Copyright is owned by the Author of the thesis. Permission is given for a copy to be downloaded by an individual for the purpose of research and private study only. The thesis may not be reproduced elsewhere without the permission of the Author.

Problematizing Māori Achievement in Education Policy: An Exploratory Mixed-Methods Study on Teacher Enactment of Ka Hikitia

A thesis presented in partial fulfilment of the requirement for the degree of

Doctor of Education

at Massey University, Manawatū, New Zealand.

Timu-o-te-rangi Hirini Niwa

2022

Dedication

This thesis is dedicated to my three daughters:

Maia, Aria and Koa

Abstract

This thesis analyses and describes a range of factors that impact upon mainstream primary school teachers' enactments of the Māori education policy strategy, *Ka Hikitia* (Ministry of Education, 2013, 2018, 2020). Where this study differs is that it goes beyond the traditional implementation approach to policy research and seeks to identify and investigate the 'messier' aspects of interpretation, subjectivity and context, factors that are often missing in accounts of how policy works in schools.

It has utilised an exploratory, two-phase mixed-methods approach to collect the data. The initial phase was a series of one-to-one interviews with a small cohort of primary school teachers from the Manawatū region of New Zealand. The data collated helped to develop a set of initial themes that were used to formulate the second phase survey that was sent out to a wider cohort. The themes from both two phases of the study have been used in a complementary manner to engage with research and literature from the fields of Māori education, culturally responsive pedagogy and critical policy enactment.

This study concludes that teachers rely heavily upon school context and personal subjectivities to interpret and enact *Ka Hikitia*. It contends that teachers respond to *Ka Hikitia* in three key ways: *considered enactment*, *perfunctory enactment*, and/or *enactment resistance*. While teacher enactment is a focus of this study, it is purported that a broader consideration of how government and institutional factors impact upon teacher enactment of *Ka Hikitia* needs to be taken into account. Solely focusing on teachers as mere ciphers of policy reinforces institutional invisibility.

This study calls for a broader understanding of how Māori student achievement is understood and problematized in *Ka Hikitia*. While supporting the necessity for Māori language, culture and identity to be an integral part of mainstream primary schools, this research urges policy makers and Māori academics to re-consider and re-calibrate the impact of socio-economic factors upon Māori student achievement and, henceforth, rework policy designed to address this.

Acknowledgements

I want to take this opportunity to thank the many people and rōpu who have supported me throughout this doctoral journey. The road has been long and arduous at times, but I have always been encouraged to know that this journey has never been just mine alone and that many have travelled alongside me in a number of ways.

Firstly, to the two whānau groups back home in Taranaki who have supported me financially: Paraninihi ki Waitotara Inc and the Niwa Whānau Trust. A big 'mihi aroha' to you for the financial contributions you have given to me. I know that such contributions come with a responsibility to give back and I hope that my iwi, hapū and whānau share in the joy of me completing this doctoral journey and the doors that it may invariably open in the years to come.

E titia nei e Te Ātiawa, i te iti, i te rahi, te kātoa.

Secondly, I want to thank my supervisors: Professor Howard Lee, Dr Tony Carusi, Dr Karen Ashton and Dr Bevan Erueti. I have appreciated your patience, encouragement, guidance and feedback throughout this thesis journey. Your expertise and experience in matters of an academic, theoretical and political nature have helped sharpen my view on the world of research and education.

I want to express my deepest thanks to the teachers from both phases of the study for their participation. Your openness, honesty, and willingness to share your perspectives, experiences and pedagogies has been much valued and greatly appreciated.

I finally want to thank my family, friends and colleagues for their support. It has not been easy juggling doctoral study while working full-time as a primary school principal, being a husband, a father and a friend while striving to maintain a sense of work-life-study balance. Special thanks to my wife, Laura, who has been forever patient, quietly encouraging and always behind me 100%. And to my daughters: Maia, Aria and Koa – thank-you for the gentle nudges and whispers in the ear of, 'Do your thesis!'

Table of Contents

Page

Title Page……………………………………………………………………………*i*

Dedication……………………………………………………………………*ii*

Abstract……………………………………………………………………………*iii*

Acknowledgements…………………………………………………………………*v*

Table of Contents…………………………………………………………………*vii*

Glossary of Māori Terms…………………………………………………………*xvii*

List of Tables……………………………………………………………………*xix*

Chapter One: Introduction

1.0 Introduction……………………………………………………1

1.1 Research Context……………………………………………3

1.2 Statement of Purpose…………………………………………5

1.3 Research Aims and Objectives………………………………6

1.4 Research Questions……………………………………………7

1.5 Overview………………………………………………………8

Chapter Two: Literature Review

2.0 Introduction……………………………………………………13

2.1 Historical Backdrop: Māori Culture, Language & Identity in Schools…………………………………………………………16

2.2 Explaining Disproportionate Māori Student Achievement……………………………………………………23

2.2.1 Deficit Theorising……………………………………23

2.2.2 Monocultural Schools & the 'Cultural Thesis' Concept..25
2.2.3 Socio-economic Status, Home Resources & Poverty...28
2.2.4 Complex Māori Social Realities……………………..31
2.3 Ka Hikitia: Prioritisation of the 'Culture Thesis'…….………34
2.3.1 From Māori Deficit to Changing the Monocultural…34
2.3.2 Structural Changes through School Policies & Practices……………………………………………35
2.3.3 Challenges to Teacher Enactment of Ka Hikitia……37
2.4 New Zealand Research: Teacher Enactment of Culturally Responsive Pedagogy………………………………………45
2.5 International Research: Teacher Enactment of Culturally Responsive Pedagogy……………………………............51
2.6 Neoliberal Capitalism & Epistemic Provincialism…………53
2.6.1 Critique of Neoliberal Capitalism…………………...54
2.6.2 Western Thought & Epistemic Provincialism………..57
2.7 Critical Policy Literature: Problem Representation and Enactment Theory……………………………………...58
2.7.1 What's the Problem? Problem Representation in Policy & Policy-as-Discourse………………………………59
2.7.2 Policy Enactment, Context, & Performativity: The 'Folds' of the Teacher………………………………62
2.8 Summary of Literature…………………….……………...66

Chapter Three: Theoretical Framework

3.0 Introduction……………………….…………………………68

3.1 Theoretical Framework…………………………………...69

3.1.1 Philosophical & Theoretical Struggles of a Māori Researcher………………………………………..69

3.1.2 An Overarching Māori Ontology and Epistemology & An 'Uncertain' Kaupapa Māori Theory…………..……80

i. A Tentative Approach to the Perception of Things…80

ii. Connectivity Between the Self /Thing.....................82

iii. A 'Traditional' Kaupapa Māori Theory…..………83

3.1.3 Enactment Theory…………………………………...86

3.1.4 Policy-As-Discourse Theory………………………...87

3.2 Summary ……………..……………………………………..87

Chapter Four: Methods

4.0 Introduction………………………………….…………………89

4.1 Research Design…..…………………………………………90

4.1.1 Phase One: Depth-Interviews of Teachers from 'Ordinary' Schools…………………………………..91

i. Rationale 91

ii. Participant Selection Criteria ……………....92

iii. Participant Selection Sampling Design …....93

iv. Depth-Interview Data Collection …………...95

v. Data Analysis………………………………..96

4.1.2 Phase Two: Online Survey..99

i. *Rationale and Design*…………………………..99

ii. *Survey Sampling Design*……………………101

iii. *Survey Data Collection*……………………103

iv. *Data Analysis*………………………………104

4.1.3 *Summary of Mixed-Methods Data Analysis*………...106

4.2 Ethical Considerations……………………………………..108

4.3 Summary …………………………………………………..110

Chapter Five: Findings

5.0 Introduction…………………………………………………...111

5.1 Phase One: 1-1 Depth Interview Themes…………………………..111

5.1.1 *Theme 1: Teachers interpret Ka Hikitia as being about Māori achieving as Māori and improving Māori student academic achievement* ……………………………..112

5.1.2 *Theme 2: Senior leaders provide a Māori language and cultural backdrop to ensure their school enacts Ka Hikitia*…………………………………………...113

5.1.3 *Theme 3: Teachers employ a range of enactments in their classroom related to Ka Hikitia, with some of these enactments being perfunctory in nature*…………...118

5.1.4 *Theme 4: Teachers struggle with enacting Ka Hikitia due to having many other priorities to juggle*……...121

5.1.5 *Theme 5: Teachers sense a lack of support and trust with a concomitant intensity from the MoE on target-meeting pressures to ensure Māori students achieve*.122

5.1.6 *Theme 6: Teachers find that involving whānau in the education of their tamariki can be tricky*...…………123

5.1.7 *Theme 7: Teachers have co-workers who have a poor attitude towards Māori language and culture and therefore very little/token gestures are enacted in their classrooms*..……..124

5.1.8 *Theme 8: Some teachers know very little about Ka Hikitia*……………………………………………...127

5.1.9 *Theme 9: Some teachers believe that Ka Hikitia is limited in its scope to effect positive change for Māori*………………………………………………128

5.1.10 *Theme 10: Teachers believe that Māori students who achieve do so because of strong parental, whānau and community support and relationships*……….......129

5.1.11 *Theme 11: Māori children who underachieve do so due to poor parenting and issues going on at home*...….131

5.1.12 *Theme 12: Māori children who underachieve do so due to a range of problems related to poverty, social issues, and socio-economic factors*………………………..131

5.1.13 *Summary of Phase One Themes*……………….………133

5.2 Phase Two: Online Teacher Survey Themes……………….………134

5.2.1 *Theme 1: Approximately a third of teachers surveyed indicated that they are unable to describe the purposes of the Ka Hikitia policy*……………………………..135

5.2.2 Theme 2: Principals and senior leaders impact upon the level of school-wide enactment of the Ka Hikitia policy in a variety of ways......................................137
5.2.3 Theme 3: Teachers acknowledge that they enact the Ka Hikitia policy in a variety of ways, with some of these enactments being perfunctory in nature................140
5.2.4 Theme 4: Relationships between schools and iwi are not simple and straightforward..............................142
5.2.5 Theme 5: Schools have issues with timetabling Te Reo/tikanga due to a crowded curriculum..............143
5.2.6 Theme 6: Not all parents/caregivers expect teachers to enact Ka Hikitia...143
5.2.7 Theme 7: *Some teachers have an indifferent attitude towards Māori students who have little or no Te Reo or much connection to their Māori heritage*..............144
5.2.8 Theme 8: Very few teachers have a strong sense of confidence in their ability to speak to Te Reo..........144
5.2.9 Theme 9: There are teachers who do not value Māori language/culture/identity in mainstream primary schools...145
5.2.10 Theme 10: Teachers feel undervalued and sense a lack of support by the Ministry of Education to enact Ka Hikitia..146
5.2.11 Theme 11: Teachers support the notion that incorporating Māori culture, language, and identity

into classrooms and schools, improves Māori student engagement...……………………………………147

5.2.12 Theme 12: Teachers support the notion that incorporating Māori culture, language, and identity into classrooms and schools, improves Māori student achievement……………………………………..148

5.2.13 Theme 13: Most teachers support the notion that social factors impact upon Māori student achievement to a greater degree than the role of teachers incorporating Māori culture, language and identity into classrooms…………………………………………149

5.2.14 Summary of Phase Two Themes……………………151

5.3 Complementarity of Thematic Findings……………………………152

5.3.1 Complementary Theme 1: While a number of teachers are able to interpret the purposes of Ka Hikitia, there is a large proportion of teachers who know very little or nothing about it…………………………………….153

5.3.2 Complementary Theme 2: Principals and senior leaders provide a key contextual backdrop for teacher enactment of Ka Hikitia ……………………………153

5.3.3 Complementary Theme 3: Teachers employ a range of enactments in their classroom related to Ka Hikitia, some of which are perfunctory in nature…………..154

5.3.4 Complementary Theme 4: *Some teachers do not value and/or have a poor attitude towards Māori language, culture, and identity*……………………………........154
5.3.5 Complementary Theme 5: Teachers struggle with enacting Ka Hikitia due to having many others priorities to juggle………………………………………….154
5.3.6 Complementary Theme 6: *Teachers sense a lack of support and trust and feel undervalued by the Ministry of Education*.……………………………………….154
5.3.7 Complementary Theme 7: *Teachers strongly believe that incorporating Māori language, culture, and identity into mainstream classrooms improves Māori engagement and achievement*..……………………..155
5.3.8 Complementary Theme 8: Most teachers support the notion that social factors impact upon Māori student achievement to a greater degree than the role of teachers incorporating Māori language, culture, and identity into classrooms……………………………155
5.3.9 Theme Divergence…………………………………155
5.4 Summary ………………………………………………………..156

Chapter Six: Discussion

6.0 Introduction…………………………………………………...158
6.1 Ka Hikitia: The Types of Teacher Enactment………………………164
6.1.1 Considered Enactment………..……………………164

6.1.2 Perfunctory Enactment……………….…………....166

6.1.3 Enactment Resistance……………………………...170

6.2 Subjective Factor: Teacher Attitudes………………..…………..173

6.3 Contextual Factors: Institutional Impacts…………………….………184

6.3.1 School Leadership …………………………………185

6.3.2 'Sensing' Ka Hikitia ……………….………………188

6.3.3 Broad Institutional Context 194

6.3.4 Juggling Multiple Demands….…………………….199

6.4 Benefits & Constraints of Teacher Enactment of Ka Hikitia……….202

6.4.1 Benefit: Improved Māori Student Engagement & Achievement …………………………….……………204

6.4.2 Constraint: Teachers as Policy Ciphers……..…….206

6.4.3 Constraint: The Limits of the Cultural Thesis............207

6.5 Summary ……….…….……………………….……………………...211

Chapter Seven: Conclusion

7.0 Introduction……………………..………………………………213

7.1 Summary: Research Aims & Questions……………………………213

7.2 Limitations ……………………………………………………...219

7.3 Further Research…………………….……………………………..220

References………………………………………………………............225

Appendix A: Phase One Informed Consent Form……………………………235

Appendix B: Phase One 1-1 Depth Interview Schedule……………..............240

Appendix C: Phase Two: Online Survey……………………………………..243

Appendix D: *Research Outputs*……………………………………………...256

Glossary of Māori Terms

Aroha ki te tangata**:** *maintaining respect for people (i.e., through management of research data and control over where and when to meet for research purposes)*

Haere atu: *move away from the speaker, go away*

Haere mai: *come toward the speaker, come here*

Hangi: *a pit in the ground in which food is cooked on heated stones*

Hapū: *sub-tribe*

Iwi: *extended kinship group, tribe, often refers to a large group of people descended from a common ancestor and associated with a distinct territory*

Ka Hikitia: *name given to the Māori education policy strategy (Hikitia = to lift up, raise)*

Kanohi kitea: *being a face that is seen and known to those participating in research*

Kapa haka: *Māori cultural group, Māori performing group*

Karakia: *to recite ritual chants, pray*

Kaua e takahia to mana o te tangata: *do not trample on the* mana *(dignity) of people*

Kōhanga Reo: *literally 'language nest', Early Childhood education conducted via immersion in Māori language*

Kupu: *word, vocabulary*

Kura Kaupapa Māori: *Primary school education conducted via immersion in Māori language*

Mana: *dignity, prestige; a supernatural force in a person, place or object*

Marae: *complex of buildings belonging to a particular tribe, sub-tribe*

Matariki: *Pleiades, heralds the start of the Māori new year*

Mātauranga Māori: *Māori knowledge, understanding from a Māori worldview or perspective*

Mihi: *to greet, speech of identifying oneself*

Pākehā: *English, New Zealander of European descent*

Pepeha: *speech of identifying oneself via tribe, mountain, canoe, river, marae, sub-tribe, eponymous ancestor*

Pōwhiri: *welcome ceremony at a marae or other institute such as a school*

Tahi, Rua, Toru: *numbers one, two, three*

Tamariki: *children*

Taonga tuku iho: *a treasure handed down from previous generation/ancestors, heirloom, cultural property*

Tapu: *be sacred, restricted, set apart, forbidden, a supernatural condition where object is removed from sphere of profane to sphere of sacred*

Te Ao Māori: *the Māori world*

Te Reo: *the Māori language*

Tikanga: *correct procedure, protocol, customary system of values and practices that have developed over time*

Tino Rangatiratanga: *self-determination*

Treaty of Waitangi: *Treaty first signed on 6 February 1840 by representatives of the British Crown and Māori chiefs*

Waiata: *song*

Whakapapa: *genealogy, lineage*

Whakataukī: *proverb*

Whānau: *family, extended family group*

Whānaungatanga: *kinship, sense of family connectedness*

Wharekura: *high school education conducted via immersion in Māori language*

Whare Wānanga: *tertiary education conducted via immersion in Māori language*

List of Tables

Table 1: 2019 and 2020 NCEA School Leavers' Attainment: Ethnicity……………..48

Table 2: Proposed Phase One Maximal Variation Sampling Table..........................104

Table 3: Actual Phase One Maximal Variation Sampling Table............................105

Table 4: Phase Two Survey Participant Information..114

Table 5: Summary of Phase One Themes..123

Table 6: Summary of Schools' Contextual Enactment..125

Table 7: Summary of Sub-themes Phase 1 – Theme 3...130

Table 8: Summary of Phase Two Themes..146

Table 9: Summary of Sub-themes Phase 2 – Theme 2...149

Table 10: Summary of School-wide Enactments of Ka Hikitia (1)...........................150

Table 11: Summary of School-wide Enactments of Ka Hikitia (2)...........................151

Table 12: Summary of Teacher Enactments of Ka Hikitia (1).................................152

Table 13: Summary of Teacher Enactments of Ka Hikitia (2).................................153

Table 14: Summary of Phase Two Items – Theme 10..158

Table 15: Summary of Complementary Themes..164

CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION

1.0 Introduction

Mainstream New Zealand primary schools continue to evolve into spaces where being, speaking and identifying as Māori is becoming more normalised than it has been historically. Our recent colonial past where Māori students were strongly discouraged, and even physically punished, for speaking Te Reo in schools differs markedly to the policy landscape underpinning the current Māori education policy, *Ka Hikitia* (Ministry of Education, 2008, 2009, 2013a, 2020). Today, schools and teachers are tasked with the responsibility to ensure that their policies and practices are culturally responsive so that "all Māori students, their parents and whānau participate and contribute to an engaging and enjoyable educational journey that recognises and celebrates their unique, identity, language and culture" (Ministry of Education, 2013a, p. 13). It is purported that through this channel of cultural responsiveness within schools, Māori students will be able to "achieve the skills, knowledge and qualifications they need to achieve" (ibid, p. 13).

Despite this rhetoric, rates of Māori student achievement continue to lag behind that of their non-Māori peers (Education Counts, 2021). A number of competing theories and explanations exist as to why this disproportionate rate of Māori achievement/underachievement has continued to occur across New Zealand schools. *Ka Hikitia* advances one of those explanations, the 'cultural thesis' (Cooper, 2012). This theory articulates that Māori students suffer a sense of cultural dislocation in monocultural, Pākehā dominated schooling structures and the primary means by which Māori learners can recover academically is for teachers to ensure that their Māori

students achieve educational success as Māori. This study is an unearthing of how teachers make sense of and enact the Ministry of Education's culturally responsive policy, *Ka Hikitia*, in their classrooms and schools. Attempting to alleviate the sole focus of traditional policy implementation on teachers as mere ciphers, this study recognises that a range of subjective, contextual, and institutional factors impact upon teacher enactment of *Ka Hikitia*.

This study also examines teachers' explanations of what they conceive of as impacting upon Māori student achievement. It concludes that while mainstream primary school teachers see the importance of enacting culturally responsive practice so as to improve Māori students' engagement and achievement in schools, there is an identified need for education policy to recognise the impact that socio-economic factors have upon Māori student achievement. Such an approach ought not to be regarded as deficit theorising tamariki Māori, their parents or their whānau. Rather it is urged that socio-economic factors should be conceived of as an influential force that gives shape to the academic trajectories of all children. Negating the impact of socio-economic factors upon the academic trajectories of Māori via education policy not only renders invisible its influential force but works to maintain the disproportionate rate of Māori achievement status quo.

1.1 Research Context

This study aims to investigate the complex 'terrain' upon which the *Ka Hikitia* (Ministry of Education, 2008, 2009, 2013a, 2020) policy priority of 'Māori achieving education success as Māori', via the incorporation of Māori language, culture and identity, is enacted by teachers in mainstream, New Zealand primary schools. The

purpose of this study is not to assess whether teachers are fulfilling the performative criteria set out in the *Ka Hikitia* policy document and its associated support documents. Rather, this research goes beyond this traditional policy research approach. It will investigate what teachers do, explore their reasons for putting into place the Māori language, culture and identity-based practices that they enact and identify and investigate the varying factors (i.e., institutional, subjective, material and professional) that impact upon what is enacted by these teachers in response to the *Ka Hikitia* policy strategy. It will also examine the benefits and constraints mainstream primary school teachers articulate in relation to the *Ka Hikitia* policy focus on incorporating Māori language, identity and culture in schools in order to address the 'problem' of disproportionate Māori underachievement. It is through this broader approach to investigating how *Ka Hikitia* is interpreted and enacted, encapsulated within an overarching Māori ontological and epistemological perspective, that conceptualisations of doing things better for tamariki Māori will be closer within reach.

Evidence suggests that many mainstream primary school teachers struggle to provide culturally responsive learning for their Māori students (Bishop, 2012), a key focus of the broad Māori education policy document, *Ka Hikitia*. To overcome this, both local and international research urges teachers to demonstrate a range of skills and understandings such as high levels of self-awareness and reflexivity (Habib, Densmore-James, & Macfarlane, 2013), establishing and maintaining whānau like relationships with their Māori students (Bishop, Ladwig, & Berryman, 2014) or to connect with Māori identity, language and culture in order to foster Māori students' well-being and learning (Ministry of Education, 2013a). The understanding of policy implementation from this perspective connotes that when teachers do *'a, b and c',*

Māori students will achieve *'x, y and z'*. Unfortunately, this traditional policy implementation logic has not only gained normative social currency but it frames teachers in a deficit manner, as needing policy and its associated performative instruments to measure, address and report on teachers' 'shortcomings', 'weaknesses' and 'inadequacies'. While this research readily acknowledges that a number of mainstream primary school teachers *do* indeed struggle with aspects of being culturally responsive to their Māori learners, (i.e., poor knowledge of Te Reo, lacking in understanding of Māori cultural and social norms), the traditional policy implementation logic of 'fix the teacher, fix the student' negates a more complex rendering of the process of how policy is 'worked out' in schools.

This research will utilise the critical policy concepts of "enactment, context and performativity as an analytic toolkit to illuminate the complex processes" (Singh, Heimans, & Glasswell, 2014, p. 826) of the *Ka Hikitia* policy uptake by New Zealand, mainstream primary school teachers. Rather than solely focusing on the need for teacher improvement, preparation and implementation, this study will largely focus on exploring a range of subjective, contextual and institutional factors that influence and impact upon teachers' enactment (or lack thereof) of *Ka Hikitia*. These factors will include but are not limited to, the nature of school professional cultures (i.e., senior management decisions), the import of external pressures (i.e., Registered Teacher Criteria and/or Education Review Office (ERO) concerns), the taken-for-granted decentralised educational policy landscape of New Zealand and school material contexts (i.e., available resourcing). It is suggested that when such an approach to understanding how the *Ka Hikitia* policy is 'enacted' and 'lived out' in the 'complex and sometimes incoherent social assemblages' of schools (Ball, Maguire, & Braun, 2012), different practical possibilities will be envisioned which will detract from the

oft microscopic gaze that policy implementation places upon and over teachers and into a much more broader and contextual recognition of how deeply bound and implicated primary school teachers are within the contemporary neo-liberal policy process (Ball, Maguire, & Braun, 2012).

1.2 Statement of Purpose

The purpose of this mixed-methods study is to explore and describe the varying factors that impact upon teachers' enactment of the current Māori education policy, *Ka Hikitia*. The two phase exploratory study began with a series of one-to-one depth interviews with teachers from within 'typical' mainstream Manawatū primary schools. By engaging with teachers in regard to how they interpret, enact and respond to the *Ka Hikitia* policy, it was hoped that a much deeper picture would be provided to show how certain aspects of the policy are "picked up and worked on" and "what alternatives are discarded along the way" (Ball, Maguire, & Braun, 2012, p. 4). The second phase used data from the interviews to construct a regional teacher survey. Very little data existed in the literature to assist in the construction of a survey so in line with Creswell and Plano Clark's (2007) suggestion, phase one interview data was used to develop codes and themes for further exploration via a region-wide teacher survey in the second phase of the investigation. Made available through the online platform, *SurveyMonkey*, the survey instrument captured a snapshot of teacher enactment of *Ka Hikitia* across a range of 'typical' Manawatū primary school contexts.

The data collected from the two phases explored how mainstream primary school teachers' experiences of negotiating the demands of "work" (i.e., professional, material, external and situational factors) and "home" (i.e., teacher subjectivities and

cultural intelligibilities) influence the enactment of *Ka Hikitia,* that is, the contextual and embodied meanings attached to the provision of culturally responsive learning for Māori students. It provided an explorative view into some of the benefits, constraints and limitations that teachers perceive there to be in regard to the impetus that incorporating Māori language, culture and identity will address the issue of disproportionate Māori student underachievement.

1.3 Research Aims and Objectives

Using Newman et al.'s (in Onwuegbuzie & Leech, 2006, pp. 478-479) framework as a guide, the following aims outline the overall, long-term goals of the research.

- To understand the complex contextual and subjective phenomena of how primary school teachers are impacted upon and implicated in the enactment of *Ka Hikitia*.
- To inform key stakeholders, including policymakers, about the range of factors that constrain and enable the enactment of the *Ka Hikitia* policy by New Zealand primary school teachers.
- To examine teacher discourses in relation to the place and status of Māori knowledge in mainstream primary schools
- To add to the critical policy and Māori education scholarly knowledge bases.

Two standard research objectives noted by Burke Johnson and Christensen (2014), namely, *exploration* and *description*, underpin the nature of the proposed investigation's two broad objectives. They are:

1. To inductively explore and thematically generate an account of the enactment of the *Ka Hikitia* policy strategy that makes sense and is familiar to New Zealand mainstream primary school teachers.
2. To describe the range of contextual and subjective factors that constrain and enable a sample of primary school teachers' enactment of *Ka Hikitia* and to present teachers' accounts of such enactment in a manner comprehensible to those in key policy-making positions.

1.4 Research Questions

The research questions derive from both my experience as a Māori teacher and principal in the mainstream primary school context and from the review of the literature. The study followed an exploratory, sequential, qual→QUAN mixed-methods design (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2011), and the research questions embed both a quantitative and a qualitative aspect within each. The benefit of using both quantitative results and qualitative findings is evident in the sense of thematic complementarity that existed between the datasets. Using a mixed-methods approach offered a more comprehensive understanding of phenomenon understanding

investigation and enabled the goals and objectives of this study to be realised. The research questions were as follows:

1. How do mainstream primary school teachers interpret and enact the *Ka Hikitia* policy focus of incorporating Māori language, culture and identity into their classrooms and schools?
2. Which contexual and subjective factors influence how Māori language, culture and identity is enacted by mainstream primary school teachers?
3. What benefits and/or constraints do mainstream primary school teachers sense in regard to the incorporation of Māori language, culture and identity to address the issue of disproportionate Māori student underachievement?

