledge and traditions.</p> <p>Status: <i>Recognition of parties as equal</i></p>	<p>Partnerships – Recognition of Māori as partners in research and respect for their cultural knowledge and traditions, including Māori individual and collective rights, Māori data, Māori culture, cultural concepts values, norms, practices and language in the research process.</p>	<p>Rangatiratanga (Authority)</p> <p>Respects culture</p> <p>Tikanga Māori (Māori protocols and practices)</p>	<p>Collective consent</p> <p>Use of Māori protocols</p> <p>Whānau (family) support</p>
<p>Control – Indigenous control over involvement of Indigenous groups in research processes.</p> <p>Process: <i>Integrity of engagement</i></p>	<p>Participation – Control over involvement in research processes by Māori and Māori in design, governance, management, implementation and analysis especially research involving Māori</p>	<p>Mana whakahaere (control over decision making)</p> <p>Validating Māori concepts</p> <p>Incorporating Māori values</p> <p>Alignment to Māori goals</p> <p>Involvement of Māori participants</p>	<p>Collective construction</p> <p>Access to Māori advice</p> <p>Māori participation as researchers</p> <p>Māori analysis</p> <p>Collect ethnicity data</p> <p>Over-sampling protocols to provide equal explanatory power</p>
<p>Reciprocity- Ensuring there are mutual benefits and they are realised within indigenous groups in an equitable manner</p> <p>Outcome: <i>Equity of outcome</i></p>	<p>Protection- Actively protecting Māori rights by ensuring there are mutual benefits and that they are realised within Māori groups in an equitable manner.</p>	<p>Allocation of research resources</p> <p>Māori workforce development</p> <p>Mātauranga Māori (traditional knowledge)</p>	<p>Relevance to Māori health goals</p> <p>Development of Māori research capacity</p> <p>End use of results</p> <p>Cultural Intellectual Property Rights</p>

Source: Hudson & Russell, 2009.

Appendix K

Thematic Analysis Procedure

This process has been modified from King and Horrocks (2010, pp. 152-158).

Stage 1: Descriptive Coding

- 1.1 Read through transcript to get overall feel for the whole
- 1.2 Highlight anything in the transcript that might help you to understand the participants' views, experiences, and perceptions in relation to the topic under investigation
- 1.3 Write a brief comment indicating what is of interest to you in the highlighted text
- 1.4 Use preliminary comments to define descriptive codes. These should stay close to the data.
- 1.5 Do not be speculate what might be behind what the participant has said or interpret it in the light of psychological theory
- 1.6 Label descriptive codes with single words or short phrases as self-explanatory as possible
- 1.7 Reread text to identify overlapping descriptive codes and merge together
- 1.8 Repeat process with remaining transcripts – defining, applying and redefining codes

The law of diminishing returns will indicate time to move on.

Stage Two: Interpretive Coding

- 2.1 Group together descriptive codes that share common meaning
- 2.2 Create an interpretive code to capture this
- 2.3 Refer to descriptive code and data in context to clarify thinking of identifying interpretive code
- 2.3 One descriptive theme may feed into more than one interpretive theme

2.4 If most of the descriptive themes fit into several interpretive themes then *revisit* descriptive codes to define clearly and distinctly enough

2.5 Add to, refine and reply your interpretive codes as you proceed from one transcript to another until you have done a thorough job of capturing the meanings offered by the text.

At all times Keep research question in mind. Avoid tangential information

Stage 3: Overarching Themes

3a. Identify overarching themes that characterise key concepts in analysis

3b. Interpretive themes need to be contained within overarching themes

3c. Aim for 2-5 overarching themes, but if one participant has a major focus but it is absent in another and this comparison reveals something important for the study as a whole, include this theme

3d. Compile written report

3e. Cross check each stage of the process with checklist from Braun and Clarke (2006, p.96).