1.5 Thesis Overview

This thesis is divided into six chapters. The first chapter introduces the focus of the thesis, the national Māori education strategy, *Ka Hikitia* and its culturally responsive mandate. It outlines the research context, purpose, aims, objectives and questions. These help to foreground the ensuing chapters.

Chapter Two contextualises the research undertaken by providing an historical review of the place of Māori language, culture and identity in New Zealand schools. It provides an insight into how Māori were not only subjected to colonial norms and values but also historically battered down by cultural and linguistic suppression via

mainstream schooling. This is followed by a review of the varying contestable explanations that are provided in the literature as to why Māori students achieve at a disproportionate rate to their non-Māori peers.

The latter part of the second chapter begins by seeking to better understand the 'cultural thesis' explanation that underpins the *Ka Hikitia* policy. The 'cultural thesis' contends that the New Zealand mainstream schooling system is structured around norms and values that are largely unfamiliar to Māori students and that their rate of achievement is disproportionate to that of their non-Māori peers due to this sense of cultural dislocation. This is followed by an analysis of both the local and international literature around teacher enactment of culturally responsive pedagogy. It examines a range of factors that impact upon teacher enactment of indigenous culture, language, and identity in mainstream schooling contexts, a key focus of this study.

This second chapter concludes with a review of the critical policy enactment literature with a particular focus on how the 'problem' of disproportionate Māori student achievement is represented in *Ka Hikitia*. This is followed by a critical questioning of traditional implementation approaches in educational policy research. A set of enactment theoretical tools are outlined which are utilised in this study to help understand how policies such as *Ka Hikitia* travel, are sensed, and are enacted.

Chapter Three describes the philosophical and theoretical 'messiness' that underpins this research. While this study aligns with a Kaupapa Māori theoretical approach, its divergence is in its privileging of a Kaupapa Māori theory that acknowledges tentativeness, hesitancy and uncertainty (Mika, 2017; Tiakiwai, 2015, in Hetaraka, 2019). This is coupled with an understanding that Kaupapa Māori theory can often be driven more by critical theory rather than Māori values (Eketone, 2008) and because of this can be overly reliant on binary and deterministic thinking (Hoskins,

2012). This study acknowledges that Kaupapa Māori can often be bereft with colonial imprints and mechanisms (Mahuika, 2008) despite numerous proponents' claims to the contrary. It aims to contribute to the space created by a number of Māori researchers who are provoking and questioning from within Kaupapa Māori theory so as to make room for alternate visions of how to philosophically and theoretically approach objects of research and study.

This third chapter ends with a brief articulation of both enactment theory and policy-as-discourse theory. These two theoretical approaches to educational policy research counter the prevailing instrumentalist policy implementation 'logic' that dominates policy research frameworks and educational contexts.

Chapter Four outlines the key elements of the methods study and procedures undertaken in this exploratory mixed-methods study. It explicates an overview of and rationale for the two sequential qual→QUAN phases of the study. It provides the participant sampling designs used in both phases of the study. It clarifies how phase one data was used to develop the survey instruments for phase two of the study. It also explains how data was analysed to arrive at the eight complementary themes of the study. It concludes with a summary of a number of ethical considerations and noted limitations of the study.

Chapter Five begins by outlining the twelve interpretive themes from the initial one-to-one depth interview phase of the study. These interpretive themes were used to structure the survey items for the second phase of the study. From the survey, thirteen intepretative themes were identified. A range of participant anecdotes and survey results are explicated throughout the chapter. The data from both phases were compared and eight complementary themes were elicited. These themes brought

illustration, elaboration and clarification of phase one findings with the themes of the second phase of the study.

Chapter Six pulls together the literature in Chapter Two and the findings from Chapter Five to discuss the research questions of the study. It examines and discusses a range of personal, local and institutional factors that shape teacher enactment of *Ka Hikitia*. This is followed by an outline of three forms of enactment identified from the study: *considered enactment*, *perfunctory enactment,* and *enactment resistance.*

Drawing from the findings of the study, this chapter critiques the policy implementation logic that teachers are solely responsible for the advancement of policy objectives. Instead, it proffers that subjective, local contextual and institutional factors need to be given more critical attention by those responsible for creating and ascertaining the degree of *Ka Hikitia* policy uptake by mainstream schools and teachers.

This chapter discusses one of the key findings of the study that while teachers largely contend that their enactment of incorporating Māori language, culture and identity into mainstream classrooms and schools improves levels of Māori student engagement and achievement, over half of the teachers surveyed felt that social factors impact upon Māori student achievement to a greater degree than the cultural dissonance factors that underpin the *Ka Hikitia* policy. This perspective argues that factors such as family poverty, socio-economic status, and the lack of home resources impacts upon on Māori student achievement to a much greater degree than the lack of Māori culture, language and identity in mainstream schools. It is contended that this glaring absence in educational policy is muted within *Ka Hikitia* due to such a position being viewed as one of teacher deficit theorising, a position that is critiqued and discussed here.

This chapter concludes with a call for Kaupapa Māori academics to re-engage with a critique of the inequitable nature of capitalist economic and socio-political structures rather than defaulting to the teacher deficit theorising position that dominates in the literature. Such a defaulting contributes to maintaining the economic status quo where family poverty, low socio-economic status, and a lack of home resources are ignored as mitigating factors upon disproportionate rates of Māori student achievement. Kaupapa Māori theorists are urged to consider how we not only re-design the education system so that it is culturally compatible and responsive to the needs of tamariki Māori but to consider how we might use Kaupapa Māori values to re-design the broad social and economic systems and institutions in Aotearoa/New Zealand to improve the life chances of Māori students in a range of indicators including educational attainment.

Chapter Seven provides concluding reflections on the findings of the study. It specifies the study's limitations and outlines suggested areas for future research.

CHAPTER TWO: LITERATURE REVIEW

2.0 Introduction

The review of the literature is divided into seven sections. The first section starts with an historical backdrop to modern education for Māori in New Zealand schools. It looks at how since the Native Trust Ordinance of 1844, when the state began their involvement in the schooling of Māori students, followed by over a century of Native Schooling, the British Colonial Office and the ensuing settler government sought to 'civilise' and assimilate Māori into European culture. The varying complexities surrounding the manner in which Māori students were expected to leave their language, culture, and identity at the classroom door forms the backdrop to an understanding of the current Māori education policy, *Ka Hikitia*, which places emphasis on schools and teachers to ensure Māori students' language, culture and, identity is nurtured and supported in mainstream, English-medium education.

The second section moves on from the historical to discuss a range of competing perspectives from the literature as to why Māori students underachieve disproportionately in comparison to their non-Māori peers. In its scope it considers a body of research that examines deficit theorising, monocultural schooling, the impact of socio-economic status, home resources and poverty, and the notion of Māori learners inhabiting complex social realities.

The third section frames the *Ka Hikitia* policy as being underpinned by the 'cultural thesis' (Cooper, 2012) concept that purports that to alleviate the issue of disproportionate Māori student underachievement, primary school teachers need to be more culturally responsive to their Māori learners. This theory of disproportionate

Māori underachievement articulates that Māori students are said to suffer a sense of cultural dislocation in mono-cultural, Pākehā dominated schooling structures and the primary means by which Māori learners can recover academically is for teachers to ensure that their Māori students achieve educational success as Māori. A large corpus of literature exists in support of this which will also be explicated upon with an analysis of both the positives and challenges that teachers face when enacting culturally responsive pedagogy. This section ends with a focus on the range of challenges that teachers face when enacting *Ka Hikitia* and its varying policy tools. These challenges include the view that *Ka Hikitia* has been poorly implemented by the government (Office of the Auditor-General, 2013), its intent focus on teachers as needing to take sole responsibility for improving Māori student achievement rates is misguided (Stewart, 2016) and that its attempt to make schooling for Māori more 'user-friendly' lacks Māori epistemological and ontological depth (Hetaraka, 2019).

In the fourth section, empirical research on teacher enactment of culturally responsive pedagogical approaches in the New Zealand context will be reviewed. The first part will draw from a small body of empirical research that highlights some of the possibilities and benefits that have come from teacher enactment of culturally responsive approaches. The '*Te Kotahitanga'* culturally responsive professional development programme forms the main focus in this section as one of the most prominent programmes to receive NZ government funding. Other local studies are analysed and examined in relation to how teachers have navigated and responded to culturally responsive pedagogy in their classrooms so as to improve Māori student engagement and to ensure that Māori enjoy education success as Māori.

The fifth section turns to the international research. Findings from the literature explicate on the some of the issues and challenges faced by teachers when enacting

culturally responsive approaches in their classrooms. Of note is the tendency for teachers to incorporate cultural iconography and tokenistic gestures rather than providing authentically responsive teaching and learning. This section concludes with a brief examination of why teachers tend to focus on learning and teaching ‘about’ cultural traditions of minority or indigenous peoples’ rather than teaching and learning through the cultural ontologies, epistemologies and processes that indigenous and minority children bring with them to school.

The sixth section analyses the literature in regard to critiques of neoliberal capitalism and how it constitutes the institutional grammar of educational policy and practice, relinquishing Māori efforts at transforming the polity to one of “epistemic provincialism” (Ahenakew, Andreotti, Cooper, & Hireme, 2014). In critiquing neoliberalism, the literature argues that inequality is part and parcel of capitalist logic where market forces are seen as preferable to notions of social justice. This section ends with a brief analysis of differences between Western and Māori ontology and epistemology.

In the final section, a critique of the traditional view of policy implementation in schools is mounted by analysing what the literature says in regard to the concepts of policy enactment, context, and performativity. Following the path laid by critical policy scholars, this analytic toolkit of concepts is articulated as a foreground by which to take “account of the diverse variables and factors (the what), as well as the dynamics of context (the how) that shape” (Ball, Maguire, & Braun, 2012, p. 20 in Singh, Heimans, & Glasswell, 2014, p. 827) the enactment of policies within schools rather than solely focusing on teacher shortcomings and lack of skills and knowledge. A critique of the traditional policy tenet of teachers being framed as ‘mere ciphers who implement’ is also made, instead offering a framing of teachers as conscious policy

actors who 'draw upon a variety of resources in making their 'readings' and interpretations' of policy such as their 'own experiences, scepticisms, critiques' and their contextual surroundings which will inevitably lead them to "read policies from positions of their identities and subjectivities" and specific school contexts (Ball, Maguire, & Braun, 2012, p. 15).

2.1 History of Māori Culture, Language & Identity in NZ Schools

The review of the literature begins with a summary of mission and native schooling for Māori. Set with the task of introducing Māori to Christianity and the ways of the European, missionaries were the first group to establish and control schools in New Zealand. While the first mission school in Rangihoua, initiated in 1816, failed to ignite much interest amongst Māori in the early 1800s, Judith Simon (1998) noted that it was not until the 1830s that Māori began to interest themselves in European-style schooling. Of note was the enthusiasm for European notions of literacy amongst Māori.

At the time of the signing of the Treaty of Waitangi, reading and writing were "immensely important means of communicating" (Jackson, 1975, in Simon, 1998, p5). Simon (1998) states that while Māori were highly enthused with gaining literacy skills, the focus for developing these skills were centred on the Bible and European values rather than Māori culture, values and worldviews. This meant that for Māori their language, culture and identities were being challenged and beginning to become marginalised. With the introduction of the Native Trust Ordinance of 1844, Māori were being increasingly exposed through literacy to European social and cultural

practices, the English language and European concepts of the self and identity. The assimilatory impact of this upon Māori has been well documented in the literature.

Jackson (2003) has noted that European values and their inherent emphasis on the power of the written word “challenged the authority of specialists in traditional lore” (p. 46). He goes on to state that through literacy, Māori were confronted with the “relative truth or falsity” (p. 31) of traditional values such as ‘tapu’ and ‘mana’ (Jenkins, 1991 in Simon, 1998). Jackson (2003) iterates that literacy had “enabled the critical detachment of mind” (p. 47) where the written word was not only abstracted from the context of social action, but that the literate person was in effect detached from the social group. European emphasis on the value of the written word changed the intensity in which oral-aural forms of knowing were utilised in Māori society and Māori started to witness the deprecating impact of literacy upon mātauranga Māori and Māori ways of living. Both Simon and Jackson note that over time Māori realised that the literacy offered through mission schools “was not as efficacious as they had anticipated” (Jackson, 2003, p. 47) so began returning their attention to Māori knowledge and worldviews. But such a return was never to be fully regained (Simon, 1998, p. 6) as the hallmarks of a colonial worldview seeped its way into Māori consciousness, social structure, and being.

It was within this space of ambivalence in which Māori found themselves, between their own culture, language and identity and that of the European, that in 1847, the Government of the time began to formally extend its powers upon the schooling of Māori children. Seeking to further impel an ideology of assimilation upon Māori through education policies and practices, the Government provided subsidies for mission schools that complied with certain regulations and conditions. The provision of industrial education and training for Māori, aimed at creating a Māori

labour/working-class in the newly emerging capitalist society and instruction in the English language, further alienated Māori children from their Māori culture, language and identity.

Despite disruptions via the land wars of New Zealand, the 1860s saw the beginning of a secular, state-controlled education system for Māori. Perpetuating the assimilation policies of the colonial government, the village Native Schools emphasised English knowledge through the English language, omitting Māori culture, Māori knowledge and Māori language in the process.

The introduction of the 1877 Education Act saw a universal system of primary schooling available in New Zealand. Based upon the ideals of egalitarianism, racial harmony, economic growth and social control, the Education Act sought to eliminate the inequalities that had occurred under a rigid class-based system, which many of the settlers had escaped from in Great Britain. Despite sitting parallel to the Native Schooling system there were no official restrictions of access to either system based on race. While both Māori and Pākehā children attended both, it seemed that the intention of the Department of Education at that time was to move towards an integrated public schooling system.

From the early 1930s, the notion of assimilation was giving way to the new discourse of integration. Māori were located within both a Pākehā dominated society and Pākehā-controlled schooling system which aimed to promote their integration rather than their assimilation. This transformed into a policy of 'cultural adaption'. This saw an increase in emphasis on things Māori in Māori schools. Native Schools were expected to follow the same syllabus as public schools but were given space to make 'appropriate' modifications for Māori. It must be made clear that while Māori arts and crafts were accommodated during these times, the policy of cultural adaption

continued to disallow Te Reo to be spoken within school grounds. It was not until the 1950s and early 1960s that Māori views and experiences within the schooling system were more attentively considered. Judith Simon (1998) has noted three key reports that signalled a turn in the tide of competing discourses.

The first report was that produced by the National Committee of Māori Education established in 1955. For the first time ever, the Department of Education sought Māori views on the education of their children when they invited representative Māori leaders to participate in a national committee. This committee made a number of recommendations, one of which saw the position of Officer of Māori Education created in 1956. The second report was formulated and released by Jack Hunn, the secretary of Māori Affairs, in 1961. For the first time a report was publicly available which highlighted the plight Māori were in in regard to education, health, employment and housing (Simon, 1986). It also provided a blueprint for the establishment of the Māori Education Foundation. This picture of poor Māori educational achievement rates in the Hunn report was reiterated in the Report of the Commission on Education in New Zealand, 1962. Known as the Currie Report, it recommended the transfer of all Māori/Native Schools to education board control. Seeing the existence of a separate group of Māori schools as an ‘anomaly’, Hunn also proposed better staffing for schools with high Māori populations, encouraged Māori parents to take a more active interest in their children’s schooling and increase the number of Māori men and women accepted into teachers’ training colleges.

While it seemed that more power was being given to Māori since the time of mission and native schooling, Māori were becoming increasingly incensed and “vocal in protesting about the education system” (Simon, 1994, p. 72) and the inequalities it perpetuated against Māori children. The discourse of Māori tino rangatiratanga in

education was fast approaching where education designed by, with and for Māori, challenged Pākehā dominance and Pākehā culture, language and epistemological supremacy in the lives of Māori children.

In the early 1980s, as a number of Māori academics and educationalists became increasingly vocal about how the 'one size fits all' mainstream model of education did not work for them (Caccioppoli & Cullen, 2006; Durie, Hoskins & Jones, 2012), Māori communities rallied together and called for autonomy over the educational livelihoods of Māori children, rather than seeing children continually fall prey to a schooling system that was seen as not meeting Māori needs or aspirations. Kōhanga Reo were soon borne out of this, followed closely by Kura Kaupapa Māori, Wharekura and Whare Wānanga (Smith, 2000). Māori began to take educational matters into their own hands privileging and normalising Māori culture, language and identity. Graham Smith (1992) notes that two key ideologies curbed Māori interests propelled them towards theories of resistance and self-determination in education.

The first was the ideology of Pākehā knowledge and culture being seen as superior to Māori knowledge and culture. The second was the ideology that Pākehā knowledge held the liberating potential that Māori knowledge lacked. Smith has noted that such ideologies undermined Māori cultural norms and perpetuated Pākehā dominance in education "to the exclusion of Māori preferred interests in education" (Smith, 1992, pp. 99-100). The discourse of Māori resistance has resulted in educational structures that mirror and normalise Māori culture, language and knowledge.

The Education Act of 1989 saw a number of changes to the educational landscape for Māori. Kura Kaupapa Māori schools were given legal recognition for the first time, a Māori-medium advisory group on the Teachers' Council was

initialised, and mainstream schools had to ensure that their charters legally contained statements and sections that ensured their policies and practices reflected New Zealand cultural diversity, in particular, the unique position of Māori culture.

In 1998 Te Puni Kokiri, the Ministry of Māori Affairs, put out a report that identified the education system's underachievement for Māori. It was from this report that the first Māori education strategy (Ministry of Education, 2005) was collaboratively developed by the Ministry of Education and Te Puni Kokiri in 1999, and consequently republished in 2005 to reaffirm the Ministry's commitment to Māori education. Three core goals underpinned the first Māori education strategy. They were to "raise the quality of mainstream (English-medium) education", "support the growth of high quality kaupapa Māori education," and "support greater involvement and authority of Māori in education" (Ministry of Education, 2005, p. 4). The reaffirmed version of the Māori Education Strategy drew from Professor Mason Durie's address at the 2001 Hui Taumata Mātauranga where he articulated that there were three particular goals for education that were pertinent to Māori. They were noted as "enabling Māori to live as Māori", "facilitating participation as citizens of the world," and "contributing towards good health and a high standard of living" (Ministry of Education, 2005, p. 2).

In 2006, the Māori education strategy started to be redeveloped with a period of consultation in 2007 leading to the release of the first iteration of *Ka Hikitia* in April 2008 followed closely by an updated version in 2009 (Ministry of Education, 2009). Its mantra of '*Realising Māori Potential'* focused intently on how the education system had failed Māori rather than Māori students themselves. Through this turn of perspective, the system was expected to change and work to ensure maximising Māori student potential so that Māori would enjoy education success as Māori. This change

in thinking differed markedly from the assimilatory and integration policies of early Governments.

In 2013, the Ministry of Education (2013a) released the second phase of the Māori education policy strategy titled, '*Ka Hikitia – Accelerating Success 2013-2017*.' This refreshed version cites a number of things that the Ministry of Education felt worked well with the first rollout of the strategy and vision. The biggest gain mentioned was the fact that schools were seen to have sharpened their focus on Māori achievement, highlighting the specific learning needs of their Māori students. Again, the policy iterates that there is strong link between identity, language and culture in the literature when it states that, "Māori students do much better when education reflects and values their identity, language and culture" (Ministry of Education, 2013a, p. 6). This call to New Zealand mainstream schools to ensure that 'all Māori students, their parents and whānau participate in and contribute to an engaging and enjoyable educational journey that recognises and celebrates their unique identity, language and culture' (Ministry of Education, 2013a, p. 13) continues to show the differing trajectory that the assimilation and integration education policies prior to and following on from the 1877 Education Act sought to achieve. There was an expectation within this refreshed version of *Ka Hikitia* that by the release of the third phase it was projected that Māori would be academically achieving on a par with the total population by 2018 (Ministry of Education, 2013a).

In the most recent release of *Ka Hikitia* this goal has, again, been reiterated with a view to achieve shifts within the education system so that Māori would achieve excellent and equitable outcomes (Ministry of Education, 2020). Recent NCEA results from 2019 and 2020 available on the joint Ministry of Education and New Zealand Government website, *Education Counts* (2021), would suggest that despite such

rhetoric, Māori students continue to underachieve at a disproportionate rate to that of their non-Māori peers. School leavers' attainment data, the main reporting measure for the Ministry of Education, sees a continuing trend of disproportionate Māori student achievement.

NCEA Lev. 1 +: Total Cohort: 88.4%; Māori cohort: 76.7%
NCEA Lev. 2 +: Total Cohort: 80.8%; Māori cohort: 66.1%
NCEA Lev. 3/UE: Total Cohort: 59.1%; Māori cohort: 40.3%

(Education Counts, 2021)

Since the mid-1950s, armed with varying policy tools and strategies, successive governments have attempted to address the 'problem' of disproportionate Māori student achievement. Yet, despite the range of policies, achievement rates between Māori and non-Māori continue to be disproportionate.

2.2 Explaining Disproportionate Māori Student Achievement

A number of competing theories and explanations exist as to why this disproportionate rate of Māori achievement has continued to occur over the past six to seven decades in New Zealand schools. What follows is an examination of four key discourses on disproportionate Māori achievement that are prominent in the research and literature at present.

2.2.1 Deficit Theorising. One theory that offers an explanation for the disproportionate achievement of Māori students is the notion of 'deficit theorising' (Macfarlane, 2004), also referred to in the literature as 'cultural deficit theory' or 'teacher deficit theorising' (Bishop, Berryman, Tiakiwai, & Richardson, 2003). In its

simplest terms, deficit theorising refers to attributing Māori educational underachievement to Māori learners and/or their families. Some examples of how deficit theorising might be made manifest in thought and attitude can include but are not limited to the following examples: i) that Māori are inherently lazy; ii) that Māori children come from deprived homes; or iii) that Māori are intellectually inferior to non-Māori. Bishop et al. (2003) collectively label all forms of 'finger-pointing' at Māori children and their families for Māori student underachievement as deficit theorising.

Bishop (2003) further iterates that deficit theorising has a number of guises. Drawing from the conceptual work of Elbaz (in Bishop, 2003) and Heshusius (in Bishop, 2003) he maintains that the images that teachers hold and the principles and practices that they consequently develop from those images are based on teachers' "concise, clearly stated prescriptions for action" (p. 225). Bishop (2003) goes on to relate their conceptual work to the issue of disproportionate Māori underachievement when he states that,

> …if the imagery that teachers hold of Māori children…along with their interaction patterns, continues to be one of deficit, then their principles and practices will reflect this, and will thereby perpetuate the educational crisis for Māori children.
>
> (Bishop, 2003, p. 234)

Donaldson (2012) echoes this when articulating that when teachers view their Māori students in a deficit manner, "it is mirrored by students in terms of having lower expectations of themselves" (p. 50). Similarities can be found in White's (2001) study on differential education attainment in Fiji between 'backwards Fijians' and 'advanced

Fijian Indians' whereby receptivity towards cultural deficit theorising is strongly linked to "surviving stereotypes about group attributes originating from colonial discursive practices" (p. 305) that rationalises the colonial status quo. White's fieldwork saw deficit theorising alluded to by principals, teachers and school staff when they talked about things like Fijian parents' lack of interest in schooling, their poor attendance at parent/teacher interviews and their lack of support for their own children's learning.

2.2.2 Monocultural Schools & the 'Culture Thesis' Concept. Linked to the notion of deficit theorising is an assimilationist position rooted in New Zealand's colonial history whereby schools assume that Māori students must shed their indigenous skins to effectively participate in mainstream education (Weir, 2012). Monocultural classroom practices are seen as contributing to disproportionate Māori achievement by isolating, marginalizing and perpetuating the non-participation of young Māori from the educational benefits that schools have to offer by forcing them to leave their identities at the classroom door (Bishop et al., 2003).

Berryman and Woller (2013) support this notion when they state that learning difficulties experienced by Māori students in mainstream schools are often due in part to cultural differences between them and the values and beliefs of their teachers and schools that stems from the imposition of a colonial system of how school ought to be. They proffer that the "subsequent intergenerational suppression of cultural values, reinforced by the education system…continues to be a marginalizing factor in Māori student achievement today" (Berryman & Woller, 2013, p. 827).

This 'cultural mismatch' (Macfarlane, 2004) discourse has been well documented by a number of academics with supporting arguments encouraging schools and classrooms to become less monocultural and urging them instead to be a

place where young students' sense-making processes (cultures) are incorporated and enhanced (Bishop, 2003). Cooper (2012) critically conceives of this rationale as the "culture thesis" (p. 68). He outlines that implicit to the culture thesis is "the proposition that the reason for poor provision of services for Māori, or negative attitudes towards Māori, is simply a lack of awareness of how Māori are culturally different" (p. 68). He goes on to suggest that the resolution to this, under the culture thesis, is for those unfamiliar with Māori culture and lacking in culturally responsive skills, to undertake some form of training or professional development.

Macfarlane (2004) supports this by advocating that teachers and educators need to look at the cultural mismatch between monocultural schools and Māori students as a contributing factor in understanding Māori underachievement. He has outlined a culturally responsive model of learning and teaching that affirms the validity and legitimacy of Māori knowledge, language and culture with real-life examples for teacher and principals to use in their classrooms and schools.

Similarly, Tomlins-Jahnke (2012) presents a case study based on an initiative called the Ngāti Kahungunu Cultural Standards Project (NKCSP). This iwi and government partnership scheme aims to give Māori children located within the Ngāti Kahungunu tribal area with Ngāti Kahungunu linguistic and cultural knowledge in order to ensure Māori student academic success. The main focus is on the 93 per cent of Māori children in the mainstream schools within the Ngāti Kahungunu area with the core assumption that through linguistic and cultural knowledge, Māori students will enjoy success in education.

Milne (2013) supports this when she articulates that in mainstream New Zealand schools, being 'white' is the norm. She calls for a questioning of New Zealand's education policies and practices as she argues that they are Eurocentric in

nature, “relegating non-White children to the margins” (p. vi). She rightly argues that young Māori and Pasifika students a right for all aspects of their learning to be supported by “pedagogies that ‘colour in’ the white school spaces” (p. 281).

Penetito (2010) also theoretically and philosophically critiques the monocultural nature of the New Zealand mainstream education system. He notes that the system,

> …seems to prefer operating under the guise of finding solutions for the Ngati Haua problem – or the Māori problem, or the American Indian problem – rather than looking at itself. It externalizes the problem and does not bring itself into the equation.
>
> (Penetito, 2010, p. 30)

However, where Penetito differs from others is that while he embraces the notion that Māori have historically wanted more of their language, knowledge and cultural values injected into the mainstream education system he is critical of Māori education policies that addressed cultural elements (i.e., Te Reo, pōwhiri, karakia) to the detriment of structural elements (i.e., power relations, regulations, accountabilities). In citing examples from his time in London on a fellowship reading anti-racist and multicultural education he encountered groups of Indian and Afro-Caribbean community members who were wanting change within their children’s schools in regard to the cultural discrimination that they faced. Penetito (2010) noted that the discrimination, as argued by such community members, “could not be overcome by schools taking part in ethnic minority celebrations once or twice a year, nor would learning a few phrases or greetings in the languages represented by the student population make the slightest inroads into…raising student achievement” (p. 34).

Garrick Cooper (2012) notes the veracity with which the culture thesis has been taken up and become very popular in New Zealand education over the past twenty-five years. He states that it has various discursive manifestations including "culturally responsive pedagogy, cultural awareness, culturally sensitive, cultural safety, culturally appropriate, culturally relevant, and cultural competencies" (p. 68). He articulates that implied in the cultural thesis is the notion that "poor provision of services for Māori…is simply a lack of awareness of how Māori are culturally different…The way to address such conflicts is for those who are unfamiliar with Māori culture to undertake some type of awareness training" (p. 68).

2.2.3 Socio-economic Status, Home Resources & Poverty. Another of the well-documented explanations of disproportionate Māori student underachievement is that of working-class socio-economic status, the lack of resources and poverty (Gutschlag, 2007; Marie, Fergusson, & Boden, 2008; Nash, 2001; Song, Perry, & McConney, 2014). These three interrelated effects stem from the notion that family income, associated socialization effects and lack of resources explains a much bigger proportion of the variance in primary school achievement.

In support of this, Nash (2001) has contended that family resources effects are a credible factor in regard to inequality in education for Māori. The accompanying working class, early childhood socialization practices of many Māori, inculcates them with a deeply instituted working class culture that contributes to underachievement in schools. Song, Perry and McConney (2014) maintain that poverty and home resources account for more of the achievement gaps between Māori and non-Māori and "such social forces are outside the control of education policy-makers" (p. 195).

The statistical analysis carried out by Marie, Fergusson and Boden (2008) similarly points to socio-economic status as being the main determinant of Māori

educational underachievement. While they highlight that Māori have been subjected to disadvantage via an imposed curriculum and that cultural differences do play a critical role in explaining disproportionate Māori underachievement, socio-economic factors play a much greater role than ethnic or cultural differences. Their findings suggest that the "educational underachievement of Māori…were, for the most part, explained by their exposure to family socio-economic disadvantage in childhood rather than factors relating to cultural identity" (p. 192). The researchers go on to express the lack of direct evidence that show cultural factors contribute to Māori being disadvantaged in education. They state that current demands for culturally responsive pedagogy in mainstream schools and Māori-centred education systems are based more on "concerns about social equity" (Marie, Fergusson, & Boden, 2008, p. 193) rather than evidenced social factors "such as exposure to relative socio-economic deprivation" (ibid, p. 194).

Nash (2001) has supported this in his research where he has articulated that the "effect of class background on intellectual development, almost certainly generated by the processes of linguistic and cognitive socialisation" (p. 31) provides evidence enough to suggest that the socio-economic status of one's family rather than cultural differences explains Māori disproportionate achievement rates. He outlines a key mechanism that drives the underachievement of working-class students. Nash maintains that there is an uneven distribution of necessary early childhood socialisation and cognitive functioning practices among working-class students. These loosely defined but related cluster of practices are linked to socio-economic status and what parents are able to offer their children as they grow (i.e., from having regular bedtime stories, parental aspirations for their child's education, support with

schoolwork). In articulating his perspective, Nash is fully aware that his research flies in the face of current conventional educational parlay when he states that:

> The hypothesis that Māori students as a whole underachieve in school basically because of the class-resource-based practices of their families…is readily criticised as a deficit theory that ignores the relevance of Māori culture, and as an exemplification of the neglect with which Māori culture is treated by mainstream academic discourse.
>
> (Nash, 2001, p. 35)

Chapple (in Lourie & Rata, 2014) supports Nash in his identification of 'class culture' as a key factor in disproportionate Māori achievement. He states that those Māori students who underachieve are,

> …sole Māori with low literacy, poor education, and living in geographical concentrations that have socio-economic problems, not the Māori ethnic group as a whole. There are probably also sub-cultural associations with benefit dependence, sole parenthood, early natality, drug and alcohol abuse, physical violence, and illegal cash-cropping.
>
> (Chapple, 2000, in Lourie & Rata, 2014, p. 29)

Lourie and Rata (2014) go on to explain a number of research studies that have shown the link between socio-economic location and the disproportionate achievement of Māori children. They cite a study carried out by Cathy Wylie (in Lourie & Rata, 2014), which found that family income and maternal qualification significantly explained differential achievement. Likewise, they cite the work of Biddulph, Biddulph, and Biddulph (in Lourie & Rata, 2014). They highlighted that

children's achievement is confounded by socioeconomic status with Māori and Pasifika children occupying the lower levels of the socioeconomic (SES) scale.

Madland and Bunker (2011) support this when they argue that middle-class parents are more inclined to get involved in making their children's schools better places, "pushing to raise educational standards" and "some of the culture of and behaviours that middle-class parents pass on to their children about education, such as valuing school achievement and attending school, are thought to come from their middle position in society with a level of income and security" (pp. 1-2). They cite a significant body of research that finds that "countries with lower levels of economic inequality do better academically than countries with greater levels of economic inequality" (p. 4). They maintain that unlike those in poverty, the middle class make long-term educational investments in their children and are less likely to reject such values. Madland and Bunker (2011) argue that those at the bottom of the socio-economic ladder are more likely to develop an oppositional stance to education, learning and schooling as "they don't see a clear path to success" (p. 8) like middle-class families.

2.2.4 Complex Māori Social Realities. A small but growing body of local literature critiques the cultural thesis that is currently dominant in New Zealand education. Rather than seeing the issue of Māori disproportionate underachievement as being due to cultural and political forces whereby Māori are subjected to a mono-cultural system of education that privileges Western/European ways of knowing and identity, some academics are arguing that modern Māori inhabit a much more complex, multi-faceted world than the predominant uni-causal, culturalist explanations aforementioned. Nash (2005) moved on from his sole explanations for disproportionate Māori underachievement, such as teacher deficit theorising, as he

suggested that disparities are, in reality, much more complex than ‘blaming’ one thing or another. Rata (2012) supports this by arguing against importing cultural solutions to address the issue of Māori underachievement. She instead proffers that Māori are subject to complex social realities and therefore sole theories of underachievement and their solution-based practices are meaningless and will do nothing to address Māori underachievement.

This is extended in Lourie and Rata’s (2014) theoretical examination of why Māori students achieve disproportionately to that of their peers. They strongly critique the cultural thesis that underpins culturally responsive approaches to schooling in New Zealand. They argue that Māori have complex social realities, such as identity, whereby nearly half of Māori also identify as having European ethnic links. With this example and many others at hand, Lourie and Rata maintain that “the reasons for Māori underachievement may be found in the complex mix of demographics, ethnic identification, and socio-economic class location” (p. 26).

Rata’s (2012) social realist research reiterates this perspective when she argues that empirical evidence indicates that Māori inhabit a much more complex and ambiguous social reality than the one proffered by cultural thesis advocates. She maintains that addressing Māori disproportionate underachievement lies not in culturalist solutions whereby Māori culture, language and identity is recapitulated and normalised in mainstream schools but in the acknowledgement of the range of identities (i.e., ethnic, gender, age) and social realities (i.e., socio-economic, spiritual, familial) with which modern Māori occupy. She maintains that cultural solutions are not the answer to disproportionate Māori student achievement. Rata (2012) openly critiques claims made by indigenous and critical scholars that models of schooling

based on cultural and linguistic identity assist in leveraging rates of achievement for Māori.

Caccioppoli and Cullen (2006) iterate a similar perspective when they contend that no one theory of underachievement provides a full answer in regard to Māori. They state that deficit theorising holds some truth and ecological explanatory models (i.e., socio-economic class; mono-cultural schooling) hold some truth but lack in being able to provide a full picture of the complex nature of Māori underachievement. What Caccioppoli and Cullen provide is a review of all sole-causal models which claim to explain why Māori students underachieve disproportionately to that of their peers while at the same critiquing those who minimise and discount other explanatory models.

While Rata (2012) claims to consider disproportionate Māori achievement from a broad and multi-faceted perspective, she outrightly discounts the voice discourse approach that underpins the much needed focus on enacting Māori culture and language within mainstream schools. Rata (2012) states that such an approach "tends to obfuscate the contradictions and ambiguities of a complex social reality" (p. 1069). How can a complex rendering of disproportionate Māori student achievement wholly exclude indigenous voices and experiences within the mainstream schooling setting? While some theorists call for a broader policy consideration of how to understand disproportionate Māori student achievement, others 'dress up' their theories as complex, while concomitantly negating the very voices for whom such policies impact.

2.3 Ka Hikitia: Prioritisation of the 'Culture Thesis'

The contestable nature of these contrasting theories on why disproportionate Māori achievement continues to occur is played out in the literature and research. What is of interest is that the rhetoric of the monocultural schooling and the 'culture thesis' concept has prominence at the governmental level in regard to educational policy pertaining to Māori and has had some dominance over the last thirty years. In flipping the assimilatory and integration intent of past education policies, *Ka Hikitia* moves away from the theories of Māori deficit toward a call for schools and teachers to become more culturally responsive in the way they 'do' education. This section will briefly outline the genesis of this move in theory and policy for Māori educational benefit.

2.3.1 From Māori Deficit to Changing the Monocultural. The key policy initiative pertaining to education of tamariki Māori at present is *Ka Hikitia* (Ministry of Education, 2020). This policy differs markedly from the assimilatory policies of the past.

In *Ka Hikitia* there is a significant move away from thinking of Māori in deficit terms. Whereas policies of the past focused intently on the 'shortcomings', 'gaps' and 'needs' of Māori students and their whānau, current policies prioritise structural change and readily acknowledge the government's failure in the past to adequately provide for Māori educational aspirations within the mainstream schooling context. The second key feature of this policy initiative is the underlying idea that Māori ought to be achieving and enjoying educational success as Māori. This recognition of difference through the problematising of the 'one size fits all' model is a progressive step forward in governmental thinking.

Professor Wally Penetito (2010) supports this renewed focus when he states that education institutions are starting to question themselves and are giving attention to changing the structural elements in mainstream education. Through structural change Māori things are embraced more fully rather than as peripheral archaisms and this is argued by Penetito as being the key to addressing Māori underachievement in mainstream schools. The Office of the Auditor-General (2013) has also noted that rather than blaming students and families for Māori student underachievement, schools are changing through incorporating a range of activities and programmes designed for the purpose of more adequately meeting the achievement needs of Māori students. Song et al. (2014) reiterate this call for structural change when they state that "substantial differences in educational outcomes between groups of individuals are a cause for concern. Such differences suggest that social and educational forces, policies and structures are systematically privileging some groups over others" (p. 178) and are in need of change.

2.3.2 Structural Changes Through School Policies & Practices. To address this, the Ministry of Education have released a number of supporting documents aimed at giving breadth and depth to the *Ka Hikitia* vision of ensuring Māori identity, language, and culture are seamlessly integrated into mainstream school structures. A sample of these will be briefly discussed to help provide a picture of the current policy drive aimed at structural change.

Tātaiako (Ministry of Education, 2011) outlines five teacher competencies when working with Māori learners that are aligned to the national Registered Teacher Criteria and Graduating Teacher Standards. Boards of Trustees have a specific document (Ministry of Education, 2013b) that provides governance guidelines in addressing Māori underachievement through data-driven initiatives and self-review

processes. It is hoped that collecting presence and achievement data, Te Reo and tikanga data and productive partnerships with whānau data, will help to cement structural changes in mainstream schools for Māori educational benefit. Group Special Education have developed *Te Hikoitanga: The Journey* (Group Special Education & Ministry of Education, 2008), an aspirational professional development chart aimed to develop culturally responsive educators when working with Māori. The *Māori Success: Complementary Evaluation Framework* put out by the Education Review Office (2012) provides a helpful set of focus questions aimed at enabling internal school self-review and external ERO reviews in light of ensuring Māori are achieving educational success as Māori.

At the policy level these documents demonstrate the significant move away from the deficit view that dominated Māori education policy in the past. Along with this change to policy, there has also been a flow-on change to what teachers are expected to practice in the classroom to meet Māori students' achievement needs more readily.

Another manner in which current policy attempts to address this systematic privileging of some groups over others is through the suggestion that culturally responsive professional development for teachers is imperative and necessary to enhance engagement and raise the achievement of Māori students (Bishop, 2012; Bishop, Ladwig, & Berryman, 2014; Mugisha, 2013; Smyth, 2013). Bishop, O'Sullivan and Berryman (2010) have argued that a sustained paradigm shift in how teachers relate to and consider their Māori students is needed to create a classroom environment that nurtures improved Māori achievement. Habib, Densmore-James and Macfarlane (2013) support this when they maintain that teachers and principals need to adjust their practices by providing school instruction that is tailored to their

culturally and linguistically diverse students' specific cultural needs. The authors suggest that when teachers make changes to their practices due to a consideration of how different cultural factors impact education, Māori students can achieve academic success.

Hawes (2011, 2012a, 2012b) holds up exemplars of mainstream schools that have turned things around for Māori students by incorporating a number of processes and approaches in their schools. Aspects such as whānaungatanga, hui, awhi and aroha are interwoven in the delivery of the curriculum and teachers participate in relevant professional development. Berryman and Woller (2013) support this when they argue that effective interventions for Māori are to be found in both the cultural and spiritual Māori worldview. Berryman's '*Ngā Pumanawa*' model is noted which was developed out of her research with whānau, students and staff from different mainstream schools. Her participants articulated that considering both the cultural and spiritual domains of Māori was necessary to affect engagement, build capacity and ensure Māori enjoy success as Māori.

Stewart (2012) iterates these thoughts when she contends that even though Māori students may be located in the mainstream, they "have a right to be educated in a way that promotes and protects Māori identity and its elements such as te reo me ona tikanga (Māori language and culture)" (p. 54). In support of this, Bishop, Ladwig, and Berryman's (2014) research has found that effective discursive practices are needed to improve Māori student achievement and such practices "will only occur on the foundation of whānaungatanga" (p. 210).

2.3.3 Challenges to Teacher Enactment of Ka Hikitia. Despite the breadth of support in the research and literature for a range of approaches and changes that meet the current Ministry mandate of ensuring that Māori enjoy and achieve education

success as Māori, there are a number of challenges raised in the literature and research that need to be acknowledged. What follows is an outline of some of the challenges and problems that have arisen at policy, school and teacher level since the inception of *Ka Hikitia*.

An audit carried out by the Office of the Auditor-General (2013) highlighted the Ministry of Education's mismanagement of *Ka Hikitia*, saying that its rollout was extremely poor in places. It was introduced "slowly and unsteadily"; there was evidence of "poor planning", "poor programme and project management" and "ineffective communication with schools" (p. 7). While it was highlighted that *Ka Hikitia* helped sharpen schools' focus on improving educational outcomes for their Māori students, the flow-on effect of the poorly executed rollout has had implications in mainstream classrooms. Their research showed that most schools have been sent the policy document but unfortunately left to their own devices about how to ensure Māori were enjoying and achieving educational success as Māori. The Office of the Auditor-General (2013) has noted that without the appropriate guidance and support many teachers have been left adrift with the policy having little or no impact.

Goren's (2009) independent evaluation of the *Ka Hikitia* strategy also noted this lack of guidance for teachers and schools. He found that education initiative after education initiative fall onto principals' and teachers' desks and that school staff could not keep up with the vast number of them. The lack of professional development for school staff and lack of instructions for integrating and implementing *Ka Hikitia* has left many teachers and principals clueless as to how it ought to best be utilized.

This need for teacher professional development in the area of culturally responsive pedagogy in New Zealand has been highlighted in research (Hynds, Sleeter, Hindle, Savage, Penetito, & Meyer, 2011). It has been noted that teachers require more

technical-rational professional development opportunities to "give insight into Māori concepts, language and knowledge" (p. 349) and how such concepts can be integrated into mainstream schools in a non-tokenistic and non-iconographic manner.

A progress report completed by the Education Review Office (2010) revealed that many mainstream schools were not demonstrating sufficient commitment to ensuring the progress and achievement of Māori students. Similarly, McLeod and Kenrick (2013) note that *Tātaiako* is poorly understood and under-utilised by teachers. Added to this, further research and literature suggests that in an effort to do 'something' related to Māori, teachers are struggling to provide learning and engagement that is authentic and non-tokenistic for their Māori students.

Bishop (2012) acknowledges the difficulties that teachers face to provide a culturally responsive learning context for Māori students when he states that, "a typical initial reaction is to see culture in terms of the teacher's own needs to incorporate cultural iconography, to learn to pronounce Māori words and names correctly, and/or to incorporate Māori examples into their lessons" (p.43). Such an approach puts the teacher and their interpretations of culture at the centre of Māori students' learning. Siteine (2013) echoes Bishop's thoughts when stating that the concept of identity in the New Zealand Curriculum is complex and unexplained and because of this, teachers are "compelled to use personal and social knowledge to interpret curriculum requirements that may not be intended" (p.99) which in turn creates ambiguity and leads to a promotion and privileging of a particular view of Māori identity.

Bishop (2012) contends that another core problem faced by principals and teachers is the confusion they face in regard to what constitutes the 'culture' for the Māori child. Through his work he has encountered teachers who conceptualise 'culture' in a "static, representational and iconographic" (p. 43) manner. Hence, the

tendency for teachers to consider 'culture' in classrooms as referring to Māori tikanga, or customs. Bishop (2012) goes on to state that teachers see culture in terms of the teacher's own needs,

> …to incorporate cultural iconography, to learn to pronounce Māori words and names correctly, and/or to incorporate Māori examples into their lessons…The tendency among teachers – the legacy of the Taha Māori programmes in New Zealand schools – is to see culture as an external commodity, which they need to import into the classroom in order for them to understand their students and provide their students with authentic learning experiences.
>
> (Bishop, 2012, p. 43)

Hutchings, Barnes, Taupo, Bright, Pihama, and Lee (2012) similarly argue against this iconographic approach. Their research gathered the voices of whānau and asked whether or not they were satisfied with mainstream education for their tamariki. One whānau member stated:

> It's not just kupu and it's not just kapa haka, there is a whole other side of Māori culture that they're not really tapping into.
>
> (p. 3)

Durie (in Durie et al., 2012) supports this lack of authenticity evident in some schools when he states that in the schooling context, "simply learning about 'things Māori' is not the same as being guided by an evolving knowledge system called mātauranga Māori" (p.23). He goes on to argue that mātauranga Māori is an adaptive form of knowledge that is susceptible to change. This is a markedly different approach from the static, representational and iconographic modes often seen in schools.

Durie (in Durie et al., 2012) challenges the static, representational form often seen in schools when he asserts that "some people think that Māori knowledge is something ancient, and therefore static" (p. 23). He goes on, "But when you look back on ancient times, mātauranga Māori was an evolving form of knowledge. You didn't survive otherwise. You had to adapt to new situations all the time" (p. 23).

Garrick Cooper has argued that the *Ka Hikitia* prioritisation of the culture thesis is highly problematic. He maintains that "much educational policy and discourse concerning Māori achievement continues to rest on cultural, not epistemological, imperatives" (p. 68). Cooper (2012) argues that the culture thesis, as promoted and prioritised in *Ka Hikitia*, "proposes that teachers learn 'cultural' aspects of Māori students' being in order to assist them to 'succeed' or 'achieve' learning knowledge (the hitherto unchallenged knowledge)" (p. 68). This, Cooper suggests, continues the assimilationist agenda through integrating 'Māori culture' into mainstream schooling, manifesting coloniality, "reinforcing Western epistemologies as normative" (p. 71) and reducing Māori epistemologies to mere culture and wisdom. This casting of Māori as producers of culture rather than knowledge and the perception of viewing Māori primarily in cultural terms exacerbates what Du Bois (in Cooper, 2012) calls 'double-consciousness'. Cooper (2012) notes that "it becomes a disembodied way of understanding ourselves and who we are. If we accept that we are primarily cultural, then we accept the stories of us as being an exotic and different Other" (p. 69).

Hetaraka (2019) shares Cooper's concern and also argues against prioritisation of the culture thesis in *Ka Hikitia* and insists that mātauranga Māori needs to be the basis of a structure of knowledge in any strategy aimed at addressing Māori achievement. She notes that "these highly specialised areas of knowledge are collapsed into paragraph definitions, then left open to interpretation and modification by

professionals who have varying levels of understanding" (Hetaraka, 2019, p. 166). Like Cooper, Hetaraka critiques the notion of *Ka Hikitia* promoting Māori as being primarily identified in cultural terms. She iterates that "individuals have numerous identities…identities are fluid and dynamic" (p. 166) and that while *Ka Hikitia* aims to ensure that Māori achieve and enjoy academic success as Māori, "there is little explanation as to what "as Māori" means" (p167). Hetaraka notes that there is a lack of provision in *Ka Hikitia* for the "acknowledgement and management of multiple, fluid and dynamic identities" (p. 167) nor a mechanism whereby teachers can "develop understandings that might assist them to mediate the loss of identity as Māori caused by the intrusion of colonisation" (p. 167). Hetaraka also suggests that by Māori accepting our status as being primarily cultural, we then also buy into a range of stereotypes about ourselves; that we are "kinaesthetic, oral and aural, and learn best in group situations" (Hetaraka, p. 164). There is little emphasis in *Ka Hikitia* about Māori as individuals or Māori having a range of shifting and fluid identities. Without this acknowledgement there is danger in making the term 'as Māori' become "another white space" (Hetaraka, 2019, p. 167) whereby Māori are defined in stereotyped ways to appease white consciousness and to fulfil needs of being able to define and hence control and measure, the Other.

Hetaraka (2019) raises a strong argument in regard to a sole focus on teacher responsibility for Māori student education success. She notes that the cultural competencies within the *Ka Hikitia* document charges teachers with ensuring that they examine and adapt their pedagogical practices for the benefit of Māori achievement. What she questions is that with the intent of the policy being so fixated and focused in on teachers being solely responsible for raising Māori achievement, the curriculum and other deeper educational structures are left unexamined without criticality. She

maintains that such a focus on the teacher as being solely responsible for Māori academic success is not only misguided but collapses all other relationships (i.e., students' social relationships, a multitude of power relationships, structural and institutional inequalities) into one primary relationship; that of the Māori student and their teacher. Hetaraka (2019) states that this "gives teachers a misleading sense of the work required of them" (p. 168) and puts a whole lot of unnecessary pressure upon them.

A final critique of the *Ka Hikitia* policy lies in the failure of its own objective to ensure that Māori students would be achieving on par with the total population. A specific goal outlined in *Ka Hikitia* (2013) projected that by 2018-2022 Māori students would be achieving at least on a par with the total population (p. 8). This would come into effect through sustained system-wide change in the sector and innovative community, iwi and Māori-led models of educational provision. Despite this, Māori continue to achieve disproportionately to that of their peers.

The 2019 and 2020 NCEA School Leavers' results in *Table 1* below indicate a continuing pattern of disproportionate achievement for Māori.

Table 1: 2019 and 2020 NCEA School Leavers' Attainment: Ethnicity

	Year	*Asian*	*Pākeha*	*Pacific*	*Māori*	*Average*
NCEA Lev. 1+	*2020*	*96.1%*	*90.7%*	*86.6%*	*77.5%*	*88.4%*
	2019	*94.5%*	*90.8%*	*85.1%*	*79.1%*	*87.3%*
NCEA Lev. 2+	*2020*	*93.0%*	*83.3%*	*78.4%*	*66.1%*	*80.8%*
	2019	*90.0%*	*82.7%*	*75.1%*	*66.0%*	*79.5%*
	2020	*81.3%*	*60.4%*	*55.8%*	*40.3%*	*59.1%*

NCEA Lev. 3 / UE	*2019*	*75.9%*	*57.6%*	*47.8%*	*36.8%*	*55.0%*

(Education Counts, 2021)

Despite the targeted efforts to improve the cultural capability of teachers and responsiveness of mainstream New Zealand schools over the varying iterations of *Ka Hikitia*, the current data suggests that Māori students continue to achieve disproportionately to that of their peers.

Data of school leavers' attainment in NCEA suggests that a clear positive correlation can be seen between the socio-economic mix of the school (decile) a student attends and the percentage of school leavers attaining at least an NCEA Level 1, 2 and 3 qualification or equivalent (Education Counts, 2021). The percentage of students from the highest socio-economic schools (decile 9 and 10 schools) that passed their 2019 NCEA Levels 1 and 2 were 95.8 and 91.3 per cent respectively. This is compared to the percentage of students from the lowest socio-economic schools (decile 1 and 2 schools) that passed their 2019 NCEA Levels 1 and 2 at a rate of 77.8 and 64.9 per cent respectively. Similarities can be seen in regard to attainment of NCEA Level 3 with students from the highest socio-economic schools, decile 9 and 10 schools, almost twice as likely to achieve this compared to students from the lowest socio-economic schools, decile 1 and 2 schools. With Māori students located largely in lower decile schools, could *Ka Hikitia*, with its inherent focus on culture, language and identity, be limiting how the 'problem' of disproportionate Māori student achievement be thought of and represented? In essence, is *Ka Hikitia's* silence on the impact of socio-economic factors upon the education achievement of a large number of Māori students, limiting educational policy responses for Māori?

2.4 New Zealand Research: Teacher Enactment of Culturally Responsive Pedagogy

What follows is a brief review of local research and literature in regard to teacher enactment of Māori culture, language and identity in mainstream schools. It outlines that while there is a degree of success evident in pockets around New Zealand, as noted in the previous section, a number of challenges are faced by primary teachers in numerous mainstream schools such as a lack of professional development opportunities and an inevitability of incorporating tokenistic and iconographic Māori content rather than the culturally responsive approaches articulated in *Ka Hikitia.*

While much literature supports the Ministry of Education's *Ka Hikitia* policy stance, very little empirical research exists on the impact of culturally responsive pedagogical approaches upon aspects such as teacher practice, improved whānau/school relations and Māori student academic achievement rates. What follows is a brief synopsis of empirical work carried out by researchers who have noted a range of benefits and challenges faced by teachers and principals enacting culturally responsive practices and interventions.

One of the main culturally responsive professional development programmes over the last two decades designed specifically for the New Zealand context is '*Te Kotahitanga'*. Having started in 2001 and with centralised funding for *Te Kotahitanga* ceasing in 2013, a wealth of research data has evolved from the years of work that facilitators have been into New Zealand mainstream high schools with the explicit aim of helping teachers to "improve the achievement of Māori students by focusing on relationships between themselves and the students within a cultural pedagogy of relations" (Meyer, Penetito, Hynds, Savage, Hindle, & Sleeter, 2010, p. 15). This

relationship-based professional development programme differs from other professional development initiatives. Rather than being driven by professional or adult stakeholders, the model is purportedly "grounded in the voices of Māori students as they articulated what does and does not work for them in school, and how they have been victimised by teacher deficit theorising coupled with a transmission approach to teaching" (ibid, p. 17). The model links in culturally relevant/relationship-based pedagogy alongside implementation of an Effective Teaching Profile (see Berryman & Bishop, 2011). While *Te Kotahitanga* has formally ended, Alton-Lee (2015) contends that "no future policy designed to bring about equitable educational outcomes for Māori should ignore the evidence base it has created" (p. 12).

A number of mainstream high schools with high Māori student populations have participated in the *Te Kotahitanga* professional development programme over its five phases of implementation. Evidence from the evaluation report of 2004 – 2008 (Meyer et al., 2010) confirmed a number of benefits. Teachers valued relationship-based pedagogies with the majority of teachers affirming that "Te Kotahitanga professional development had an impact on classroom instruction leading to enhanced outcomes for Māori students" (p. 2). Teachers also spoke of the types of improvements that occurred in their classrooms including a change in teacher beliefs, expectations and understandings and an increasing awareness of Māori students' needs "such as valuing, respecting and including Māori students' language and/or cultural knowledge" (p. 2). There was a growth in the awareness of Māori issues, language, identity, and pedagogy and of note were attitudinal shifts that had taken place for a number of teachers.

One of the key findings in the 2010 report was that implementation of *Te Kotahitanga* caused some initial division amongst staff members, especially amongst

those "whose different perspective on enhancing student achievement may result in resistance" (Meyer et al., 2010, p. 134). The report also highly criticised the fact that schools involved in the professional development programme were not seeing the shifts in achievement data for Māori as anticipated.

Alton-Lee (2015) did a follow–up report on *Te Kotahitanga* after its cessation, analysing the effectiveness of Phase 5 of the project. Evidence from that report noted a number of areas of growth from the 2010 report, in particular, accelerated shifts in achievement data for Māori students in participating schools.

Data from this final phase revealed that "the achievement of Māori students (as measured by NCEA levels 1-3) in Phase 5 schools improved at around three times the rate of Māori in the comparison schools" (Alton-Lee, 2015, p. 7) and "by 2012 the achievement of year 12 Māori in the phase 5 schools (mean decile = 3) was on a par with the achievement of year 12 Māori compared across all deciles" (ibid, p. 7). Sleeter (in Alton-Lee, 2015) noted how pleased she was to see that the lack of impact of *Te Kotahitanga* on Māori students' academic achievement during her earlier analysis in 2010 was starting to be evidenced as the programme moved into this latter phase. Alton-Lee (2015) concludes that what *Te Kotahitanga* Phase 5 achieved 'was an accelerated improvement trajectory for Māori students' (p. 71) at a time when "the OECD was reporting the New Zealand secondary education system to be in a period of accelerating decline" (p. 71). She surmises that such an accomplishment "is particularly remarkable in the context of the wider evidence base that indicates that many well-intended interventions have little (or even negative) impact on Māori achievement" (p. 71). Thus, she turns to the Ministry of Education with the recommendation that they will "need to develop highly effective interventions to

support accelerated improvement across primary and intermediate schools too" (p. 72) in order for sustained momentum to not be lost.

ERO released a progress report in 2010 on the manner in which schools and teachers promote success for Māori students. Of the 287 primary and secondary schools reviewed in the middle of 2009, approximately a third of the school had high or substantially improved Māori student achievement data. These effective schools were seen to have "a climate in which te ao Māori was recognized, respected and valued" (ERO, 2010, p. 3). Common characteristics included positive teacher-student relationships, culturally responsive teaching, and school leaders and teachers had an understanding of the centrality of te reo me ngā tikanga in the curriculum of the school.

ERO (2010) also noted a number of concerns that they had in relation to how schools and teachers were lacking in this regard. They had a huge concern over the lack of professional responsibility that a number of educators had, especially those who did not provide a learning environment that promoted success for Māori students. Other concerns included the way in which some "schools put in place initiatives for all students rather than Māori per se" (p. 3) and that despite widespread information and support being available, a substantial proportion of schools did not "review their own performance in relation to Māori student achievement" (p. 1). They go on to argue that despite clear expectations from the government, "for a significant group of New Zealand schools Māori success is not yet given sufficiently high priority" (p. 3).

There are a number of smaller empirical studies that have examined the phenomenon of culturally responsive teaching in mainstream New Zealand schools. Averill's (2012) small-scale study explored the views of six teachers and one hundred and thirty-six students on how Māori and Pacific heritages were reflected in mathematics learning in high schools. Her findings indicated that "substantive

incorporation of heritage cultures in mathematics instruction requires changes in teacher and student beliefs regarding the place of heritage cultures within mathematics learning" (p. 157). Implications from her study included the need for more mathematics resources based on Māori and Pacific Nations' cultures and a need for further professional development for teachers.

A pilot study carried out by Gordon-Burns and Campbell (2014) examined early childhood pre-service teachers' attitudes towards biculturalism as they were concerned over teachers' lack of commitment to biculturalism and te ao Māori once they had graduated. It was interesting to note that the findings included the following: 1) a number of students lacked an awareness of biculturalism; 2) while many had students had examined the Treaty many students lacked an understanding or awareness of the Māori world and language.

Mugisha (2013) carried out a small-scale study that sought to explore how Pākehā principals navigated culturally responsive leadership within the New Zealand schooling context. The inquiry sought to explore the principals' knowledge, actions, motives, perceptions and challenges faced as pedagogical leaders of a school. The emerging conceptual definition of 'culturally responsive instructional leadership' that came out of the findings entails the range of actions that a principal takes "to enhance the academic engagement and achievement of minority-culture students…actions may include motivating teachers to teach students to their culturally founded strengths and cognitive styles…value minority students' culture and their pedagogies" whilst also providing teaching staff with "ongoing professional learning opportunities" (Mugisha, 2013, p. 15).

Georgina Stewart (2016) carried out a critical discourse analysis between a book used as a policy directive for teachers in 1971 titled, '*Māori children and the*

teacher' and the current policy instrument derived from *Ka Hikitia*, '*Tātaiako: Cultural competencies for teachers of Māori learners*' (Ministry of Education, 2011). She noted in her findings that while Tātaiako is said to be designed for teachers to support their work, "it contains no explanation of how to use the competencies, merely referring the reader to further guidance available online" (Stewart, 2016, p. 94). Rather she suggests that "the claim to be a resource *for* teachers sits at odds with being an assessment *of* teachers, especially given the brevity and generic language of the text" (ibid, p. 94). Another point of contention that Stewart raises in regard to Tātaiako is that by including the official registration criteria in the document "it shifts responsibility away from the Ministry, and towards classroom teacher being individually accountable for the achievement of the Māori students they teach" (Stewart, 2016, p. 95). She goes to argue that teachers are increasingly being held personally liable for disparities in educational outcomes for Māori students when she states,

> Tātaiako claims to provide a tool for measuring the cultural competence of teachers, but actually does little besides support the fallacious policy notion that classroom teachers, not wider social and historical processes, are responsible for ongoing poor educational outcomes for Māori students.
>
> (Stewart, 2016, p. 96)

Lee (2008) carried out a review of varying studies that analysed teachers' perceptions of cultural differences. She first cites a study by Judith Simon (1984) whereby she found that Pākehā teachers commonly held views that denied cultural differences existed. Such teachers were "often motivated by intentions to be egalitarian by catering for all" (Simon in Lee, 2008, p. 268) when they made statements such as,

“I don’t think in terms of Māori or Pākehā – they are all children to me”. Lee (2008) states that “instead of acknowledging obvious racial markers of difference amongst students, teacher attempt to avoid issues of race and ethnicity altogether with the new that they are neither prejudiced nor discriminatory in their practice” (p. 268) but the fault with that is, she maintains, by “ignoring the culture of Māori students (as if there is no difference) in favour of egalitarian ideals served to advantage Pākehā children (because their culture was the normal at school) and reinforced the notion of Māori culture as unimportant.” (p. 268). If teachers hold onto such a ‘colour-blind’ discourse, what challenge does *Ka Hikitia* pose for them?

Lee (2008) maintains that for teachers “to not see colour in education, is to not see racism” (p. 268). In citing the work of Michelle Fine (2004), Lee notes that teachers who deny seeing colour often place emphasis on “the diversities of the individual” (in Lee, 2008; p. 269). This acts as a form of smokescreen that denies the fact that “schools manufacture whiteness, or being Pākehā in New Zealand, as normal in ways that make the ‘colour’ of the dominant group invisible” (Lee, 2008, p. 270). Lee (2008) contends that “the imaginary neutrality of teacher ethnicity (or ‘colour’) in New Zealand diversity discourse is a product of an institutional design of whiteness or racism” (p. 271).

2.5 International Research: Teacher Enactment of Culturally Responsive Pedagogy

This section briefly reviews some of the international literature in regard to teacher enactment of minority/indigenous culture, language and identity in mainstream schools. Citing empirical research from locations including Australia, the United

States, and Canada this section summarises some of the benefits and challenges teachers faced in these contexts to enact culturally responsive policy and pedagogy.

Ma Rhea (2012) reported on the findings of a national study about teacher readiness to be able to account for their skills and knowledge around the Australian Professional Standards for Teachers with a particular emphasis on the standards that focus on the needs of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander students. Teachers were found to be wanting professional development to guide them in a set of knowledge and skills to enable them to have reliable information about Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people. Such knowledge and skills included an understanding of the history between non-indigenous Australians and Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islanders, intercultural and cross-cultural skill development, development of teachers' personal attitudes, expectations, and understandings of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islanders and be taught strategies to better create inclusive classrooms and schools.

Erbesole, Kanahale-Mossman, and Kawakami (2016) carried out an action research study with a group of teachers who were enrolled in a Master of Education course. Their focus was on finding out about teachers' understanding and perceptions of culturally responsive teaching in their island context of Hawaii, USA. They found that teachers were "doing culturally responsive activities" but these connections "could be interpreted as mere attempts to include culture within their curriculum" (Erbesole, Kanahale-Mossman, & Kawakami, 2016, p. 101). Typical plans included activities focused on learning about different ethnic groups with one teacher mentioning that they had students do "a cultural research project so they make their special food" and one stated that because they had a talented music teacher, "we are learning different songs from different countries" (ibid, p. 100). They noted that 'without a firm foundation or having a perspective that supports culturally responsive

teaching, teachers saw culturally responsive teaching as limited to “doing activities” (ibid, p. 102). Erbesole, Kanahale-Mossman, and Kawakami (2016) iterated that their research uncovered that teachers have a range of understandings and perspectives on what constitutes culturally responsive teaching and their findings would inform their future programmes as teacher educators.

Deer (2013) carried out action research with non-Aboriginal, pre-service teacher candidates in Canada. It specifically focused on what the candidate teachers said about the on-going influences of indigenous oral traditions on their own writing pedagogies. The study explored teacher candidates’ perceptions of and attitudes towards the potentialities and challenges associated with the integration of Aboriginal perspectives into mainstream education. Her study findings that while some participants reported a great deal of comfort in the delivery of Aboriginal perspectives in school, a significant number of the participants were apprehensive. Deer (2013) stated that ‘because of the cultural disconnect that may be felt by many non-Aboriginal teachers, these challenges may become so ominous that a piecemeal approach may be seen as the easier course of action – one that does not place the teacher in a vulnerable position in the classroom’ (p. 180). Some of the apprehensions voiced by participants included fear of failure, discomfort with subject matter, and not being indigenous individuals themselves.

2.6 Neoliberal Capitalism & Epistemic Provincialism

Before reviewing the critical policy literature, it seemed pertinent to address the macro-nature of the issue being analysed. As has been noted, a number of Māori academics (Berryman and Woller, 2013; Bishop, 2003; Bishop, Berryman, Tiakiwai,

& Richardson, 2003; Macfarlane, 2004; Penetito, 2010) have articulated how entrenched teacher deficit views of Māori impact upon Māori student achievement. Alongside this critique is a deep mistrust of contentions purported by fellow academics who regard unequal educational outcomes for Māori as being due to the working class, early childhood socialization practices of many Māori, inculcating them with a deeply instituted working class culture that contributes to underachievement in schools (Nash, 2001). What both positions fail to acknowledge is how inequality (i.e., social, economic, political, educational) is weaved into the very fabric upon which neoliberal, capitalist, state nations are predicated upon.

While a number of Māori and indigenous academics have rightly questioned the monocultural nature of institutes such as schools, virulently focusing upon the need for structural change via culturally responsive professional development for non-Māori teachers, there are groups of academics who are challenging a form of "cognitive imperialism" (Battiste & Henderson, 2000, in Ahenakew, Andreotti, Cooper, & Hireme, 2014; p. 217), or "epistemic provincialism" (Ahenakew, Andreotti, Cooper, & Hireme, 2014; p. 216). This epistemic provincialism is tied to a prevailing neoliberal, capitalist ideology, an ideology that gives shape to Western thought and modern structures such as schools. This section reviews the literature in light of criticisms of free market ideology and Western thought, an often taken-for-granted socio-political and epistemological contextual backdrop to Māori achievement.

2.6.1 Critique of Neoliberal Capitalism. A number of academics have raised and critiqued the impact of neoliberal capitalism upon educational policy and educational contexts around the world. They proffer that current New Right inspired education reforms in a number of countries not only privilege the 'already privileged'

but educational outcomes decline overall and negatively impact upon those from working class, minority and indigenous groups.

Apple (2004) has heavily critiqued neoliberal, free market ideologies and neo-conservative, middle class managerial regulatory propositions that impact upon varying educational contexts across the world. In citing the work of Lauder and Hughes (in Apple, 2004), Apple notes how New Right ideas in education such as accountability, testing, streaming, competition and privatization leads to a negative effect upon the educational performance of children from working-class and minority populations. Apple (2004) argues that unless academics and practitioners recognise the neoliberal intent of current education reforms and the socio-economic realities that many indigenous families endure, we will all "fall into the trap of assuming that schools can do it alone" (p. 28). In stating this, Apple acknowledges that there are issues that constitute schools, namely, the free-market economy and the New Right managerial regulatory proposals, which need reimagining in an effort to curtail the inequality that characterises education systems in neoliberal capitalist nations.

Olssen, Codd and O'Neill (2004) likewise critique the neoliberal, market forces that pervade nations such as New Zealand. They contend that in order to understand educational policy one must understand the origins and influences that impact upon that policy in relation to social, cultural, political and economic forces. In outlining how pervasive inequality is to the neoliberal model of life, Olssen et al. (2004) state,

> The market introduces competition as the structuring mechanism through which resources and status are allocated efficiently and fairly. The 'invisible hand' of the market is thought to be the most efficient way of sorting out which competing individuals get what. Even though is it assumed to

> be an autonomous, apolitical and gender-neutral mechanism, it is not independent of the values and customs of those who participate in it. The centrality of the market is one of the central and distinctive features of the neoliberalism's theoretical and programmatic propositions.
>
> (ibid, pp.137-138)

Olssen et al. (2004) differentiate between utilitarian neoliberalism and social justice and concur that utilitarian neoliberalism is hostile to social democracy and the notion of the welfare state and instead emphasizes the institutional and political embodiment of individual rights “within a social environment of enterprise and competition” (p. 246). They note that neoliberalism promulgates that a moral decision is justified if it produces the “greatest happiness for the greatest number of people” (ibid, p. 138). They go to say that “in the distribution of a good such as education, utilitarianism would seek to maximize the average distribution even if the disparities were wider as a result” (ibid, p. 138). The neoliberal logic maintains that in a free-market model of social, economic and political life there will always be ‘winners’ and ‘losers’ and Olssen, Codd and O’Neill criticize how prevalent the escalation of inequality in the distribution of income, wealth and educational outcomes has been in Western nations where state controls over neoliberal, free market structures have been shunned.

Biesta (2015) also discusses the prevalence of neoliberalism and its impact upon education policy. He notes that under neoliberalism students and parents/caregivers are regarded as consumers of learning who need to be served and satisfied, schools are imbibed within a culture of accountability and the notion of excellence leads to a competitive system whereby some schools are seen as being better or worse than others. He notes that in neoliberal nations, emphasis is

predominantly placed upon achievement data as 'what counts' as the primary purpose of education. This competitively oriented neoliberal view of education is markedly different to a social justice view of education whereby there is "good education for everyone everywhere" (Biesta, 2015, p. 81).

Ahenakew, Andreotti, Cooper, and Hireme (2014) take their critique of capitalism toward a more epistemological bent. In recognizing the need to engage with capitalist modes of production to secure means of subsistence, they argue that "human life cannot be sustained in this over-exploitative system" (pp. 218-219). They suggest that under modernity, indigenous thought is constrained through what they term "epistemic provincialism" (ibid, p. 217). The universalization of Western thought via modernity constrains and restricts the possibilities for resistance that minority and indigenous people can take up. What follows is an analysis of this notion of epistemic provincialism and why it is important when examining education policy designed for Māori within a predefined neoliberal system of education where Western knowledge production and conceptions of the self are taken-for-granted.

2.6.2 Western Thought & Epistemic Provincialism. Tied to the expansion of neoliberal capitalism is what some academics have termed 'cognitive imperialism' or 'epistemic provincialism'. Within neoliberal structures such as schools, indigenous knowledge is often integrated and valorised as a means to an end, namely, that aspects of indigenous knowledge are selected for 'inclusion' in such a way that often becomes tokenistic and insufficient. Ahenakew, Andreotti, Cooper and Hireme (2014) refer to epistemic provincialism as "modernity's epistemic trap" (p. 217) in that it restricts the possibilities of resistance and counter-hegemony. The authors note that in indigenous strategies of resistance such as indigenous education policy and practices tend to focus on the "inclusion of indigenous ways of knowing into a predefined normalized order

of schooling” (ibid, p. 220). They maintain that counter-hegemonic strategies that are “vocalized in institutional politics are necessarily condition by the (post) modernist grammar that structures modern institutions” (ibid, p. 221).

Mika (2012) takes this notion further by arguing that Western thought not only constrains indigenous knowledge but that Western and Māori thought differ markedly ontologically and epistemologically. Mika contends that Māori ontology privileges mystery and unknowability whereby objects are constituted by one another in an ongoing inter-relationship that defies fixity. He compares this to the ontological and epistemic certainty that is taken up in Western thought whereby objects and entities are enframed as fully identifiable and knowable in and of themselves. Mika accepts that Western epistemologies of certainty are here to stay but pushes for a critically philosophical project whereby Māori object to the delusion of certainty and assuredness about objects and move towards a sense of apprehension and mystery that characterises Māori thought.

2.7 Critical Policy Literature: Problem Representation & Enactment Theory

This section of the literature review will engage with the work of policy-as-discourse analysts, policy enactment theorists and critical policy scholars to broadly consider a number of issues related to education policy with a view to use the findings from the research to contribute to this field of inquiry. Firstly, the literature will be examined in relation to problem representation in policies. Using Bacchi’s (1999), ‘What’s the Problem?’ approach to policy, an understanding of how policy ‘problems’ are represented and constructed will be examined alongside a close analysis of how

“countours of a particular policy” (p. 2) give shape to a particular representation of a policy ‘problem’. It is these constructions or representations that then place limits upon “what is talked about as possible or desirable, or as impossible and undesirable” (Bacchi, 1999, p. 2) in relation to a particular policy.

Secondly, a body of educational policy enactment research literature will be examined. Enactment research seeks to know how schools (or specifically teachers) ‘do’ the work of policy rather than the normative policy implementaion approach. Traditional policy implementation approaches do not help with understanding how particular policies ‘travel’. Nor do they help with examining how a range of actors negotiate policy enactment within the complex institutions of schools. Policy enactment theory brings to fore the notion that teachers are ‘meaning makers’ (Ball, Maguire, & Braun, 2012, p. 138) and not mere ciphers who implement. Teachers are considered both actors and subjects of policy. Teachers’ accounts of how policy is enacted (or not) through their work will help to provide a much more indepth understanding of how policy is interpreted, how social and material contextual factors impact upon and mediate what is enacted and the range of personal and institutional factors that impact upon varying possibilities and contraints for enactment.

2.7.1 What’s the Problem?: Problem Representation in Policy & Policy-as-Discourse. Bacchi’s (1999, 2000) theoretical work on the framing, construction and representation of policies assists critical policy scholars to analyse, identify and assess the manner in which specific ‘problems’ get represented in policies. She maintains that policies are usually framed and constructed in such a manner that there is often only one possible interpretation of the ‘problem’. This means that examination of policies as ‘solutions’ to ‘problems’ is itself problematic and instead she proffers that policies ought to be conceived as ‘constituting competing interpretations or

representations of political issues (Bacchi, 1999, p. 1). Bacchi goes on to state that policy work is a strategic and political process, not only in wanting one particular policy over another but also 'at the level of consituting the shape of the issues to be considered' (ibid, p. 7).

Bacchi's '*What's the Problem*?' approach to critical policy analysis offers a set of questions that helps researchers and policy theorists to reflect upon the interconnections between and within particular policy areas. In terms of this inquiry, re-framing her questions to match the focus of this research would have the questions posed as follows.

1) How is the 'problem' of disproportionate Māori achievement represented in Ka Hikitia?
2) What pressuppositions or assumptions underlie this representation?
3) What effects are produced by this representation? How are subjects (students/teachers/principals/schools) constituted within it? What is likely to change? What is likely to stay the same? Who is likely to benefit from this representation?
4) What is left unproblematic in this representation?
5) How would 'responses' differ if the 'problem' were thought about or represented differently?

(adapted from Bacchi, 1999, pp. 9-10)

These questions directly provide a critical lens from which to consider *Ka Hikitia*. In brief, the 'problem' represented in *Ka Hikitia* is articulated as Māori achievement data being disproportionately low in comparison to that of other ethnic cohorts. The key assumption that underlies this problem representation is one of cultural dislocation for Māori students in a mainstream schooling system. '*Māori achieving and enjoying education success as Māori*' is the catchcry of *Ka Hikitia*. Effects produced by such a

representation include accountability tools and measures with which teachers, schools and Boards of Trustees are judged against, teachers are charged through appraisal mechanisms to be culturally responsive and teachers are encouraged to enact Māori culture, language and celebrate Māori identity via a range of enactments within their classrooms. What is left unproblematic in this representation is its intense focus on culture as the sole means by which disproportionate Māori achievement can be remedied. Policy responses would differ in a number of ways if the problem was represented differently.

However, Bacchi (1999) reminds us that as critical policy scholars, we are not only interested in the manner in which policies are constituted around problem representations but we are also vitally interested in the range of material effects of such problem representations in policy. Hence the set of critical questions above that analyse not only representations of a ‘problem’ but also the impact and effects that such representations have on subjects that are constituted within such policies.

Taylor (1997) supports this when citing the policy work of Codd (in Taylor, 1997), suggesting that the “proper task of policy analysis is to examine the differing effects that (policy) documents have in the production of meaning by readers” (pp. 26-27). She maintains that such policy effects are not certain or predictable but undoubtedly useful in the exploration of how policies are read, interpreted, and used in context.

Alongside an analysis of the representation and effects of policy problems, Bacchi (2000) has articulated a policy-as-discourse theoretical position. She argues that analysts who utilise a policy-as-discourse position “have at some level an agenda for change” (p. 46), defining discourse in a way that “helps to identify constraints on

social change, while attempting to maintain space for a kind of activism" (p. 46). Webb and Gulson (2015) support this when they strongly urge that,

> ...the promise of emanicipatory practices needs our attention in the enactment of policies aimed at transforming educational spaces. Examining what comes to be performed through policy is an important step in understanding the realities for those affected by policies and conceptualising the ways in which things might be differently performed.
>
> (cited in Viczko & Riveros, 2015, p. 480)

Such an interest in "identifying the reasons progressive change has proved so difficult to accomplish" (p. 47) lies in the policy-as-discourse approach to problematizing. Emphasis from a policy-as-discourse approach is upon the ways in which discourse sets limits upon what can be said, what can be actioned and what can be thought about in regard to that which has been problematized .

Ball (1993) supports this concept of a policy-as-discourse approach. He articulates that critical policy scholars need to "appreciate the way in which policy ensembles, collection of related policies, exercise power through a *production* of 'truth' and 'knowledge', as discourse" (p. 14). Drawing from the work of Foucault, Ball argues that '(d)iscourses are "practices that systematically form the object of which they speak...Discourses are not about objects; they do not identify objects, they constitute them and in the practice of doing so conceal their own invention"' (Foucault, 1977, in Ball, 1993, p. 14).

2.7.2 Policy Enactment, Context, & Performativity: The 'Folds' of the Teacher. The final section of the literature review takes a turn toward critiquing how teachers are often framed within policy by engaging with the critical policy works of

Ball, Maguire and Braun (2012) titled, '*How Schools Do Policy: Policy Enactment in Secondary Schools*' and Webb and Gulson's (2013) theoretical work on policy intensions. In brief, policy enactment theory pits itself against policy implementation theory, proffering that teachers are not mere ciphers who implement but instead are "actors and subjects, subjects to and objects of policy" (Ball, Maguire, & Braun, 2012, p. 3). One of its main tenets is that policy is written on teachers' bodies and produces particular subject positions. With this in mind, Ball contends that policies do not normally tell teachers what to do, but rather that "they create circumstances in which the range of options available in deciding what to do are narrowed or changed, or particular goals or outcomes are set" (Ball, 1994 in Ball et al., 2012, p. 8). This is certainly the case with the *Ka Hikitia* policy document.

Under a policy implementation theoretical framework, teachers are collectively singled out of the policy picture and their shortcomings, weaknesses and inability to ensure a given policy inhabits their school or classroom environments are highlighted and focused upon for improvements and development (Werts & Brewer, 2015). While there certainly is a case to be made for providing teachers with a degree of professional development and skill improvement in Te Reo and deeper knowledge and understanding of Māori culture and identity, such a solitary focus negates the broader institutional, material and external contexts in which teachers are situated within and implicated by both professionally and subjectively. Werts and Brewer (2015) support this when they argue that "most policy implementation studies do not invest in the richness of the local world" (p. 210) but rather often focus on attributing local actors such as teachers as "being the lacking element in policy" (p. 224). This is supported by Shore and Wright (in Viczko & Riveros, 2015) who state that such as instrumentalist view of teachers still dominates much of the policy analysis research

in the field of education. They argue that in questioning this instrumentalist view of teachers, policy research ought to consider teachers' "interpretations, sense-making, translation, embodiment and meaning through the policy process" (p. 479).

In citing the work of fellow enactment theorists, Webb and Gulson (2013), have also noted this gradual focus away from 'demonising' teachers in implementation to broader notions of teacher enactment in contemporary policy research. They state that enactment research articulates that teachers

> ...sense policy and act accordingly without rational deliberation (Webb & Gulson, 2001); (b) make sense of policy through different reasoned interpretations (Spillane, Gomez & Mesler, n.d.), (c) co-construct policy during implementation (Datnow, Lasky, Stringfield & Teddlie, 2006); and (d) enact policy (Braun, Ball, Maguire & Hoskins, 2011).
>
> (Webb & Gulson, 2013, p. 56)

Context is considered a key conceptual tool in policy enactment theorising. Here context is utlised as "an analytic device to make sense of the processes of policy enactment" which "allows researchers to attend to the complex ways in which official policies are enacted within and across schools" (Singh, Heimans, & Glasswell, 2014, p. 827). Ball, Maguire, and Braun (2012) explore four dynamics of context and how they inter-relate and impact upon the enactment of policy in schools. They are identified as situational, material and external contexts and professional cultures. Ball et al. (2012) maintain that these four dynamics of context shape teachers' enactment of policies "and thus relate together and theorise interpretive, material, and contextual dimensions of the policy process" (p. 20).

Performativity is another key conceptual tool in policy enactment theorising. Here pressures such as those put upon teachers and schools by the likes of ERO and varying auditing mechanisms impact upon how teachers 'perform' in "initiating and shaping particular enactments of policy" (Perryman et al., 2011, in Ball, Maguire, & Braun, 2012, p. 36). Ball's research has noted that some schools "may pay some attention to a policy and 'fabricate' a response that is incorporated into school documentation for purposes of accountability and audit, rather than to effect pedagogic or organisational change" (Ball, 2001 in Ball, Maguire, & Braun, 2012, p. 10). It is noted that "policy enactment in schools may concentrate on what superficially maps on to current practices with the result that any innovatory potential is simply ignored or avoided" (Spillane, 2004, in Ball, Maguire, & Braun, 2012, p. 10). This management of performance which aims to meet the demands of external requirements may produce a "spectacle, or game-playing, or cynical compliance" (Ball, 2003, in Singh, Heimans, & Glasswell, 2004, p. 828). Such an account of how the *Ka Hikitia* policy document has been enacted in mainstream primary schools has been lacking in the literature as the gaze has often focused on teachers and their need to be the sole change agents in advancing Māori educational achievement.

Webb and Gulson (2013) take a slightly different tangent on the aspect of teacher interpretation of policy and instead urge policy theorists to consider the 'folds' of a teacher in policy. In their articulation of policy intensions, Webb and Gulson (2013) state that intensions is not about interpreting policy but rather about how a teacher senses it. This focuses on how teachers are 'folded' so as to examine their obscured subjectivities. This perspective is helpful in considering the role of the teacher who might be unaware of a particular government policy. They posit that the concept of a policy intension signals the important and central role of policy subjects

and actors (teachers) within implementation attempts but where it differs is that "policy actors sense, encounter, enact, and respond to policy desires, often without recognizing particular policy desires" (Webb & Gulson, 2013, p. 57).

Rather than examing teachers' understandings of a policy document they contend that personal subjectivities and the institutional context within which teachers are situated have a greater impact upon how teachers interpret and enact policy. In citing the work of Datnow and Park, Webb and Gulson (2013) state, "even fully planned, highly co-ordinated, and well supported policies ultimately depend on how individuals within the local context interpreted and enacted policies; in other words, local factors dominanted policy outcomes" (p. 56). This theoretical notion of policy intensions will be useful in examining how teachers sense and are 'folded' affectively through enactment of the *Ka Hikitia* policy within their school contexts.

2.8 Summary of Literature

The main implications that can be drawn from a look back at the history of contemporary education for Māori students is that while colonisation and the accompanying policies of assimilation and integration have forced many Māori to leave their Māori culture, language and identities at the school door, the current Māori education policy, *Ka Hikitia*, is an attempt to address some of the historical wrongs that Māori have faced in New Zealand schools. The focus on ensuring schools and teachers embrace culturally responsive pedagogies to help Māori students achieve and enjoy academic succees as Māori has had prominence in Māori education policy over the past thirty years.

Both the local and international research cite a range of benefits and challenges for enacting culturally responsive pedagogy in mainstream schools. Very little empirical research exists that highlights the link between culturally responsive pedagogy and improved achievement outcomes for indigenous and minority students. There exists a large corpus of research that suggests that Māori disproportionate achievement is not as a result of monocultural schooling contexts but rather that socio-economic factors, poverty and the socialised effects of being working-class has a much greater impact.

Critical policy scholars have questioned policy traditional implementation approaches in research and offered different theoretical tools to help understand how policy travels, is sensed and is enacted. They contend that teacher interpretations and enactments are shaped not only by policy itself but by what teachers sense, their personal subjectivities and the context in which they work.

Teachers have often been the silent subjects in policy and the focus of the proposed investigation aims to understand how they interpret and enact (or not) *Ka Hikitia* in light of a range of subjective and contextual factors. It also seeks teachers' perspectives on whether or not they perceive socio-economic factors as having more of an impact upon disproportionate Māori achievement than cultural dislocation factors. This inquiry aims to address the dearth of studies and publications in this area from a critical policy enactment and policy-as-discourse perspective. The study aims to conceptualise a broader consideration of how the 'problem' of Māori disproportionate achievement is thought of in policy while at the same time recognising the need for culturally responsive enactment and practices within mainstream primary school contexts in New Zealand.

CHAPTER THREE: THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

3.0 Introduction

This chapter couches the approaches utilised in this study with a philosophical backdrop (Scott, 1999). It analyses and discusses some of the fervently contested methodological issues relating to power, culture, identity and epistemological differences in educational research contexts and explicates the theoretical framework that guides this research.

It begins by addressing the personal struggles that were faced as a Māori researcher and the philosophical and theoretical conundrums encountered when attempting to define a space in the research realm for this study that sat well with the notion of 'being Māori' without bracketing the research as speaking on 'behalf of' or 'for Māori'. Like Tiakiwai (in Hetaraka, 2019), who has voiced her struggles with aligning her research to Kaupapa Māori with the reticence to assume that she knows what it is to 'be Māori', I have engaged and encountered with a range of philosophical and theoretical issues that will be expounded in this chapter.

The subsequent section outlines a brief synopsis of the theoretical work of Carl Mika and his sense that an overarching Māori ontology and epistemology perceives of matters in a tentative way – an approach quite different to that of the certainty prescribed in Western metaphysics. Perspectives on embracing an 'uncertain' version of Kaupapa Māori is expounded while concomitantly keeping the ontological and epistemological matters raised by Mika, at the fore.

Two theories from the critical policy research literature are embraced for this study: enactment theory and policy-as-discourse theory. While these two theories have

been discussed in some detail within the review of the literature, they are reiterated and further expounded here to emphasise their centrality and importance to the research.

3.1 Theoretical Framework

This section outlines the theoretical framework that guides the proposed research. Imenda (2014) articulates that the genesis of a theoretical framework evolves from one's review of the literature and how one intends to collect, interpret and explain the collected data. Walshaw (2012) supports this when she states that when using theory in research, you are using it "as a sharp instrument for interacting with the data at a level beyond mere description" (p. 56). The theoretical framework of this research is articulated as having an overarching Māori ontological and epistemological purview and theoretically aligned to an 'uncertain' version of Kaupapa Māori theory research, while also linked to the critical policy theories of enactment and policy-as-discourse. With the research embracing a mixed-methods approach, a theoretical position that acknowledges the complementary nature of differing techniques will also be expounded.

3.1.1 Philosophical & Theoretical Struggles of a Māori Researcher. The 'Western-Objectivist' tradition (the realist metaphysic tradition) in educational research is widely written about from both angles of support (Nash, 1999; Rata, 2004) and from angles of critique (Smith, G., 1997; Smith, L., 1999; Royal, 2012). Others like Holbrook (in Cohen & Manion, 1997) offer both support and critique of objective approaches to educational research arguing that there are potential advantages and disadvantages in utilising such a paradigm. Replicating similar conventions, methods

and assumptions utilised within the natural sciences, dominant-objectivist social scientists tend to suggest that a single, convergent reality exists which can be known by researchers who, in acting independently from the subjects of their research, make generalisations and nomothetic statements about 'reality' as it 'truly is' (Scott & Usher, 1999, p. 2). Scott and Usher (1999) go on to say that for those of a dominant, positivist bent "the world consists of independently existing objects of which there can only be one true description" (p. 14). Methods employed by researchers who embrace a competing view of social reality are often labelled as subjectivist, post-modern, irrational or invoking folk wisdom. A strong positivist paradigm strongly argues that no external reality exists outside of the human experience. Such a position discounts and rejects the idea of intelligible spirits which a foundational in a number of indigenous knowledge systems (Henderson, 2000).

Dominant objectivist paradigms in educational research have been contested by varying groups including critical theorists, feminists, ethnic minorities, indigenous peoples and, more specifically, Māori. Such critiques have questioned the notion of a universal reality and conceptions of truth, they have queried forms of knowing that separate the object and the subject, and they have articulated 'new', 'natural' or 'recovered' research paradigms previously marginalised or forcefully negated under the dominant, objectivist framework.

A number of Māori academics have critiqued and talked back to the dominant nature of the Western-objectivist research paradigm offering varying arguments around its exclusionary nature in regard to what counts as valid knowledge, its potentiality for representing Māori in ways not supported by Māori themselves and its tendency towards replicating and reproducing dominant-subordinate relations between powerful Pākehā researchers and dominated Māori communities. The literature

addressing such issues focuses heavily on the power/knowledge relationship between Māori and Pākehā/European worldviews.

Arohia Durie (2002) supports this when she argues that Māori were traditionally subjects of research rather than the makers and constructors of research methodologies. As research subjects, Māori were located in a position of subordination under the microscopic gaze of the Pākehā/Western researcher. The space for Māori views of knowledge to be effectively utilised in the research process was seen as unnecessary. Pihama, Cram and Walker (2002) support this when they suggest that educational research which continues to deny Māori access to control over the research process for Māori concretises Pākehā hegemony and validates and legitimises Pākehā definitions and constructions of Māori people.

Russell Bishop (1999, 2003, 2010, 2012) articulates a strong standpoint against traditional, dominant research practices and epistemologies. In advocating for a Kaupapa Māori approach to research he maintains that traditional researchers and their methods are more preoccupied with notions of neutrality, objectivity and distance to give credibility to their work. In doing so they have "consequently misrepresented Māori experiences, thereby denying Māori authenticity and voice" (Bishop, 1999, p. 1). He goes on to state that "such research has displaced Māori…with the "authoritative" voice of the methodological "expert" appropriating Māori lived experiences in terms defined and determined by the "expert"" (ibid, p. 1). Bishop does not level his criticism solely at the objectivist position. He also targets the more subjectively oriented research paradigm.

More qualitative and subjectively oriented research approaches attempt to embrace a more naturalistic way of knowing which not only unifies the object-subject divide but also includes approaches which typify non-Western cultural perspectives

(Gall, Gall, & Borg, 1999). "In this view of knowledge, social reality is seen as a set of meanings that are constructed by the individuals who participate in that reality" (ibid, p. 289) rather than a view of knowledge where social reality is constructed by an 'expert' or 'experts' from 'the outside'. Such an approach contends that knowledge is something gained from personal experience rather than through the gaining of knowledge where the 'self' is bracketed out.

Beck (in Cohen & Manion, 1997) supports this when he articulates that such subjectivist research undertakings strongly urge that "the social world can only be understood from the standpoint of the individuals who are part of the ongoing action being investigated" (p. 26). Beck is arguing that behaviour and phenomena can only be understood by a researcher sharing their frame of reference so that an understanding of individuals' interpretations of social reality will come from the 'inside' and not the 'outside'. Social science from such a subjectivist position aims not to reveal 'ultimate truth', which is the task of the positivist. Rather, it helps to make sense of the world(s) and to understand that (social) reality is conceived of differently by differing groups of people.

Critical theory is a subjectivist approach to educational research, which forms a broad base of two of the theories embraced for this project: enactment theory and policy-as-discourse theory. The basic work of the critical theory tradition is one of 'cultural critique' (Apple, 2000; Gibson, 1986; McLaren, 1995; Popkewitz & Fendler, 1999). Gall, Gall and Borg (1999) state that "the term *critical* is used in critical theory to refer to a systematic process of review and analysis (i.e., critique) of cultural phenomena. In the process, hidden assumptions underlying accepted but problematic cultural practices are exposed, along with their negative aspects" (p. 361) in an interpretive mode of social science analysis. This key aspect of critical theory posits

that researchers working within this paradigm view most texts, documents and artefacts in education and research as problematic.

Another key aspect of critical theory research is that ‘facts’ can never be isolated from the domain of values or removed from some form of ideological inscription. The first part of this assumption reflects critical theory’s rejection of the notion that educational researchers’ quest for truth is an objective, value-free process. Critical theory researchers question the notion of objective reality itself. The latter part of this assumption critically locates all ‘truth’ statements and ‘facts’ within a knowledge/power inter-relationship. Critical theorists recognise that the furnishing of ‘truth’ in educational research is inscribed ideologically, unable to be removed from the possibility that statements are implicated and inscribed by power effects.

Leading Kaupapa Māori theorist, Graham Smith, aligns his work closely with the efforts of critical theorists when he states that Kaupapa Māori is built upon notions of conscientisation and transformative actions. Its directives serve to challenge the Western academy and concomitant Māori theorising serves to provoke and counter “the embedded processes of social and cultural reproduction of dominant Pākehā interests” (Smith, G., 1997, p. 64). The notion of tino rangatiratanga normalises the advancement of Māori desires to be in control over key decision-making aspects impacting upon the lives of Māori people. It is at this point that I wish to articulate some of the philosophical and theoretical struggles that I have had over the years concerning a number of the assertions made by leading Kaupapa Māori theory advocates (i.e., Bishop, Graham Smith, Linda Smith) regarding its use as a research framework. Before articulating these struggles, it seems pertinent to outline my positionalities, my ‘self’. Understanding that I cannot bracket myself out of the research endeavour, I am conscious that my experiences and background give shape

to how I proceed in the world of research. I am not 'innocent'. I am implicated within and constituted by the very fabric of how I have chosen to carry out my study.

I am a school-based practitioner and also a researcher. My experience within the mainstream primary schooling system as a teacher and more recently as a principal, largely within low-decile schools, gives shape to how I have 'arrived' at the research and theoretical framework that I articulate. I straddle the 'two worlds' of practitioner and researcher and all the grey areas in between. Similarly, having been raised in a working-class family, where poverty was a very real and daily lived experience and now as a privileged principal and doctoral student, straddling the 'two worlds' of disadvantage and privilege plays out in my research and theoretical framework. Likewise, my encounters of subtle and overt forms of racism as an indigenous person with British grandparents has left an indelible mark upon how I view, critique and respond to the world around me. I see all forms of research as being in need of critique, in need of being theoretically 'unpacked' and not accepted merely as a guide to one's research, but as a venture that the self is fully implicated within. Hence, the need to articulate my own reservations and hesitations with embracing Kaupapa Māori theory and opting instead to articulate an 'uncertain' Kaupapa Māori theory that counters a Western propensity for certainty and predictability. I acknowledge the privileged position that I find myself in as researcher and because of this, I uphold a tentative approach toward the knowledge that this research produces least I create a thorough-knowing certainty of the objects/subjects of my work. What follows are some of the apprehensions that I have in regard to Kaupapa Māori.

The first apprehension is one in which Kaupapa Māori theory articulates that whānau are in complete control of research processes. Tillman (1998) argues that Bishop's preoccupation with this notion denies a process of power and knowledge

sharing that inevitably occurs between participants and the researcher(s). Lopez (1998) identifies the tension in this conundrum when he notes that if Kaupapa Māori theory advocates that whānau are in control of research processes, how is such an assertion acknowledged when it comes to publishing? Who is privileged in research publications? Where are whānau in our research publications apart from our acknowledgement and ethics sections? How do we locate ourselves, as privileged Māori researchers, locked into the productivity mandates of the academic regime?

A further point raised by Bishop that needs critical attention is the notion of taonga tuku iho informing a Kaupapa Māori research process. If suggesting taonga tuku iho as a mantra for guiding one's research implies utilising the knowledge and gifts from our rangatira and ancestors from our whakapapa lines, where a sense of continuity with the past is retained with clear acknowledgement of the work that has gone on before us, to what effect and degree do the taonga of our 'Other' ancestor also inform the research process? As a beginning researcher do the views and knowledges of my English grandfather and European ancestors hold a place within a Kaupapa Māori researcher framework? If so, to what degree do they hold a position in light of taonga passed down from my Māori ancestors?

Lopez (1998) makes some connections to the above points when he problematizes Bishop's assumptions that there are distinctions between being, an "insider" (who has access to the 'Māori truth') and an "outsider" (who does not have that level of access). Lopez (1998) probes into this dualism presented by Bishop when he poses the question, "Who is an "outsider" and who is an "insider" in Kaupapa Māori research?" (p. 228). The winning blow however is landed in his queries about the place of people from mixed Pākehā/Māori backgrounds. He asks, "Are they "inside" or "outside" the culture?" (Lopez, 1998, p. 228). The complexity of the terrain fails to be

articulated as Lopez cites Spivak (in Lopez, 1998) suggesting that Bishop subscribes to a logic that not only assumes that insiders can speak, which is positive, but that they all speak in the same voice.

Linda Smith (1999) utilises a similar approach to Bishop when she utilises a binary dualism to communicate an understanding of indigenous-centred research methods through the concept of decolonising methodologies. Such a concept of research methodologies being either colonising or decolonising tends to ignore the more complicated aspects of epistemological borrowing, which inevitably occurs across theoretical and philosophical borders. Yet, seemingly in contradiction to this binary Smith aims to divulge a sense of complexity into her articulating of a Kaupapa Māori research mandate, which asserts that Māori culture is complicated, internally diverse and contradictory. Such comments not only stand in contrast to modernist critiques of Māori being unable to change or recreate themselves and still claim to be indigenous (Smith, L., 1999) but it also seems to refute the decolonising/colonising methodological binary which she talks to in detail throughout her book.

Throughout her book, *Decolonising Methodologies*, Linda Smith (1999) provides a lengthy critique of Western modes of operation such as Western notions of objectivity and positivism as a process of dehumanisation, critiques of the concept of the individual, Western philosophies, Western religion, Western capitalist modes of production, individual autonomy, self-interest and notions of liberalism. She goes on to articulate that Kaupapa Māori research,

> …weaves in and out of Māori cultural beliefs and values, Western ways of knowing, Māori histories and experiences under colonialism, Western forms of education, Māori aspirations and socio-economic needs, and Western economics and global politics.
>
> (Smith, L., 1999, p. 191)

With this positing of the 'West' as the 'enemy' and the point of contention in Māori struggle for social, economic and educational advancement, such an articulation of Kaupapa Māori relies upon the binary that negates the complexities that exist at varying sites of contestation.

Te Kawehau Hoskins (2012) offers a contribution to Kaupapa Māori and its propensity to theorise social and political relations within the oppositional coloniser-colonised binary. She notes that Kaupapa Māori has achieved legitimacy through strategic essentialisms, which "involves temporarily promoting ethnic/cultural identity as authentic, homogenous and stable – the simplification of group identity to achieve certain political and social goals" (p. 85). Hoskins talks to a number of complexities to the coloniser/colonised binary such as differences in the experiences of colonisation across iwi, social intimacy between groups meaning cross-cultural relations are not always in oppositional terms and the fact that history had a number of "non-indigenous, anti-colonial actors who have stood with Māori, and whose identities do not easily fit the coloniser subject position" (Hoskins, 2012, p. 86). Hoskins maintains that "*uncritically* evoking binary relations as the essential 'truth' about cultural identities and relations of power is, as Spivak (in Danius & Jonsson, 1993) suggests: regressive, destructive, and addictive" (Hoskins, 2012, pp. 86-87).

Hoskins further iterates that such a propensity to underscore social, political and cultural relations within a binary discourse stems from the structuralist undertones of critical theory. She argues that whilst structuralist accounts have their place in analyses of power and social theory, the varying binaries (i.e., Western-Indigenous, coloniser-colonised, dominant-subordinate) utilised in Kaupapa Māori theorising "can be too deterministic, offering simple reductionist explanations that, for example, cast

all Māori as colonised victims" (Hoskins, 2012, p. 89). Hoskins makes a very strong challenge against such orthodoxy when she states that too often,

> …Māori modes of relational responsibility and other cultural ethics seem reserved for ourselves, and for our indigenous cousins with whom we share identity and political positions. We draw the line at the 'coloniser', and those others who interests do not match our own. But to be ethical in any meaningful sense is to move beyond the comfort of our political positions…An oppositional politics alone, without the interruption of ethics, leads to competition and unproductive disengagement, and is ultimately unsustainable.
>
> (Hoskins, 2012, p. 92)

Eketone (2008) iterates a similar perspective on Kaupapa Māori advocates' over-reliance on critical theory. He contends that while critical theory has informed a lot of philosophising in the academic realm, a point of disconnect occurs for many in the Māori community because they see Kaupapa Māori as an embracing of Māori values first and foremost. Eketone contends that values such as "tapu, mana, utu, aroha and manaakitanga" (p. 6) are normalised as positive expressions of Kaupapa Māori and not just negative critique and resistance, which is seen as a primary focus of critical theory.

Mahuika (2008) likewise has questioned a number of the theoretical underpinnings of Kaupapa Māori. In the introduction of her paper, '*Kaupapa Māori theory is critical and anti-colonial'*, she posits that 'Kaupapa Māori theory is both critical and anti-colonial and yet in other ways is not' (Mahuika, 2008, p 3). She further questions the critical nature of Kaupapa Māori and its propensity to reject 'colonizing' epistemologies and theories when she states,

> …is kaupapa Māori a conscience raising theory of liberation that empowers individuals with a critical consciousness, or does it simply critique the 'norm' or 'oppressor' without turning its own critical gaze inward? Moreover, if kaupapa Māori both rejects the epistemological frameworks of the colonizer yet draws theoretical foundations beyond the Māori world then is it really anti-colonial?
>
> (Mahuika, 2008, p. 3)

Mahuika concludes her paper by calling for a more internally critical Kaupapa Māori theory and an honesty that acknowledges that Kaupapa Māori is not "entirely devoid of colonial imprints, mechanisms, and opportunities" (ibid, p. 12).

Mika (2017) supports this when he notes that Kaupapa Māori research "is often underpinned by strong Western epistemologies obsessed with certainty/complete knowledge of objects and others" (p. 121). He maintains that such a "sustained gaze of certainty is born of colonization by Western academic or rational desires, and Kaupapa Māori threatens to act as an emissary of these desires when it encourages the Kaupapa Māori research to approach an object or idea as it if it complete and knowable" (p. 119). As others have noted, Mika also argues that Kaupapa Māori scholars tend to act and research as if in a vacuum. He notes that the attractiveness of "the ultimate thinking this common version of Kaupapa Māori advertises: [it] means that we do not have to pay particular attention to ourselves as we research" (Mika, 2017, p. 121).

The thinking, the doubting, the conscientisation, the regression, the pointing of the finger and the questioning that has revolved around the large corpus of positivist, subjectivist, critical, and Kaupapa Māori research literature for me personally as a Māori researcher has at times made me throw my proverbial towel in. Hearing the range of voices from Māori researchers who align themselves tentatively and, more

importantly, critically to Kaupapa Māori theory has been, for want of a better word, freeing and philosophically liberating. With the review of methodological literature around some of my personal issues around research and in particular, Kaupapa Māori research, used as a backdrop, what follows in an explication of the philosophical and theoretical choices that underpin this exploratory mixed-method study.

3.1.2 An Overarching Māori Ontology and Epistemology & An 'Uncertain' Kaupapa Māori Theory. In light of the preceding discussion, this section of the chapter seeks to articulate an overarching Māori ontological and epistemological frame of reference as a lens for the proposed research. It draws heavily from the work of Carl Mika (2012, 2015a, 2015b, 2015c, 2016, 2017) where he states that a Western metaphysics of presence and its associated taken-for-granted ontological assumptions that underpins how an object is constituted as thoroughly knowable, and thus "communicable as a smooth and unproblematic entity" (Mika, 2015d, p. 5), is one of the greatest challenges when articulating that this research embraces a "Māori holistic metaphysical approach to things" (ibid, p. 8). This research will outline two aspects of an overarching Māori ontology and epistemology articulated by Mika will a view to this research privileging these perspectives.

i. A Tentative Approach to the Perception of Things. Māori philosopher Carl Mika has written a number of papers over the last ten years that seek to address and destabilise the certainty of perception and accompanying rationalism that is grounded in research and academia. In suggesting that we must "move away from a colonial belief that things are a pure moment of representation" (Mika, 2015c, p. 62), he contends that modern education promotes "relationships with things in the world towards a more objectified regard" (Mika, 2012, p. 1081). He maintains that while a number of Māori researchers have voices and expressed their dissatisfaction with

scientific research methods and “the practice of objectifying the world” (ibid, p. 1084), a more fundamental critique needs to be aimed at the “idea of knowledge as a means of making decisive statements about what was essentially mysterious” (ibid, p. 1084). Mika contends that Māori generally believe “that there is a sense of mystery to the world” (ibid, p. 1084) and “in casting people, ideas and concepts as enduring presences promotes the idea that people, ideas and concepts are knowable things” (ibid, p. 1086).

Mika and Stewart (2016) reiterate this notion when they state that “the entire trajectory of Western thought has been set up to definitively answer the very primordial need of the West to ‘enframe’ or establish how a thing shall appear” (p. 306). Mika (2015b) supports this when he notes that if one were to interrogate colonisation philosophically, Māori were impelled to take up a rational way of knowing. He states,

> This extremely subtle mechanism that configures perception of objects so that they partake in a static notion of being was transmitted through ideas about speech and representation as well as in institutional dealings with Māori. In speech, for instance, language itself became about the logical representation of the world and would point to a thing in the world with utter positivity.
>
> (Mika, 2015b, p. 95)

Mika (2012) cites the philosophers Novalis and Heidegger as both expressing angst at the delusional tendency in modern, scientific times to “make certain, final utterances about the world” (p. 1084). In a similar vein, Mika suggests that a Māori ontology via a contemplation of Being (see Mika, 2012, 2014, 2015a, 2015d) values the “importance of a tentative approach towards any perceived presence of things”

(Mika, 2012, p. 1087) and critiques Kaupapa Māori theory for being underpinned by such a complete and certain approach to the knowledge of objects and others.

This research embraces Mika's articulation of an overarching Māori ontology and epistemology via a tentative approach to the perception of ideas, objects and people. Despite this, like Mika, I have my qualms about the academy and its demands for the presentation of a rational argument. Mika (2015d) notes that "the form of colonization that a rational ordering of things in the world requires, so that those things can be written about, is quite often at the forefront of indigenous concern due to the constricting nature of the exercise" (p. 8). In citing Māori academic, Māori Marsden (1985 in Mika, 2015d) Mika argues that the certainty of perception demanded by the academy is 'counter to a more contradictory Māori apprehension, with "abstract rational thought and empirical methods [not being able to] grasp the concrete act of existing [for Māori] which is fragmentary, paradoxical and incomplete" (p. 8).

ii. **Connectivity Between the Self and the Thing.** Connected to the notion of a tentative approach to the perception and representation of things, is the construction of the self in relation to things (Roberts, 2013). Mika (2014 in Mika, 2015c) contends that "in a Māori worldview, things are not just passive entities awaiting construction by the self; they are instead animate and creative, having a much greater impact on the self than would be credited in dominant rational discourse" (p. 63). He goes on to express his concerns about this ontological sense of Māori constructions of the self being compressed by the dominance of rationality when he argues that a Māori sense of the world, which is "meant to represent things in the world so that they are inherently related, is endangered" (Mika, 2014, p. 49). The seemingly immovable Leviathan that is Western philosophy and its propensity for logic and rational thought is shaped by a vulnerability whereby indigenous worldviews and other

"submerged…modes of Western thinking that develop and encourage thought towards an approximation of a thing in all its complexity and its interdependence with all other things, including the self" (Mika, 2015a, pp. 1140-1141) lie deep within. Mika (2015c) discusses this danger in academic research when he states that for Māori,

> …the thing in its most basic sense is like the self: it is immediately connected to everything else, so discussion about 'things' itself constitute some sort of materiality that links to the thing and the self. Thus, there must be an ethical way to even comport oneself towards things so that they discussed in a way that does not constrain them. Yet, the very nature of academic research asks for a distance between self and thing, both in intention and in practice.
>
> (Mika, 2015c, pp. 61-62)

Mika argues that this sense of self will seem foreign to the modern ear as such a position posits that "humanity can be provoked into thought by a thing" (Mika, 2015c, p. 64). Salmond (2014) supports this when she outlines that a Māori ontology is a veritable field of unequivocal demarcations between human, animal, and mineral and that 'matter have never been dead or separated from people' (p. 305). Mika cites the Māori cultural tradition of naming our river or mountain when sharing pepeha. He notes that "[t]he self can be thought of as amongst those things whilst being constituted by them in some form" (p. 64). This is in contrast to the transcendent, autonomous entity that pervades Western thinking. What is of utmost importance from a Māori ontological perspective is seeing "the nature of the self as an entity among others" (Mika, 2014, p. 56).

iii. A 'Traditional' Kaupapa Māori Theory. It is with this tentative approach to the perceptions of things and a Māori ontological perspective of the self as an entity

among others that I embrace an ‘uncertain’ version of Kaupapa Māori theory to couch my research in. As has been noted, this tentativeness and uncertainty stems from a number of the criticism levelled at Kaupapa Māori theorists’ including the propensity to employ essentialist binaries, embrace a certainty reminiscent of the Western desire for completeness, and a sense that Kaupapa Māori advocates lack a degree of internal criticism. Despite these reservations there are aspects of a more ‘traditional’ Kaupapa Māori theory that need to be expounded upon as they also form part of theoretical and philosophically framing of this research.

Aligned to the embracing of a Māori ontological and epistemological frame of reference, Kaupapa Māori is taken-up as a localising theory, grounding the research in the particulars of education in New Zealand as it pertains to the schooling of tamariki Māori in mainstream primary schools. Kaupapa Māori is utilised as a theoretical and analytical tool to assess whether educational practices in mainstream contexts are carried out in a non-patronising and non-tokenistic manner in regards to Māori ways of “knowing the world” (Fitzsimons & Smith, 2000, p. 26). This investigation recognises that ‘counter-hegemonic’ strategies and policies that are enacted within mainstream institutes are inevitably conditioned by the modernist grammar of these establishments. Rather than be abandoned, such strategies and policies are in need of being “complemented by other forms of thinking generated by other forms of being that have been a part of our ancestral heritage” (Ahenakew et al., 2014, p. 222).

The emancipatory goal of Kaupapa Māori theory is also invoked in this research with the intent of informing current policy and practice as it pertains to tamariki Māori in mainstream schools. Smith (1999) supports this when she states that Kaupapa Māori research provides “a focus through which Māori people…have been able to engage in a dialogue about setting new directions for the priorities, policies,

and practices of research, for, by and with Māori” (p. 183). Ahenakew et al. (2014) endorse this when they maintain that in recognising “modernity’s epistemic trap” (p. 217), Kaupapa Māori research has the potential to offer “metaphysical possibilities for being and knowing differently: (p. 222) by “renewing our sacred and spiritual connections” (p. 229) and moving us “towards a complementary conceptualization of space” (p. 228).

Two indigenous ‘projects’, as outlined by Linda Smith (1999) in her seminal book *Decolonizing Methodologies*, are utilised as a means by which to connect and move this research toward being conducted within a Māori ontological and epistemological frame of reference. Firstly, this study attempts to indigenise the research process by drawing from a Māori worldview and value system that embraces open-endedness and tentativeness and which understands the interconnectedness of all through whakapapa (see Henry & Pene, 2001; Mika, 2014; Salmond, 2014). Secondly, this study attempts to reframe the research process by widening the issue under investigation. Smith (1999) articulates that reframing involves ‘defining the problem or issue’ at hand from a more holistic perspective rather than endorsing a taken-for-granted, “individualized programme emphasis” (pp. 153-154). The purpose of this study is not to assess whether teachers are fulfilling the performative criteria set out in the Ka Hikitia policy document. Rather, this research goes beyond this traditional approach and instead questions whether this policy maintains a culturalist incorporation of Māori language, identity and culture in mainstream primary schools and negates an even broader consideration of how to address the ‘problem’ of Māori disproportionate underachievement.

Finally, Durie (in Durie, Hoskins, & Jones, 2012) articulates that rather than using the term ‘Kaupapa Māori Theory’, ‘mātauranga Māori’ might be a better

epistemological descriptor of an ‘always evolving underlying body of knowledge that can guide practice and understanding’ (p. 23). While Durie argues that mātauranga Māori recognises that knowledge is always changing, he propounds that how one practices research, might be through a Kaupapa Māori approach. Durie notes this disconnect between Kaupapa Māori and mātauranga Māori as being a matter that is currently being played out in the field. He states, ‘That is the challenge for theoreticians in kaupapa Māori – to put a bit more emphasis on mātauranga Māori as an evolving body of knowledge’ (Durie in Durie, Hoskins, & Jones, 2012, p. 24). This study acknowledges this tension and understands that a number of Kaupapa Māori theoreticians are currently exploring this embryonic space theoretically, epistemologically and ontologically in relation to mātauranga Māori.

3.1.3 Enactment Theory. Enactment theory is invoked as another theoretical lens for the proposed research. As has already been outlined in the review of the literature, enactment theory pits itself against policy implementation theory, proffering that teachers are not mere ciphers who implement but instead are “actors and subjects, subjects to and objects of policy” (Ball, Maguire, & Braun, 2012, p. 3). Under a policy implementation theoretical framework, teachers are collectively singled out of the policy picture and their shortcomings, weaknesses and inability to ensure a given policy inhabits their school or classroom environments are highlighted and focused upon for improvements and development (Werts & Brewer, 2015). Such an instrumentalist focus negates the broader institutional, material and external contexts in which teachers are situated within and implicated by both professionally and subjectively. An enactment theoretical perspective is embraced throughout the research to not only give ‘voice’ to primary school teachers, but to question the

'common sense' notions of how policy inhabits the mainstream schooling environment.

3.1.4 Policy-as-Discourse Theory. A policy-as-discourse theoretical approach is also embraced in this research. Like enactment theory, policy-as-discourse theory confounds instrumentalist policy logic but in a different way. Policy-as-discourse begins by probing 'how 'problems' get framed within policy proposals, how the frames affect what can be thought about and how this affects possiblities for action' (Bacchi, 2000, p. 49). Ball (1990, in Bacchi, 2000, p. 17) acknowledges Foucault's (1977) definition of discourse as "practices that systematically form the objects of which they speak; they do not identify objects, they constitute them and in the practice of doing so conceal their own invention". Such a theoretical positioning allows researchers to not only probe into how actors such as teachers construct and enact responses to policies but also to ascertain whether actors perceive their actions and responses as limited or constrained in any manner. Policy-as-discourse theory will allow a probing of the 'problem' of disproportionate Māori student underachievement and explore whether the 'solution' of the cultural thesis underpinning *Ka Hikitia,* plays a part in constraining and limiting what can be thought about and what can be actioned within schools.

3.2 Summary

This chapter has outlined the theoretical framework for this study. It has described the personal struggles that I, as a researcher, have encountered attempting to articulate a theoretical space to situate this work. It has expressed an overarching Māori ontology and epistemology nestled within Mika's description of an 'uncertain'

Kaupapa Māori theory. There are two key features of this ‘uncertain’ theoretical approach. The first is a tentative approach to the perception of things. Challenging the dominant rational approach to understanding people, ideas and concepts via pure moments of representation, a tentative approach privileges hesitancy, fragmentation, and incompleteness. The second is the sense of connectivity between the self and thing. In contrast to the transcendent, autonomous entity that pervades Western thinking, a Māori ontological perspective is bound to the interrelationships that exist between the self as an entity among others entities.

Two theories from the critical policy research literature have been articulate to further frame this study. Firstly, enactment theory is used to help understand the broader institutional, material and external contexts that impact upon teacher enactment of *Ka Hikitia*. Secondly, policy-as-discourse theory is used to probe how the problem representation of disproportionate Māori achievement is framed within *Ka Hikitia*. It critiques how such a framing impacts upon what can be thought about and, in turn, how this affects possiblities for action by mainstream school teachers.

CHAPTER FOUR: METHODS

4.0 Introduction

This chapter outlines the key elements of the methods and procedures undertaken in this exploratory mixed-methods study. It begins with Section 4.1 which explicates an overview of the two sequential phases of the study. Subsection 4.1.1 describes the one-to-one interview procedures utilised in the intial phase. A rationale for these interviews is articulated followed by the criteria used for the selection of research particiants. This is subsequently followed by a participant sampling selection design. The manner in which the one-to-one interview data was collected and analysed will then be outlined.

Subsection 4.1.2 outlines the steps involved in the self-administered, online survey for the second phase of the exploratory mixed-methods study. A rationale for the survey is articulated along with a participant sampling design. This is subsequently followed by an outline of how the survey data was collected and analysed. A brief subsection follows this which provides a summary of how the connected results from the two phases of data were collected, analysed, and interpreted to answer and address the research questions.

The chapter concludes with a summary of a number of ethical considerations that were taken into account throughout the study followed by an overview of the chapter.

4.1 Research Design

There were two sequential phases to this exploratory mixed-methods research. The first phase involves the carrying out of a series of depth interviews with primary teachers from a number of 'typical' mainstream primary schools within the Manawatū/Palmerston North city region. These one-to-one depth interviews provided a picture of how this sample of primary teachers enact *Ka Hikitia* and the ways in which aspects of the policy are negotiated, embraced, represented or omitted by teachers, in the everyday life of their school. Data from this first phase were used for two main purposes. Firstly, to give democratic voice to primary school teachers in relation to policy within their workplace. As key stakeholders within schools, teachers' perspectives, experiences and views are often omitted from government processes and need to be included in policy enactment processes. Secondly, the depth interviews were used for the purpose of thematically developing a set of codes based on teachers' perspectives, experiences and views. These codes and themes informed the design and structure of the region-wide teacher survey carried out for the second phase of the investigation. This follows Creswell and Plano Clark's (2011) exploratory design instrument development model whereby the survey is developed based on the results of the first qualitative phase. The intent of the survey phase is to "quantitatively generalize qualitative results" (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2011, p. 86).

This second phase utilised the *SurveyMonkey* platform where largely quantitative, but also snippets of qualitative data, were collected. The data from the survey was used to help to ascertain the breadth of the phase one findings in relation to the enactment of *Ka Hikitia* across the mainstream, primary school teacher population in the Manawatū region. These two phases will now be outlined with

further detail provided for each in relation to the rationale for method choice, particular sampling design/selection criteria used, and methods of data collection and data analysis. This section concludes with a brief summary of how the two methods were integrated.

4.1.1 Phase One: Depth-interviews of Teachers from 'Ordinary' Schools

i. Rationale. The primary rationale behind the selection of one-to-one depth interviews with a sample of mainstream primary school teachers in the first phase of this study is that very little research data exists which takes into account the range of contextual and subjective factors that influence teachers' enactment of culturally responsive policy imperatives such as *Ka Hikitia*. As articulated by Creswell and Plano Clark (2011), by exploring the nature of this phenomena qualitatively through in-depth interviews first, the researcher will be able to better understand how *Ka Hikitia* is enacted within the complex ecologies of mainstream classrooms and schools and take into account the range of "intricate inter-relationships of actors, environments, and processes" (Weaver-Hightower, 2008a in Weaver-Hightower, 2014, p. 115) that exist. How *Ka Hikitia* is 'lived' within the everyday social processes of mainstream primary school teachers will provide the opportunity to "shed empirical light" (Yin, 2014, p. 40) on a range of contextual and subjective factors that influence teachers' enactment of culturally responsive learning for Māori students. It will also enable the researcher to 'get close' to the day-to-day normative assumptions and "discursive alignments" (Weaver-Hightower, 2014, p. 118) that teachers make in relation to the culture thesis underpinnings of *Ka Hikitia*. By carrying out the qualitiative one-to-one depth interviews first, the voices of the teachers are heard and factored into the design of the second phase survey rather than via an imposed by the researcher through a survey at the outset.

ii. Participant Selection Criteria. Criteria were placed upon the selection of phase one depth interview participants. These are listed below:

- Participants must be accessible to the researcher (teachers of schools within the Manawatū District/Palmerston North city area).
- Participants must be current practising full-time Y1-8 classroom teachers within 1 of the 58 mainstream contributing, full primary and intermediate schools in the Manawatū region.
- Participants need to be from schools on a 'typical' three-year ERO review cycle. The rationale for not including participants from schools on four/five year ERO review cycles or from schools in need of external assistance is that this would potentially identify additional factors to teachers' experiences and enactment of *Ka Hikitia* that would be specific to their cycle status. To minimise this, only participants from schools on a 'typical' three-year ERO review cycle were invited.
- No participants from home schooling operations, correspondence school, religious or private schools as these notable differences from 'typical' mainstream schools will impact upon the nature of how *Ka Hikitia* is enacted.

- No teaching principals or part-time teachers as they will hold a different perspective from those who are full-time teachers only.

With this in mind, of the 58 schools that provide mainstream primary education in the Manawatū/Palmerston North city region, a total of 34 (58.6%) met the above criteria for inclusion in the study at the time of data collection. Of those that did not meet the criteria for inclusion, 12 (20.7%) are on 4-5 year ERO review schedules, 4 (6.9% are on 1-2 ERO review schedules, 7 (12.1%) are religious schools and 1 (1.7%) is a private school.

iii. Participant Selection Sampling Design. Participants for the phase one depth interviews were selected from the 34 mainstream primary schools that met the selection criteria based on a purposive, maximal variation sampling method. A diverse range of teacher participants were selected so that a "range of different perspectives on the central phenomenon" (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2011, p. 174) of how mainstream teachers enact the *Ka Hikitia* policy, can be thematically analysed and used for the purpose of survey tool development in phase two. The main idea behind the utilisation of a maximal variation sampling design is that "if participants are purposefully chosen to be different in the first place, then their views will reflect this difference" and "provide a complex picture of the phenomenon" (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2011, p. 174). This complexity will strategically feed into the development of a more broad-ranging and fully encompassing survey tool. *Table 2* below outlines the type of variations that were taken into account with regard to phase one depth interview participants to ensure a breadth of responses. As it is seen to be beneficial that the sample in phase one matches the diversity evident within the teaching profession, the

following table outlines the variables that were considered in a proposed sample of approximately 12 interview participants in terms of school type, school decile, gender, ethnicity, and school location.

Table 2: Proposed Phase One Maximal Variation Sampling Table

Variation Characteristic	12 interview participants
School Type	5 full primary school teachers 6 contributing school teachers 1 intermediate school teacher
School Decile	3 teachers from low decile schools (Decile 1-4) 6 teachers from medium decile schools (Decile 5-7) 3 teachers from high decile schools (Decile 8-10)
Gender	11 female teachers 1 male teacher
Ethnicity	10 Pākehā/European teachers 1 NZ Māori teacher 1 Pacific Island/Asian or Other ethnicity teacher
School Location	3 teachers who work within the Manawatū District 9 teachers who work within the Palmerston North City District

There were thirteen teachers who were keen to participate in the initial phase of the study but to ensure maximal variation, (i.e., there were interested teachers from the same school) teachers were purposively chosen to ensure a diverse range of participants were selected. The final sample size for phase one was a total of ten participants.

Table 3: Actual Phase One Maximal Variation Sampling Table

Variation Characteristic	10 interview participants
School Type	6 full primary school teachers 2 contributing school teachers

	2 intermediate school teachers
School Decile	2 teachers from low decile schools (Decile 1-4) 3 teachers from medium decile schools (Decile 5-7) 5 teachers from high decile schools (Decile 8-10)
Gender	8 female teachers 2 male teachers
Ethnicity	8 Pākehā/European teachers 1 NZ Māori/Pākehā/European teacher 1 NZ Māori/Asian teacher
School Location	3 teachers who work within the Manawatū District 7 teachers who work within the Palmerston North City District

iv. Depth-Interview Data Collection. Prior to the collection of phase one data, 1-2 pilot depth interviews were carried out with the researcher's own teaching colleagues. The pilot interviews served the purpose of trailling and refining the interview protocol. Information about the logistics of the inquiry and the honing of particular interview questions and probes were gleaned from the pilot and used to inform how the phase one depth interviews would eventually proceed.

The sole data collection method for phase one was the one-to-one depth interview. Depth interviews with teachers followed a line of questioning outlined in the protocol (see *Appendix B*). The first two interview questions focused on the participant sharing about themselves, their teaching experience and any basic understanding they had of *Ka Hikitia*. Participants were asked to share about what they as teachers did to enact Ka Hikitia as well as outlining enactments that were part of the school's broader policy response to *Ka Hikitia*. Participants were then invited to talk about personal, in-school, community and government factors that influened their ability (or lack thereof) to enact *Ka Hikitia*. Participants were then encouraged to reflect on their particular Māori students that they had taught. They were asked to

comment on what they perceived as playing a critical role in either their achieving and underachieving. Participants were then asked whether or not they considered *Ka Hikitia* addresses the issue of disproportionate Māori achievement. Inclusion of these specific questions in the interview protocol were guided by the literature, by the research aims and questions, and by the feedback from the set of pilot interviews carried out earlier. Interviews lasted approximately one hour in length. All interviews were recorded and stored away safely for transcription and analysis.

Two strategies were employed in order to access potential participants. Firstly, letters were sent to a targeted selection (based on the maximal variable sampling design) of the 58 primary school principals within the Manawatū District/Palmerston North City region with a series of leaflets to be passed onto teachers which outlined details of the proposed investigation, its aims and intentions. The researcher's details were made available for potential participants to contact if they were interested in contributing their perspectives. Secondly, as the researcher is a principal with a number of professional connections to teachers and principals in the Manawatū region, I exhausted some of the connections I had and asked if I could attend staff meetings where I could talk about the project directly and elicit potential participation in a more face-to-face manner.

v. Data Analysis. The three theoretical tools of policy-as-discourse, policy enactment (broadly enacapsulating policy translation, interpretation, enactment, context, and performativity) and an 'uncertain' kaupapa Māori theory are interwoven throughout the analysis and interpration of the depth interview data. These facets were held together in a sort of "constructive tension" (Ball, Maguire, & Braun, 2012, p. 15), drawing from all, individually and collectively, at one time or another, to help make sense of the sets of data collected. Significant features from the one-to-one depth

interviews were coded and explored thematically and interpretations regarding what was noted were put forward.

As the data was being transcribed, read and re-read, the technique of memoing was used. These reflective memos indicated what was being learnt from the data. Memos included thoughts "on emerging concepts, themes, and patterns found in the data" (Burke Johnson & Christensen, 2014, pp. 588-589). As I became more familiar with the range of memos, I then identified relevant statements, or units of analysis, from participants' transciptions that contained one main idea pertinent to my research questions. These units of analysis varied in length and were summarised with a brief sentence by the researcher along with a code identifying which research question it related to. For example, the below participants anecdote was coded: *RQ2c: Teachers are overloaded with the basic core targets*. This relates to the second research question (RQ2) and is a contextual (c) factor impacting upon teacher enactment of *Ka Hikitia* and is surmised as close as possible to using the words of the participants while retaining the meaning of the unit.

P6	Teachers already feel quite overloaded with routine targets in the basic core areas and that's where they put all their professional learning into, you know. There's not time to devote to…basically you're learning a second language as well cos' essentially if you're going to do it really well and do it justice you almost need to be learning a second language, don't you, in order to be able to do it justice.

Initially there were 539 units of participant data coded in this manner. But as Braun and Clarke (2006) highlight, the process of analysis that I followed was

somewhat recursive, where I moved in and out of the data, recognising that some units had more than one idea present, so a high degree of reorganising and recoding took place. At this point a total of 614 units of participant data was coded. These 614 units were sorted into a total of 74 different codes. These codes were collated with the focus moving toward sorting the different codes into potential themes. I analysed the range of codes and considered how "different codes may combine to form an overarching theme" (Braun & Clarke, 2006, p. 89). A degree of re-organising and moving into theme-piles took place, thinking about the links between codes and emerging themes.

As this process progressed and themes were starting to be emerge, I reviewed all the coded data extracts and considered them in light of one another to see if they appeared "to form a coherent pattern" (Braun & Clarke, 2006, p. 91). Some coded data extracts were moved to another theme or discarded and some themes were reworked. This process was ongoing as themes were being refined and clearly articulated. In total, twelve interpretive themes were elicited from the initial one-to-one interview phase of the study.

These twelve themes were then used as a basis from which to develop the particulars of the second phase survey. Caracelli and Greene (1993, in Creswell & Plano Clark, 2011, p. 213) note that this strategy, used by some researchers utilising a mixed-methods approach, where one data type (in this instance, one-to-one depth interviews) is analysed for the purpose of creating a framework or tool to be applied in the analysis of a consecutive phase of the research (in this instance, a region wide teacher survey).

Carrying out of depth interviews aims to provide the research with richly descriptive data from "quotes of key participants, anecdotes, prose composed from interviews, and other literary techniques" by creating "mental images that bring to life

the complexity of the many variables inherent in the phenomenon being studied" (Hancock & Algozzine, 2006, p. 16). However, a primary rationale for carrying out the depth interviews, as Yin (in Bassey, 1999) describes in relation to exploratory research, is "aimed at defining the questions and hypotheses of a subsequent" (p. 29) aspect of an investigation. As has been already articulated, the findings from phase one were compared and contrasted with, and discussed and examined in relation to, the phase two findings.

4.1.2 Phase Two: Online Survey

i. Rationale and Design. The findings from the phase one interviews were used to inform the content and design of the online survey (see *Appendix C*). The survey asked for demographic information including gender, ethnicity, school decile and length of teaching service. The remainder of the survey had eight sections, with each section being aligned to one or more of the twelve themes from phase one. The first section of the online survey centred around teachers' understandings of the purpose of *Ka Hikitia*. These were linked to first phase themes one and eight. This was followed by two sections which examined how *Ka Hikitia* is enacted both my themselves as teachers and more broadly at their school, linked to first phase themes two and three. In total there were 40 survey items requiring *Yes/No/Don't Know* responses in sections two and three. The fourth and fifth sections of the survey asked participants to indicate their level of agreement with a series of statements in relation to a range of contextual and subjective factors that impact upon their enactment of *Ka Hikitia*. These survey items integrated six of the twelve first phase themes. The sixth and seventh section of the survey asked participants to indicate their level of agreement with two statements in relation to the impact of culturally responsive pedagogy upon Māori student engagement and achievement. These aligned to themes nine and ten

from the first phase findings. The eighth and final section of the survey asked participants to indicate their level of agreement with a statement about social factors having greater impact upon Māori student achievement than culturally responsive pedagogy. This survey section was linked to first phase themes eleven and twelve.

A few contingency questions and open-ended 'Other' comment sections also formed part of the survey. Contingency questions are those items in a survey that direct participants to varying follow-up questions, dependent upon their response (Burke Johnson & Christensen, 2014). The purpose behind the use of contingency questions is that they allowed respondents to answer a closed-ended question in depth and thus improving the data that the researcher receives (Fraenkel et al., 2014). Similar to this, open-ended/qualitative type questions allowed for more individualised and in depth responses (Fraenkel et al., 2014) which were analysed after data collection and could be used as a catalyst for future research.

A number of five-point likert scale items (i.e., *Strongly Agree, Agree, Neither Agree or Disagree, Disagree, Strongly Disagree*) were used to broadly gauge participants' attitudes and levels of agreement on varying statements related to *Ka Hikitia* and culturally responsive pedagogy. The five-point likert scale was used to determine averages for each statement so as to help build a picture of how a larger cohort responded to the items for further analysis and discussion.

A key rationale for using a survey for the second phase of this study was due to it being a sound method for collecting data regarding participants' beliefs, thoughts, feelings, perceptions and attitudes (Burke Johnson & Christensen, 2014). As the survey was used to investigate mainstream primary school teachers' interpretations and enactment of *Ka Hikitia*, their understandings and perceptions of the contextual and subjective factors that influence their enactment of *Ka Hikitia* and their beliefs

about the cultural thesis underpinnings of the *Ka Hikitia* document, the survey method was deemed most suitable to elicit this. The survey explored how embedded the 'culture thesis' underpinning of *Ka Hikitia* is amongst mainstream primary school teachers. This investigation sought to ascertain whether or not it has become a part of teachers' normative 'taken-for-grantedness'. A survey is a suitable tool for not only obtaining information about teachers' attitudes and perceptions but also how such thoughts impact upon the behavioural intentions of research participants (Burke Johnson & Christensen, 2014).

Another rationale for using the survey for the second phase of this study was due to being able to ask the same set of questions to a large group of participants within a relatively short timeframe. Gathering participants' data in such a timely and efficient manner allowed for immediate data analysis upon closing of the survey.

ii. Survey Sampling Design. Fraenkel et al. (2014) suggest that in order to make trustworthy statements about a target population, researchers must clearly define that population. In the proposed study the target population is: full-time, classroom teachers (1.0) who teach in a mainstream (English-medium) contributing, full primary, intermediate (Y1-Y8) classroom within the Manawatū region.

For the survey, a non-random, convenience sampling method was utilised. Convenience sampling was used because of practical constraints around the fact that random sampling is impossible in light of the target population of the proposed research. Convenience sampling is seen as a perfect fit as it opens up opportunities for any mainstream primary school teacher from any of the 'typical' 34 identified schools within the Manawatū region, who is available and can volunteer their time, to participate in the study (Burke Johnson & Christensen, 2014).

Participant recruitment took the form of making initial contact with principals at all 34 'typical' mainstream primary schools in the wider Manawatū and Palmerston North city region. The initial contact letter invited the full-time teaching staff of schools to complete the online survey by a particular date. A link to the survey on the *SurveyMonkey* platform was forwarded to all schools for ease of access.

In terms of sample size for the survey, Bryman (2008) suggests that the question of 'how large should my sample be?' is not one that can be answered in a straightforward manner. Fraenkel et al. (2014) answer this with the idea that "a sample should be as large as a researcher can obtain with a reasonable expenditure of time and energy" (p. 103). With the suggestion that researchers ought to try to obtain as large a sample as they reasonably can, they go on to state that for a study, such as the proposed research, "a sample with a minimum number of 100 is essential" (Fraenkel et al., 2014, p. 103). With this in mind and in recognising that the population of the 34 'typical' schools within the Manawatū region is approximately 240 teachers, a return of 100 would seem more likely and feasible when taking into account time, energy, expenditure and potential rates of online returns.

As there were approximately 240 primary/intermediate teachers working in the Palmerston North/ Manawatū area at the time that the survey was sent out to schools that met the participant recruitment criteria (*see Chapter 3*). In total there were 61 responses. Of the 61 responses, 12 were incomplete. This left a total of 49 complete responses out of an approximate total of 240 teachers. This is a survey return of approximately 20.42 per cent. Some of the issues impacting upon this response rate are discussed in further detail below.

Table 4 below outlines the demographic information of the 49 survey participants in regards to their current school decile, gender, and ethnicity.

Table 4: Phase Two Survey Participant Information

Variation Characteristic	49 survey participants
School Decile	19 teachers (38.78%) from low decile schools (Decile 1-4) 10 teachers (20.41%) from medium decile schools (Decile 5-7) 20 teachers (40.82%) from high decile schools (Decile 8-10)
Gender	40 female teachers (81.63%) 9 male teachers (18.37%)
Ethnicity	33 Pākehā/European teachers (67.37%) 5 NZ Māori teachers (10.20%) 3 NZ Māori/Pākehā/European teachers (6.12%) 2 NZ Māori/Pacific teachers (4.08%) 2 Pacific teachers (4.08%) 1 Australian (2.04%), 1 Canadian (2.04%) 1 English (2.04%), 1 Prefer Not To Answer (2.04%)

iii. Survey Data Collection. A number of key features were taken into account with the design of the survey. The appearance and format was easy to follow, it was not too lengthy, and the questions were straightforward to understand and answer (Fraenkel et al., 2014). How the questions were phrased was carefully considered with specialised and/or unusual words avoided or well defined and natural and familiar language predominating so as to make it easier for participants to complete, making them feel less threatened and more relaxed with the task of survey completion (Burke Johnson & Christensen, 2014).

The survey was piloted with 2-3 of the researcher's own teaching colleagues. The pilot test uncovered a few "ambiguities" and "poorly worded questions" (Fraenkel et al., 2014, p. 401) and also helped to clarify whether the instructions to the respondent were clear. A thinkaloud technique was explained to the researcher's own teaching colleagues and employed whereby they verbalised their thoughts and perceptions

while engage in filling out the online survey to determine whether items are being interpreted the way that was intended, why they chose a particular response choice and whether questions were understood in a consistent way (Burke Johnson & Christensen, 2014). A number of small problems with the survey instrument were changed based on feedback from the thinkaloud technique and re-piloted with the same sample of mainstream primary school teachers.

Fraenkel et al. (2014) note that there are several ways to collect survey data. A process of eliciting principals' support was preferred rather than sending individual invitations to each teacher. Fraenkel et al. (2014) note that surveys obtain higher response rates when they are sent to personnel in positions of authority. Principals were offered the direct distribution of the tool itself by the researcher at a staff meeting or similar time when staff are gathered together. No principals took this offer up and could be seen as a reason as to why the rate of response was not as high as expected.

It must also be noted that there was refusal from some of the principals to pass on the invitation to teachers at their school to participate in the survey. One incident saw the principal of one school act as 'gate keeper', refusing to pass the researcher's invitation to his teaching staff citing that he often gets hundreds of requests for participation in research for his staff and just deletes them. All requests for teacher participants were forwarded by personal contact with school principals within the region and while there were a number of survey respondents from low decile (1-4) and high-decile (8-10) schools, there were comparatively few middle decile (5-7) teacher survey respondents. This can be attributed, in part, to some principals refusing to pass on the survey link and research participation invitation to their teaching staff.

iv. Data Analysis. Sixty one survey responses were collected. However, 12 of these surveys were incomplete. Forty nine completed surveys were collected for

analysis. Percentages of the total sample responses were provided for a number of survey items (i.e., Q.11: Item 1: '*I regularly teach Te Reo in my class' (Yes/No/Don't Know*). For other survey items, average scores out of 5 were given to indicate how prevalent a factor was across the survey respondents (i.e., Q.12: Item 8: '*I feel supported by the Ministry of Education to enact Ka Hikitia*.' (*Strongly Agree, Agree, Neither Agree or Disagree, Disagree, Strongly Disagree = Average 2.94 out of 5).* Respondents were give opportunities to make comments following a survey item or a series of survey items. While many respondents chose not to make any comments, others provided comments ranging from a single sentence up to and including lengthy and detailed paragraphs. These comments were used to help illustrate the experiences and perspectives of respondents for particular survey items. With such comments sitting alongside the descriptive statistics of survey items, both were used in order to draw conclusions from the results (Fraenkel et al., 2014).

As the survey was online, an initial set of descriptive analyses were provided through the *SurveyMonkey* platform. Using descriptive statistics through the reporting of categorical data enabled basic comparisons of groups within the sample to be made. The variables of teacher ethnicity, gender, school decile rating, and school type in relation to primary teachers' attitudes toward and enactment of the *Ka Hikitia* policy were analysed.

In terms of survey data analysis, for each of the statement items an average determining the degree of agreeability from the entire cohort was provided. Comments from participants for each particular statement or set of statements were also listed. For the school and teacher enactment sections of the survey, participants had to identify whether they or their school practised particular enactments through indicating Yes, No or *Don't Know*. Total percentages of enactment from the entire

cohort were provided with comments from participants also listed. These statements were coded. Every comment from survey participants was also coded. These were brief codes which summarised the participant's comments.

As was carried out in the first phase data analysis, reflective memos were written to note what was being learnt from the survey data and codes. Thoughts "on emerging concepts, themes, and patterns found in the data" (Burke Johnson & Christensen, 2014, pp. 588-589) were written as the survey data was read and re-read by the researcher. Decisions were made about which data was relevant to the study's research aims and questions and which data was not relevant and initial themes for collated, reviewed and changed before a total of thirteen themes were gleaned from the phase two online survey.

These themes were then compared and integrated with those from the initial interview phase of the study. A total of eight complementary themes were explicated. While the study followed a sequential, qual→QUAN mixed-methods research design, the final set of coherent themes bring forth illustration, elaboration, and clarification of phase one findings with the findings of the second phase.

4.1.3. Summary of Mixed-Methods Data Analysis. The research followed a two phase exploratory mixed-methods design it seems pertinent to recapitulate and summarise, following Creswell and Plano Clark's (2011, pp. 218-219) table of steps and key decisions in mixed-methods data analyis, the key mixed-methods data analysis steps and decisions that were made throughout the investigation.

Firstly, qualitative one-to-one depth interviews were carried out and analysed. Decisions about the design of the quantitative survey were based on this analysis. Once the tool was developed, the survey was piloted and then, based on feedback, the survey instrument was refined and finalised. Quantitative data was collected and analysed

using descriptive statistics. Decisions were made in regard to how the quantitative results build upon or expand the qualitative findings. Once that data was collected and analysed, the exploratory design prompted the researcher to think about how to interpret the connected results from the two phases to answer the research questions.

Following Howe's (2004) articulation of mixed-methods interpretivism, primacy is given to the voices and dialogue of teachers, a deliberate act of democratically based research. Participants are construed in this research as key stakeholders within the policy enactment process whose perspectives and actions are implicated, albeit with great complexity, both subjectively and contextually. Rather than endorsing the role of teachers as mere 'policy do-ers' where interventions that 'work' are analysed under the unquestioning status quo, the data was collected and analysed throughout this project in such a manner that raises 'critical questions about the social and institutional context of schooling' (Howe, 2004, p. 57) and the role of the *Ka Hikitia* policy within the enactment process.

It is noted that the two different phases of mixed-methods data collection might yield contradictory findings (Johnson and Christensen, 2014). While the two phases did not yield contradictory findings, the more dominant QUAN findings of this qual→QUAN study certainly had a different tangential 'voice' to that of the 'voice' from the qualitative findings. This 'contradiction' was seen as an opportunity for analysis in a further study with a reframed research objective, purpose and questions to better reflect the new knowledge that has emerged from the data.

4.2 Ethical Considerations

It is the responsibility of every researcher to ensure that all participants in a study “are protected from physical or psychological harm, discomfort, or danger that may arise due to research procedures” (Fraenkel et al., 2014, p. 63). A number of ethical issues that arose from the research were identified, along with steps to ensure such issues were minimised.

Informed consent was an integral part of the research (see *Appendix A*). There is low risk of psychological harm. As the nature of the depth interviews asked participants to reflect on their perceptions, attitudes and experiences of incorporating Māori language, culture and identity in mainstream school contexts, it did raise levels of sensitivities towards the issues for some. Full information about the project, its aims and intentions were provided to both depth interview and survey participants. If teachers did not wish to participate, they did not have to. For phase one, interview participants were given a range of options for where they wish their interview to be held. If psychological harm may come from having their interview carried out in their workplace due to potential sensitive issues they might raise, participants were able to choose an alternate place where such potential harm would be minimized.

Confidentiality was assured in all instances and no one else will have access to any participants’ data apart from the researcher, academic supervisors and assistants involved in transcription procedures. As noted by Fraenkel et al. (2014), the names of participants were removed from all data collection forms and instead be assigned a code. The researcher closely guarded all data.

All participants had the right to withdraw from the research up until the point of data analysis, and request their data not be used in any form. All participants were

assured that "any data collected from or about them will be held in confidence" (Fraenkel et al., 2014, p. 64) and names of individuals or schools will never be used. The Massey University Code of Ethical Conduct was used throughout and the project was evaluated and judged to be low risk (see A*ppendix A*).

Clandinin and Burke Johnson (2014) note that there is a set of relational ethics that researchers ought to be aware of when conducting investigations. Relational ethics are of particular salience to the research. The primary ethical responsibility is to the participants and the stories and perspectives that they share with the researcher. As relationships build between the researcher and interview participants, the authors state that "issues of anonymity and confidentiality take on added importance as the complexity of lives are made visible in research texts" (Clandinin & Burke Johnson, 2014, p. 432). "Respectfully representing participants' lived and told stories" (ibid, p. 433) is at the core of the ethical responsibility of narrative inquirers and will also be at the core of this research (Bassey, 1999).

A kaupapa Māori approach, while utilised throughout other aspects of the proposed research (i.e., theoretical framework and data analysis), was also 'actioned' during the phase one depth interviews. While the participants may not all be Māori, as a Māori researcher, there are a number of kaupapa Māori ethical approaches that were 'taken' into each one-to-one interview. The concepts of 'aroha ki te tangata', 'kanohi kitea', and 'kaua e takahia te mana o te tangata' (Smith, 1997) all focus on being relational and respectful of those who are being researched which in this instance, are mainstream primary school teachers. While these concepts are often used as culturally specific ideas for researchers working *with* Māori participants, they are invoked here as a guideline for how a Māori researcher carries out his or her work. Following Smith's (2002) argument that research for a thesis should be seen as conceptual rather

than as a methodological recipe to follow, this research centres itself on Māori concerns in mainstream education and aims to carry out phase one interviews from this perspective.

4.3 Summary

This chapter has outlined the key elements of the methods and procedures that were undertaken in this exploratory mixed-methods study. The one-to-one interview procedures utilised in the intial phase were described followed by a participant sampling selection design. The manner in which the one-to-one interview data was collected and analysed was outlined. In particular, it outlined how the phase one interview data was used to inform the structure and make-up of the second phase survey.

A rationale for the survey was articulated along with a participant sampling design. This was subsequently followed by an outline of how the survey data was collected and analysed. A brief subsection followed this which provided a summary of how the connected results from the two phases of data were collected, analysed, and interpreted to answer and address the research questions. A summary of the ethical considerations that were taken into account concluded the chapter.

CHAPTER FIVE: FINDINGS

5.0 Introduction

This chapter articulates the thematic findings from the two phases of the study. It will begin by outlining twelve interpretive themes from the one-to-one depth interviews carried out with ten teacher participants. This data was then used to help formulate a survey that was sent out to a set of schools for teachers to voluntarily complete in the Manawatū/Palmerston North area. Forty nine surveys were analysed in the findings for phase two. Thirteen interpretive themes were identified from the survey data and these will be explicated in this chapter. The data from both phases were then looked at to see what complementary interpretive themes could be elicited. Eight complementary themes were elicited from the two phases of the research and will be outlined at the conclusion of this chapter.

5.1 Phase One: 1-1 Depth Interview Themes

Twelve themes were elicited form the initial interview phase of the study. They are noted below in summary and expanded upon thereafter.

Table 5: Summary of Phase One Themes

Theme 1: *Teachers interpret Ka Hikitia as being about Māori achieving as Māori and improving Māori student academic achievement.*
Theme 2: *Senior leaders provide a Māori language and cultural backdrop to ensure their school enacts Ka Hikitia.*

Theme 3: *Teachers employ a range of enactments in their classroom related to Ka Hikitia, with some of these enactments being perfunctory in nature.*
Theme 4: *Teachers struggle with enacting Ka Hikitia due to having many other priorities to juggle.*
Theme 5: *Teachers sense a lack of support and trust with a concomitant intensity from the MoE on target-meeting pressures to ensure Māori students achieve.*
Theme 6: *Teachers find that involving whānau in the education of their tamariki can be tricky.*
Theme 7: *Teachers have co-workers who have a poor attitude towards Māori language and culture and therefore very little/token gestures are enacted in their classrooms.*
Theme 8: *Some teachers know very little about Ka Hikitia.*
Theme 9: *Some teachers believe that Ka Hikitia is limited in its scope to effect positive change for Māori.*
Theme 10: *Teachers believe that Māori students who achieve do so because of strong parental, whānau and community support and relationships.*
Theme 11: *Teachers believe that Māori children who underachieve do so due to poor parenting and issues going on at home.*
Theme 12: *Some teachers believe that Māori children who underachieve do so due to a range of problems related to poverty, social issues, and socio-economic factors.*

5.1.1 Theme 1: Teachers interpret Ka Hikitia as being about Māori achieving as Māori and improving Māori student academic achievement. All ten participants articulated that *Ka Hikitia* is a policy intently focused on changing practices within schools to ensure that Māori students achieve as Māori. Participants noted that the policy is about ensuring that Māori children know who they are, know where they are from, and come to value themselves as Māori.

> *'My basic understanding of it is that it's a…. it's an initiative to allow Māori students to achieve success as Māori students. To let them know that who they are, where they're from is relevant and OK.'*
>
> (Teacher, P5)

'…I mean the key phrase is to help Māori succeed as Māori and that's the key phrase that always sticks out for me.'

(Teacher, P6)

'I definitely see that as obviously the kids valuing themselves and seeing themselves as Māori.'

(Teacher, P7)

'I know that it's an initiative that is targeted at raising Māori achievement.'

(Teacher, P9)

'It's pretty clear throughout it's about advancing the educational opportunities for Māori and realising that we need…the cultural capital that we currently have in existence…existing in most schools, not all, but most, doesn't actually fit with a way in which, based on research and experience, Māori students tend to thrive. So it's about shifting some of those practices at both policy level but also at classroom level so that we can actually have better outcomes for those students.'

(Teacher, P10)

5.1.2 Theme 2: Senior leaders provide a Māori language and cultural backdrop to ensure their school enacts Ka Hikitia. Five wide-ranging school-initiated contextual enactments were elicited from the teachers' interviews in relation to how the *Ka Hikitia* policy was being broadly enacted as a contextual backdrop by school leaders in a school-wide manner. *Table 6* provides a summary of schools' contextual enactments.

Table 6: Summary of Schools' Contextual Enactment

Theme 2: School leaders provide a Māori language and cultural backdrop to ensure their school enacts Ka Hikitia.
i. Our school has in-school leaders who provide support for enacting Ka Hikitia

ii. Our school sings waiata, and makes Te Reo and kapa haka available.
iii. Our school builds positive relationships with Māori students and their whānau
iv. Our school ensures that Māori students achieve academically.
v. Our school is developing relationships with local iwi.

i. Our school has in-school leaders who provide support for enacting Ka Hikitia. All participants talked about their school having in-school leaders who provided support on a school-wide level to ensure enactment of the *Ka Hikitia* policy.

> *'I guess the lead teacher, as we call him, I guess he is sort of the 'go-to-point' if we needed to know anything. (The expert is) working alongside the teacher because he also provides the teacher with um any resource material they might need.'*
>
> (Teacher, P1)

> *'We have a lead teacher in Māori at the school who is pretty fluent in Te Reo which actually makes a huge difference. She's been the one driving a lot of the Ka Hikitia stuff the last couple of years and she's also been driving thing like us going on the marae visit this year…I mean our school is incredibly lucky at the moment that we actually have somebody who has a high level of understanding of the Māori culture in our school. And without her we'd be totally lost. Cos' who's your 'go to'. You need a 'go to' person. just for little stuff, all the time.'*
>
> (Teacher, P6)

ii. Our school sings waiata and makes Te Reo and Kapa Haka available. Teachers talked about a range of contextual enactments that are school-wide. Those enactments mentioned most frequently included singing waiata, and Te Reo and Kapa Haka being available across their respective schools.

'We get little phrases that we have to learn and then some of the children will come around and say, "It's your turn to give the phrase today" and we have mini competitions and you get to use it. It's just a fun way of doing it, you know.'

(Teacher, P4)

'We've also had a couple of outside people come in for Kapa Haka. You know like it's part of the school thing, our school vision of getting people in to come and support where the needs is. You know we don't have the skills in our school to make a really effective Kapa Haka. But we've been able to have people come from the community and contribute and that's lifted it to the next level.'

(Teacher, P6)

'…it's also um ensuring that when we sing we're including waiata… with our school singing its waiata isn't not all just European songs um and of course when we sing the National Anthem at our fortnightly school assemblies, it is always in Te Reo Māori and then the English version.'

(Teacher, P1)

'…we've got a school waiata…she's (lead teacher of Māori) teaching a lot of waiata to her senior kids and the teachers and they're having competitions which is cool. There's not many songs that they've done yet. But it is something we can push along a little bit more cos' that's an easy area. And our Māori kids love movement, they love waiata.'

(Teacher, P7)

iii. Our school builds positive relationships with Māori students and their whānau. Six of the ten participants emphasised how their school enacts the *Ka Hikitia* policy by focusing on developing positive relationships with their Māori students and whānau. The role of noho, whānau consultations, and whānau hui in nurturing those warm relationships with Māori students and their whānau were often discussed.

'We've done a lot in the last couple of years in terms of promoting links with whānau. We have a noho day…Oh, a

noho day. We've had, like a couple over the last few years. It's normally on a Saturday where all the Māori families come in and they do…the kids will come in and do poi making, we might go down and look at myths and legends, waiata and the families will come in. It's a bit like a whānau get-together and then there'll be a hangi at the end.'

'We've had quite a few whānau consultations. Trying to get a lot of that voice from the community of what they feel our school needs to be doing in terms of helping our Māori feel embraced as Māori. '

(Teacher, P6)

iv. Our school ensures that Māori students achieve academically. Five of the ten participants discussed how their school enacts the *Ka Hikitia* policy by ensuring that Māori students achieve academically. One participant (*Teacher, P5*) talked about how she believed that her school was embracing *Ka Hikitia* through a culturally responsive mathematics programme that staff had recently begun enacting. Having worked for the past few years on improving school-wide mathematics teaching and outcomes for Māori and Pasifika students, the teacher saw that this was one key way in which their school was addressing *Ka Hikitia's* focus on improving Māori student academic achievement.

'…we have spent the last three years improving our maths teaching and we have worked with (name of facilitator) last year on mathematical communities, inquiry communities, accelerating learning…The rich tasks need to key into the students and who they are. So who they are is a very important factor in this programme because we have to make connections with them and their whānau or their background, whatever, ethnicity or wherever they come from. So we have to find out a bit about them and we do that by having conversations with their parents so we key into what things they are into. So our rich task questions are geared so that the children can answer the question that's related to something that they know about. So, for instance, we could have a

question about, say for instance, if we are looking at an add/sub question for the kids, the question might say something about preparing food for…at the marae…We key into those kind of concepts that the families understand and that the kids understand and we make it real. So, real contexts, but as I said, the key is actually knowing your learners and knowing their whānau, so that you, that, you know, sort of makes it real…We have made huge gains this year in our data and so our Māori achievement has gone right up.'

(Teacher, P4)

One teacher talked about how Māori students are targeted specifically as priority learners in an effort to raise Māori student academic achievement.

'…in our data we have identified, so we separate, you know, Māori students. So we have a target for our Māori students and Pasifika students. So we have all that, for mathematics, it was Year 6 students, in particular Māori students. So then they became our target group, um, Year 7 students. And it was Year 7 Māori students. So we have priority learners as well. So our Māori students, our Pasifika students, students with special needs, you know.'

(Teacher, P9)

v. Our school develops relationships with local iwi. Three of the ten participants discussed how their school enacts the *Ka Hikitia* policy by developing connections and ties with local iwi. Two participants discussed the positive value and moves forward to extend the arm of partnership with iwi. Two of the teachers noted the role of their principal in being a catalyst for those relationships between iwi and their school.

'…from having read the bits of the document that I have read and see what we have been doing particularly this year at school and last year because we did the language last

year…and the marae visit and then…I can't remember what it is called but (Principal) has ah signed a thing with the local iwi and so we've got a partnership going on…this is building our relationship with our iwi…that's been quite huge.'

(Teacher, P3)

5.1.3 Theme 3: Teachers employ a range of enactments in their classroom related to Ka Hikitia with some of these enactments being perfunctory in nature. Five broad teacher enactments were elicited from the teachers' interviews in relation to how the *Ka Hikitia* policy was being enacted by teachers in their own classrooms. *Table 7* provides a summary of teachers' classroom enactments.

Table 7: Summary of Sub-themes Phase 1 – Theme 3

Theme 3: Teachers employ a range of enactments related to Ka Hikitia in their classroom
i. I teach Te Reo, uphold karakia, pepeha and incorporate legends.
ii. I build positive relationships with Māori students and their whānau
iii. I ensure Māori students achieve academically.
iv. I celebrate Māori student success
v. I use tamariki Māori as Te Reo and cultural resources in my classroom.

i. I teach Te Reo, uphold karakia, pepeha/mihimihi and incorporate legends. All participants talked about a range of enactments that they link back to *Ka Hikitia* incorporating Te Reo Māori, aspects of cultural ways of knowing, and Māori legends.

'I teach Māori every Monday afternoon. You know, so, we do, someone does a pepeha, someone does a whaikōrero, someone does their mihimihi…'

(Teacher, P10)

> *'…so I give the kids the opportunity to share their mihimihi. So it's always good for the kids to share about their family and their culture.'*
>
> (Teacher, P8)

> *'So every morning we do tauparapara…'*
>
> (Teacher, P4)

> *'…when we choose library books we're, um, including, um, myths and legends and that sort of thing.'*
>
> (Teacher, P1)

> *'…if we are learning about plants I try and throw some Māori words in with that.'*
>
> (Teacher, P2)

> *'I try to remember even if I just do the roll in the morning you know just say, 'Mōrena'.*
>
> (Teacher, P3)

ii. I build strong relationships with whānau Māori. Five of the participants articulated how they went about building strong relationships with whānau Māori. They saw this as part of their role in enacting *Ka Hikitia*. One teacher outlined the general sense other participants noted, that building strong relationship with whānau was a priority and that involved them being proactive and engaged with whānau regularly.

> *'It also comes down to building relationships with their family and the whānau and I will text whānau, call whānau. Like in the first week I'll ring them to say, 'Hey, just ringing to say who I am. How's it all going? What's your goals and your*

aspirations for your child? What would you like your child to get out of there?' So we're setting goals together and then in a couple of weeks I'll ring back again saying, 'Hey, how's it going? How's your child enjoying? Are there any issues? Are there any problems?'

(Teacher, P7)

iii. I ensure Māori students in my class have the support necessary to achieve academically. Four participants voiced how they ensure their Māori students have the support they need in their classrooms to achieve academically. All talked about how Māori students in their class were prioritised and given provision for learning support if needed. One teacher talked about how assessment records and support programmes were of immense importance to her so as to ensure Māori students succeeded academically.

'I pay strong attention to the assessment records of all children but particularly um the Māori… enlisting the help of a SENCO or specialist teachers or whomever I might need um, TAs to get the required help that children may need to be where they should be to be achieving at their potential whatever their potential may be…'

(Teacher, P1)

iv. I celebrate Māori student success. Four of the ten participants discussed, to varying degrees, how they enact the *Ka Hikitia* policy by celebrating the success of Māori students. One teacher noted how they used the whānau as a motivation point to celebrate Māori student success.

'But in saying that, when this little girl, she's got a lot of siblings at school, and when she goes up a reading level or does a lot of writing, I make a point of taking her down to her older brother and making a big song and dance about how

> *she's gone up another reading level or I'll take her into another sibling's class and make a point of that and I sort of know that that message will also get back home and they can celebrate that and so that learning is becoming successful for her. She's feeling good about herself, she's feeling good when she progresses so she's wanting to make more progress etc. Helping her…sort of helping her with her intrinsic motivation.'*
>
> (Teacher, P1)

v. I use tamariki Māori as Te Reo and cultural resources in the classroom. Three of the ten participants discussed how they use the linguistic and cultural knowledge of Māori students to support them in their role as teachers.

> *'It's great when you are in a class and I've got a couple of kids who are great at it because I can be quite honest about it and I can say well you know what I'm really bad at this but you are much better than this. If I can get them…if I want something done and I will ask them to do it because it's their thing yeah…'*
>
> (Teacher, P3)

> *'When you have got a high percentage of Māori children often um they're actually your support too if you are not sure on how to pronounce something they they'll help you and they can be the specialists, they can be the teachers, they can stand up and um teach everyone their own language. Yeah! How cool is that!'*
>
> (Teacher, P1)

5.1.4 Theme 4: Teachers struggle with enacting Ka Hikitia due to having many others priorities to juggle. All ten participants articulated a range of factors related to struggling with 'fitting in' *Ka Hikitia* enactment. Factors such as school leaders' curriculum and pedagogical prioritising, parental expectations, and attitudes

and timetabling were seen as impacting upon what and how much time and space they had to enact *Ka Hikitia* within their classrooms.

> *'I think what it does is like any teacher, you know what it's like, stuff comes through and you think, oh yeah, that's really interesting and you skim it and scan it and then you move on to something else and suddenly something else will happen and you'll go back to it. It's [Ka Hikitia] something that's certainly not a high focus for me. Behaviour is a big thing for us hence the PB4L and all that stuff. So there is a huge focus at this school on the behaviour.'*
>
> (Teacher, P3)

> *'Teachers already feel quite overloaded with routine targets in the basic core areas and that's where they put all their professional learning into, you know. There's not time to devote to…basically you're learning a second language as well cos' essentially if you're going to do it really well and do it justice you almost need to be learning a second language.'*
>
> (Teacher, P6)

> *'When I first came here it wasn't actually very positive um thing to start off with. I actually did have a parent come up to me not realising that I was the person who instigated it saying, "Oh, why's this school starting to teach all that Māori crap. We don't need that! My child needs to learn to read and write. That's more important. That Māori stuff, it's never going to help them in the future," and I took a deep breath.'*
>
> (Teacher, P2)

> *'The juggling balls. The main…we're not meant to be creative at school. We're just meant to read, write and do maths.'*
>
> (Teacher, P1)

5.1.5 Theme 5: Teachers sense a lack of support and trust with a concomitant intensity from the MoE on target-meeting pressures to ensure Māori

students achieve. One of the key contextual factors that impacts negatively upon teachers' enactment of *Ka Hikitia* is the sense that there is a lack of adequate support for them to address the issue of disproportionate Māori student achievement. With this lack of overarching support there is an evident frustration and/or sense of pressure in the voices of a number of the teachers.

> *'…there is always that how are your Māori children succeeding? How are, is the emphasis on, you know, your Māori boys because they are frequently below? How are we catering to their needs? There is that that's out there that schools do feel that pressure.'*
>
> (Teacher, P2)

> *'I acknowledge it's great that they're bringing out policies like Ka Hikitia, I think that's great. Um…my question is how much more are they going to do to support it though, in schools? What else are they going to do really get it in schools? It's all very well writing a policy but it's so much more complicated than that. Like there's so many questions from teachers that the level of PD…you have needs to be much bigger as well. If (the Minister of Education) really wants it to succeed, you know, get more experts in.'*
>
> (Teacher, P6)

5.1.6 Theme 6: Teachers find that involving whānau in the education of their tamariki can be tricky. Another contextual factor that teachers see as impacting negatively upon their enactment of *Ka Hikitia* is the disconnect that exists between mainstream schools and Māori whānau. Five of the participants stated that involving whānau with the education of Māori students could be difficult at times.

> *'Well, that's all well and good to say that you've got a document saying that it's about teachers and schools developing these relationships with whānau but it's a two way process. The whānau have to step up too and become involved*

and it's up to them too. It's not all one-way traffic, yeah…making sure I'm involving whānau which can be a little bit tricky at times.'

(Teacher, P1)

'I suppose the hardest part of all this is connecting with the whānau and the community. They're not…they're not the easiest people sometimes to deal with compared with the Pasifika people..,But it still didn't have as much impact cos' it's still being embedded, I suppose, on getting the Māori parents in. So, yeah, that's quite difficult. It is…it's very hard.'

(Teacher, P4)

'Well, even like well sometimes even to the whānau hui we get the same people. So we're not sure whether they don't want to come in to school because they can't, they've got the kids. So we try and, 'Look, we've got people here that can look after the kids. Bring the kids', you know. So that's something that's still a bit of a work in progress. Trying to get our whānau to buy in. Um…yeah…so that's something we're still trying to work out what we can do…to get them…mmm…to get more people to, as I said, buy in to it…'

(Teacher, P9)

5.1.7 Theme 7: Teachers have co-workers who have a poor attitude towards Māori language and culture and therefore very little/token gestures are enacted in their classrooms. One contextual theme talked about by the teachers interviewed was the notion that there are fellow teachers within their school who hold poor values and attitudes towards Māori and because of this, use token gestures of Māori culture, language and identity. Six of the participants spoke candidly about staff as a whole or a specific teacher. One teacher talked about herself paying lip service to the *Ka Hikitia* policy.

'…we think we just pay lip service to the whole, even the Te Reo thing was you know, even the language thing down South [where teacher previously taught]…we don't do a lot. We

haven't quite, I mean, I and this is very true for me, cos' I'm so bad at it. I think language wise we do pay a bit of lip service. You'll do the odd word or greeting word or 'Kia Ora' or you know whatever…'

(Teacher, P4)

A second teacher talked about how her syndicate of teachers compares to other syndicates within her school in regards to their differing levels of enactment of Māori culture, language, and identity in their team of classrooms.

'There are people like us over here [in reference to the teacher's syndicate of teachers] that do karakia, you know, like, the kids all laugh and they ask for it now. I've got this playlist that I fleeced from the Ministry of Ed of all the little songs and all the waiata you learn at school and they'll be like, 'Hey, while we're doing this, can you just put that on? Can you just put that on?' And they sit there and they… and as dumb as that is, they love it. And they sing and they, 'I remember this one' and I can do this one' and then they'll try and do bloody sticks and it's cool. Um…and it's…then there are classes where very little happens and we discovered that this year.'

(Teacher, P5)

The teacher then goes on to discuss how fellow teachers make token gestures in their classrooms to give the impression of being culturally responsive, described by the teacher as 'box-ticking'. The teacher then discusses how he/she challenged his/her appraiser who, in the teacher's own words, seemed to be reinforcing the 'box-ticking' of Māori culture, language, and identity in classrooms and schools.

'…even here, you walk past classrooms here and they've got their little, their little Te Reo, little display up. This little section. And when I had my appraisal done, the guy that did it came and he said, 'Oh, where is your little section?' And I said, 'We don't have sections because there's stuff over in that corner, there's stuff over in that corner, there's stuff down

> *there, there's stuff like…there's stuff everywhere. We don't have a…it's not a, it's not a pigeon-hole little thing. It's just part of how we roll.' And he goes, 'Why haven't you got your karakia displayed in here?' I said, 'Because we know it. It's an oral thing. We never wrote it down. We learnt it orally. We didn't, you know.' 'Where did they record their mihis?' 'They didn't. They learnt them. We didn't put them on card. We…we…we're not just ticking boxes here. We're trying to live it, actually trying to live it.'*
>
> (Teacher, P5)

Another teacher iterated some of the 'box-ticking' views expressed above when talking about staff members at their school.

> *'We've got teachers here that are token… a perfect example is, (mimicking a fellow staff member) 'Oh, I have great relationships with my Māori students. I get on with the whānau so well.' Doesn't turn up till the end of the noho. Never seen after that. Will go, 'I've got relationships with the kids.' But will only spend time with her children…It gets my hoha like no-one's business. It's one of my bugbears that I've just got to bite.'*
>
> (Teacher, P7)

Yet another teacher supports this when talking about the 'tokenish' attitudes that some fellow members of his/her staff have towards enacting Māori culture, language and identity at school. Like Teacher P5, this participant mentions the appraisal process as part of the contextual fabric that is woven around such behaviour.

> *'I just think some of them (fellow teachers) don't think it's important, personally. I think that's probably…they just don't think it's important. Or they're just too busy, got other things on but we've got a lot of Māori students in here, you would think that that would be like a priority way of getting 'in' and building those relationships…cos' that's what I think a lot of it is about… Because well we've got some, we've got to do something around this so let's just put some phrases on the*

> *board and let's say, 'Kia-ora' every morning…Maybe it's a bit tokenish. I wouldn't say across the board in the whole school. But maybe some staff only do what they have to do especially as part of our appraisal process.'…'I don't think… it's not ingrained. It's not part of their culture of their room. It is because we…like school wide, um, the whole school does karakia every morning and karakia every evening… Well in your classroom, the expectation is that you do karakia in the morning and karakia after sport as you leave. And um… so kids like, you know, kids know, 'Oh, you didn't do karakia', 'Oh, we don't do that in our room.' So it's pretty obvious.'*
>
> (Teacher, P9)

5.1.8 Theme 8: Some teachers know very little about Ka Hikitia. Another contextual theme raised by participants is the notion that there are some teachers who know very little or nothing about *Ka Hikitia*. One teacher made a comment about a new staff member recently graduated from university who knew nothing about the *Ka Hikitia* policy.

> *'There's a guy that teaches in this block. He's a second year teacher and I asked him today, 'What do you know about it* [Ka Hikitia]*?' And he went, 'About what? What is it?' He had never…So he's just done three years at College at Massey and he didn't know a thing about it. It had never even come up for him…There's people that are just coming out of T. Coll…They should be the ones that are full of this, that are blazing for it. And they don't know what it is.'*
>
> (Teacher, P5)

One of the participants talked openly about how they had not heard about *Ka Hikitia* until a number of years after its inception. Arguing that not knowing about it in his/her previous school showed the policy was not a priority for the school leaders at the time.

'I hadn't even heard about it until 2015 in which I was self-motivated to actually learn about it. And I think that's…that's crazy, and if…if…if a teacher with ten, well at the time…nine years experience, is not even aware of it at two separate school contexts, it goes to show that there were other priorities for that Board and leadership team rather than advancing Māori based on the document.'

(Teacher, P10)

The final comment for this theme comes from Teacher, P9. Their openness in acknowledging the policy's silence for some teachers is resounding.

'I don't know if anyone even remembers, like thinks about, Ka Hikitia, you know?'

(Teacher, P9)

5.1.9 Theme 9: Some teachers believe that Ka Hikitia is limited in its scope to effect positive change for Māori. Three of the participants acknowledged that they have the belief that while a positive idea full of good intent, *Ka Hikitia* is limited in its ability to effect positive change for Māori in education. All cite different reasons for their belief in the limitation of *Ka Hikitia*.

'…it's not going to make much difference and it's got to be a culture, a school culture. I mean I don't want to be defeatist about it, it might make a, it will make a difference because if you've got teachers making a change to their practice of course that's going to make a difference. Whether it makes any differences to any long term achievement…I don't know.'

(Teacher, P3)

'I think the policy is really, um…the intention is good. Um…yeah…I really like all the ideas and the components of

the policy. I like it. I think though it's going to be very hard for it to become a reality in schools unless more is put into it.'

(Teacher, P6)

'I spoke with a particular person who has a particular family member who was actually quoted in it, in Ka Hikitia. And when I shared it with him he essentially, not scoffed at it but just went, 'Mate, these aren't the real factors. There's some really good things in here. But this is not actually what is going to make true change.' And he was really alluding to the real social issues we have in our society.'

(Teacher, P10)

5.1.10 Theme 10: Teachers believe that Māori students who achieve do so because of strong parental, whānau and community support and teacher/student and whānau/student relationships. The most prevalent explanation teachers articulated in regards to why they believed Māori students succeeded educationally was the notion that these students had support from parents and whānau and strong relationships with teachers and/or parents/whānau. Seven of the teachers articulated their beliefs that supportive parents/whānau and community who value education are of primary influence to Māori student achievement.

'Family support, parents who turned up for school interviews um. Parents who turned up for sport on a Saturday…parents who may have been on the Board of Trustees or played some sort of involvement in the PTA um. Parents who were known around the school who were visual, visible within the school… when a child wants to learn and when they've got the parental backing that's two boxes already ticked isn't it and I'm just a third cog in that wheel really.'

(Teacher, P1)

'What I can generalise about my Māori students that achieve well… they have a supportive home but that's probably the key

thing that probably sticks out for me is that those kids all have a supportive home. And I'm not meaning like, um, they're all rich, you know. They are supportive. They've made education a priority. Like one parent, like she was a cleaner and she didn't want her daughter to be doing that. So that was it. She was going to be… education was important and you know, she um, every opportunity that she could give her she would save for it or, you know, so I think that the big key thing is that they see education as important and that they instil that in their kids.'

(Teacher, P9)

'Some of the stuff we were doing well as a school for Māori was actually taking place because of the quality of the community that we had around.'

(Teacher, P10)

One teacher, when asked to discuss what she believed were the main factors that impacted upon Māori student achievement, articulated that although she ought to consider factors such as poverty, housing and socio-economic situation of students more, because they were out of her remit of control as a teacher, she stated that her focus was on the nature of her relationships with Māori students and their whānau.

'I'm just going to come back to relationships. I will always come back to relationships. At the moment my relationships are my focus, are here with my kids. And yes, I should be probably thinking about the bigger picture and bigger education but at the moment I'm controlling what I can control which is where I am at the moment. I can't control what's happening there [in reference to outside school factors such as socio-economic situation, standard of living] but I can control what's happening in my classroom, with my school, with the whānau around the community, to a point.'

(Teacher, P7)

5.1.11 Theme 11: Teachers believe that Māori children who underachieve do so due to poor parenting and issues going on at home. Seven of the ten teachers talked in detail about the issue of poor parenting as being a primary factor on Māori student underachievement. A number of specific issues were raised in relation to poor parenting of Māori students. These included lack of parental buy-in and support for school, alcohol/drug issues, family conflicts, parent-encouraged truancy, and having a parent or both caught up in the criminal justice system.

> *'…but I think they have a lot of issues going on at home. She's quite bright but I don't know whether I'll ever and I don't want to sound defeatist because I've still got her for another year but will I ever see her full potential?...I don't know. I think there are other things that are more important to the family so I think that, you know, having her home sometimes, maybe looking after the kids or I don't know, I mean there are some assumptions I am making in there… I hate to say this but I think it comes down to your parenting it comes down to your parents, if it is important to you, important to your parents it will be important to you.'*
>
> (Teacher, P3)

> *'Yeah definitely home environment again. I guess there's always, yeah oh, it makes such a difference what goes on in the home environment. Um…sometimes it's, yeah that family dynamics and then it just contributes to that child's sense of self, you know, self-worth, that self-belief. Um…specifically I can think of one child it's more um…yeah I guess motivation. And for one I'm thinking of, it's driven a lot by what's going on in the home.'*
>
> (Teacher, P6)

5.1.12 Theme 12: Some teachers believe that Māori children who underachieve do so due to a range of problems related to poverty, social issues, and socio-economic factors. Linked to the theme above, half of the ten teachers talked

in detail about teaching Māori children who underachieved due to problems related to poverty, and a range of social and socio-economic issues. Points raised included children who had a lack of educational opportunities due to financial constraints, poor nutrition, poor health, family violence, abuse, gang culture, inadequate clothing, and a lack of stable social housing. As with the previous theme, this theme was talked about in some depth by the teachers who sensed that these factors hugely impacted upon the educational outcomes of Māori children.

> *'…lack of nutrition, children who come and who don't have adequate lunch, either not enough or what they've got is just all packaged garbage.'*
>
> (Teacher, P1)

> *'I think there is an issue with poverty and other things at home as well. I mean, I know that they have been cut off from the internet...a child coming into the school that has not got enough food, hasn't got enough clothes, comes from a broken home, sees violence all the time, deals with parents who you know are on benefit or all those kind of things then you know they're not going to learn in the same way and it doesn't matter what I do in my classroom, that's never going to change… If those issues were dealt with, this is my very perfect little world, all those issues were dealt with, those kids would be coming to school able to learn.'*
>
> (Teacher, P3)

> *'There's poverty issues, you know. Children aren't sent to school because they haven't got any food. We've tried to overcome that. That's I suppose the initiatives with the Breakfast Club. Yes, Breakfast Club.'*
>
> (Teacher, P4)

> *'...poverty is a huge thing. Um, you know, I knew a boy who lived under a bridge…under a bridge and he still came to school though. His mum still made him come to school. So that, I always think about that, like um, that how can a kid come to school knowing he's going to go home and live under a*

bridge? So I think that a big part of, you know, we've got the KidsCan and they say they're going to do this and they're going to do that but they need to realise just how much that impacts on parents and learning and kids achieving. If they've got all that chaos at home that unless I think we really do something to address that, um, yeah, it is difficult to make those changes um, within the classroom.'

(Teacher, P9)

'...given kids stationery, dropping kids off, I've even bought food for a couple of families who have been in crisis with Dads doing a runner and things like that and it hasn't actually resulted in anything and it felt as though it was very much a sticking plaster approach to the situation. It was, you know, the money that I spent on the groceries, that was simply, it was almost like I was another government social service. Rather than, 'Wow! Someone believes in me and wants me to succeed.' They were very gracious and very thankful for what I did on those occasions but it didn't make any change for those kids because really it was that can of spaghetti and that's all it was.'

(Teacher, P10)

5.1.13 Summary of Phase One Themes. This section of the chapter has outlined the twelve interpretive themes elicited from the first phase of the study. The themes have identified how teachers interpret and enact *Ka Hikitia*. It also identified a range of subjective and contextual factors that impact upon their enactment of the policy. Teachers have strongly argued that Māori student educational success is primarily due to strong networks of relationships between parents, whānau and the community but concomitantly that Māori student underachievement is due to poor parenting and a range of socio-economic and home factors. The findings were used to help formulate a survey to further explore these themes.

5.2 Phase 2: Online Teacher Survey Themes

This section outlines the findings from the second phase of the mixed-methods study. Thirteen themes in total were elicited. They are noted below in summary and expanded upon thereafter with the quantitative survey findings and exemplification from the open response data where teacher participants provided these.

Table 8: Summary of Phase Two Themes

Theme 1*: Approximately a third of teachers surveyed indicated that they are unable to describe the purposes of the Ka Hikitia policy.*
Theme 2*: Principals and senior leaders impact upon the level of school-wide enactment of the Ka Hikitia policy in a variety of ways.*
Theme 3*: Teachers acknowledge that they enact the Ka Hikitia policy in a variety of ways, with some of these enactments being perfunctory in nature.*
Theme 4*: Relationships between schools and iwi are not simple and straightforward.*
Theme 5*: Schools have issues with timetabling Te Reo/tikanga due to a crowded curriculum.*
Theme 6*: Not all parents/caregivers expect teachers to enact Ka Hikitia*
Theme 7*: Some teachers have an indifferent attitude towards Māori students who have little or no Te Reo or much connection to their Māori heritage.*
Theme 8*: Very few teachers have a strong sense of confidence in their ability to speak to Te Reo.*
Theme 9*: There are teachers who do not value Māori language/culture/identity in mainstream primary schools.*
Theme 10*: Teachers feel undervalued and sense a lack of support by the Ministry of Education to enact Ka Hikitia.*
Theme 11*: Teachers support the notion that incorporating Māori culture, language, and identity into classrooms and schools, improves Māori student engagement.*
Theme 12*: Teachers support the notion that incorporating Māori culture, language, and identity into classrooms and schools, improves Māori student achievement.*
Theme 13: *Most teachers support the notion that social factors impact upon Māori student achievement to a greater degree than*

the role of teachers incorporating Māori culture, language and identity into classrooms.

5.2.1 Theme 1: Approximately a third of teachers surveyed indicated that they are unable to describe the purposes of the Ka Hikitia policy. It must be acknowledged that most teachers surveyed stated that they are able to describe the purposes of the *Ka Hikitia* policy (69.38%). One respondent talked about engagement with a similar policy through pre-service teacher training and others talked about the exposure they have had within their school via professional development and school-wide teacher engagement.

> *'I studied Te Kotahitanga through teacher training and into my first years of teaching and I believe this led to the development of phase 1 of Ka Hikitia, which I then led the initial introduction of Ka Hikitia in to our school in 2013-2014.'*
>
> (Respondent #53)

> *'Our school has a document that has broken down the goals of Ka Hikitia. For the past 4 or 5 years we have been recording our progress towards the goals. We reflect on our progress towards these goals at least once per term and record it in our document during staff meetings. Therefore I am extremely familiar with Ka Hikitia and it is strongly in action at our school.'*
>
> (Respondent #48)

> *'I have read and reflected on this document a few years ago and try to apply the principals* [sic] *to my class and school when planning.'*
>
> (Respondent #47)

> *'We have P.D on this. Our school values reflect and embed many of the core policies and values.'*
>
> (Respondent #34)

> *'I think I understand the basics of the document in that we want to lift the educational outcomes for Maori students through including whanau and partnerships, high expectations, ako, Te Reo, cultural identity, high engagement/ interest etc.'*
>
> (Respondent #26)

This was in contrast to approximately one-third of teachers (30.62%) surveyed who stated that they '*Neither Agreed nor Disagreed'*, '*Disagreed*' or '*Strongly Disagreed*' with the statement, '*I am able to describe what the purposes of the Māori education policy, Ka Hikitia, are*.' With an average of 3.57 out of 5, a few of the teachers stated that they had little to no knowledge of the policy at all while others stated that they had 'looked' at the document but didn't feel confident enough to describe it.

> *'I have little to no knowledge of the contents of the Maori education policy.'*
>
> (Respondent #42)

> *'I only found out about "Ka Hikitia" as a policy when your survey came through, nor had I heard about the previous Policy (I may have been out of the country or on maternity leave??).'*
>
> (Respondent #24)

> *'Have a very brief, general understanding. Wouldn't feel confident to actually describe it.'*
>
> (Respondent #60)

'We did look at the kahikatea [sic] *document - but it was not a very thorough 'look'.'*

(Respondent #43)

5.2.2 Theme 2: Principals and senior leaders impact upon the level of school-wide enactment of the Ka Hikitia policy in a variety of ways. Approximately two-thirds of the teachers surveyed (65.30%) indicated that their school leaders displayed a genuine interest in enacting *Ka Hikitia* with a complementary number indicating that their school actively promotes *Ka Hikitia* values (65.31%).

Table 9: Summary of Sub-themes Phase 2 – Theme 2

School Leadership Enactment	***Yes (%)***
School actively promotes Ka Hikitia values	*65.31*
School leaders genuinely interested in enacting Ka Hikitia	*65.30*

With an average of 3.96 out of 5, some of the comments made by teachers indicated the positive things that their school principal/leaders have been doing to enact the *Ka Hikitia* policy. Others have indicated the disinterest that their past and/or present principal/school leaders have exhibited. All the comments demonstrate the impact that school leaders and in particular, principals, have upon whether *Ka Hikitia* is made a priority within a school or not.

'Due to our recent change of Principal, attitudes and integration towards Te Reo/Tikanga maori are more positive and integrated in all that we do. The current management team are working hard towards achieving cultural inclusiveness. We have a very low percentage of Maori students on our

school roll, however, we do identify them in our assessments and report on & celebrate their progress.'

(Respondent #60)

'This year we got a new principal and I am so excited that he is passionate to continue our journey to grow. He is genuinely interested in supporting the enactment of Ka Hikitia. He has even made steps to further enhance what we were already doing and has personally inspired me to keep my passion for Te Ao Maori alive!'

(Respondent #48)

'Students in my class have written and recited their mihi, but it is not a school expectation. We have studied and participated in powhiri's, but it is not a regular thing. After reading Ka Hikita and reporting to the board early last year, I recommended putting a survey out to Maori whanau and gave them some samples to consider, but the principal at the time decided it was not something he wanted to do.'

(Respondent #26)

'Some of the questions ask about 'all' kids doing something. 'Most' kids at our school learn their pepeha and 'most' are involved in learning karakia and waiata - but it is not a school wide expectation.'

(Respondent #43)

Over 80 per cent of the teachers surveyed acknowledge that their school leaders enact the following across the school:

Table 10: School-wide Enactments of Ka Hikitia (1)

School Enactment	***Yes (%)***
Waiata	*95.92*
School actively pursues relationships with whānau	*91.84*
Kapa Haka	*89.80*

Māori knowledge is integrated into other curriculum areas	*89.80*
Māori student success is celebrated at school	*89.79*
School supports Māori students academically	*87.75*
School regularly observes tikanga	*83.33*
School buildings/parts of school named in Te Reo	*81.63*
Matariki	*81.63*

'We have a Māori strategy to develop tikanga and te reo further in our school. We want to lift the profile and visibility of Māori culture in our school and recognize its unique place in the world and the strengths it brings to our practices.'

(Respondent #47)

'Our school makes use of the 'Māori potential approach' pg 15 of the document. We are committed to realising potential within akonga, identifying opportunity for learning and collaborating / co-constructing personalised learning experiences for our akonga. It is our intent to highlight Te Ao Maori where possible. Kaiako use Te Reo Māori actively, they are constantly striving to improve their use and application of it. They are keen to cleverly integrate Ti Kanga within Kete / akomanga to improve / highlight Turangawaewae. As a kura, we are at the early stages of implementing successful programmes to promote 'Māori learning as Māori'. I think this is because our kaiako are striving to further develop their understanding and skill level. It's a process and it's about becoming more confident in stretching one's self beyond what is the norm.'

(Respondent #25)

'A big strength of our school is building strong relationships with our students and their families. This includes Māori students. We do all we can to support the achievement of all our students, and knowing their interests, family connections and beliefs enable us to provide individual learning activities to assist with strong outcomes.'

(Respondent #26)

Between 66 and 80 per cent of the teachers surveyed acknowledge that their school enacts the following:

Table 11: Summary of Schoolwide Enactments of Ka Hikitia (2)

School Enactment	***Yes (%)***
Iwi relationship with school	*79.59*
Mihi/Pepeha learnt	*79.59*
Te Reo is a living language at the school	*75.51*
Perform karakia	*73.47*
Use whakataukī	*73.47*
Participate in pōwhiri	*69.39*

> *'Our school has a whakatau termly to welcome new whanau, staff, etc.'*
>
> (Respondent #45)

> *'We have a close affiliation with (name) who is our Maori Liaison with the Ministry.'*
>
> (Respondent #24)

> *'...our school is now holding weekly te reo lessons for beginners, middle and advanced abilities for all staff. This has allowed me to identify as a learner and is increasing my confidence as a te reo speaker. The activities and learning we have also means I can confidently take my learning back to my class and share it with my students and learn alongside each other.'*
>
> (Respondent #39)

5.2.3 Theme 3: Manawatū primary school teachers acknowledge that they enact the Ka Hikitia policy in a variety of ways, with some of these enactments being perfunctory in nature. Over 80 per cent of the teachers surveyed acknowledge that they personally enact *Ka Hikitia* in the following ways:

Table 12: Summary of Teacher Enactments of Ka Hikitia (1)

Teacher Enactment	***Yes %***
I regularly observe & practise tikanga in my class	*97.96*
I initiate warm relationship with Māori students' whānau	*97.96*
I ensure Māori student success celebrated	*95.83*
I ensure Māori children have support to achieve academically	*95.83*
I give commands given in Te Reo	*93.88*
I observe karakia	*87.76*
I use Māori symbols and approaches in art	*85.71*
I ensure Matariki celebrated in class	*85.42*
I integrate Māori knowledge into other curriculum areas	83.67
I ensure children learn their pepeha/mihi	*81.63*
I regularly teach Te Reo	*81.63*

> *'I personally enjoy integrating Te Reo/Tikanga in my classroom.'*
>
> (Respondent #60)

> *'I use Maori daily in my class. I don't know a lot myself, but I use what I know. We regularly count in Te Reo, use greeting daily, basic commands, shapes, colours, body parts etc. We sing waiata regularly and my students particularly enjoy action songs.'*
>
> (Respondent #26)

Between 66 and 80 per cent of the teachers surveyed acknowledge that they enact *Ka Hikitia* in the following ways:

Table 13: Summary of Teacher Enactments of Ka Hikitia (2)

Teacher Enactment	***Yes (%)***
I use Māori legends in my class	*79.59*
I lead/assist with teaching waiata	*79.59*
I use Māori pedagogy in my class	*77.55*
Māori children share about their marae in my class	*75.51*
I actively promote the values of Ka Hikitia	*73.47*

I use whakataukī in class	*71.43*
I participate in pōwhiri	*69.39*
I lead/assist with Kapa haka	*40.82*

'I am actively involved in leading our Kapa Haka. One of my portfolios involves lifting the profile of Te Ao Maori.'

(Respondent #25)

'The reason I said I don't regularly teach te reo in my class is because I am trying to make it a normal part of the classroom. I throw in Maori words as much as I can and it's a normal part of my conversational language at home, at school and in life. In saying that, I have scheduled a specific time to teach Te Reo on top of the ordinary integrated language I use in Terms 3 and 4 this year.'

(Respondent #48)

5.2.4 Theme 4: Relationships between schools and iwi are not simple and straightforward. Despite 79.59 per cent of respondents indicating that their school has a relationship with a local iwi, just under one-half of the survey respondents indicated that connecting with a local iwi is simple and straightforward (*48.98%)*. With an average of 3.37 out of 5, a couple of the teachers commented on the issues they particularly faced with trying to build that school/iwi partnership.

'We are quite a distance from our nearest marae, with other schools closer than us. We don't have a close local iwi to build a relationship with that isn't already associated with other schools.'

(Respondent #60)

'It is still hard to work out when to engage iwi and what expectation there is to offer koha or even how much this might be. Clarifying the amount of consultation and acceptable levels of koha would be a great next step for us.'

(Respondent #47)

5.2.5 Theme 5: Schools have issues with timetabling Te Reo/tikanga due to a crowded curriculum. Approximately just under half of the survey respondents (*44.89%)* indicated '*Agree*' or '*Strongly Agree*' that they have sufficient time in the school week to focus upon enacting *Ka Hikitia*. With an average of 3.39 out of 5, a couple of the teachers commented on the issues they faced in regards to timetabling.

> *'I try to add more but with the crowded curriculum and the lack of professional development available, I have not done as much as I would like.'*
>
> (Respondent #26)

> *'Learning their pepeha is overdue. I usually teach this in term one, but I have so many ESOL students who just arrived into the country, I'm teaching them to say their mihi in English first. Some other Maori students know theirs.'*
>
> (Respondent #11)

5.2.6 Theme 6: Not all parents/caregivers expect teachers to enact Ka Hikitia. Just over a quarter of the survey respondents (*26.53%)* indicated '*Agree*' or '*Strongly Agree*' that all parents/caregivers of students at their school expect them to enact *Ka Hikitia*. With an average of 3.04 out of 5, a couple of the teachers commented on the issues they faced with respect to parental attitudes towards Māori language and culture.

> *'There are a few voices in our school community who do not value Maori language and practices. Most are happy and a few actively supportive. Hard to gauge at this stage.'*
>
> (Respondent #47)

> *'Our school is a very conservative rural school where many of the parents are resistant to learning Te Reo, but some are very*

supportive of me with the small amount I do regularly in my class.'

(Respondent #26)

5.2.7 Theme 7: Some teachers have an indifferent attitude towards Māori students who have little or no Te Reo or much connection to their Māori heritage. This theme emerged from the comment-based data of the survey. Several of the teachers surveyed indicated that some of their Māori students seemed to have little access to their Māori heritage. One teacher posed the question about whether Māori students would develop an appreciation of their own language and culture if teachers were the only avenue from which to gain access to Māori students' language and culture.

> *'In my experience (over the past 20 years), it is often the Maori students who have no connection with their own tikanga. Most don't even realise that they ARE Maori or they dispute it when you make any suggestion to their heritage. If the students are unaware of their heritage or have access to Marae, etc, how will they develop a true appreciation if they only have access through teachers?'*
>
> (Respondent #24)

> *'Most of the Maori students I have taught at this school have little or no Te Reo or much connection to their Maori heritage. I have tried to get their parents input and knowledge, particularly when we have had topics where we have been looking at Maori culture, but it has been minimal.'*
>
> (Respondent #26)

5.2.8 Theme 8: Very few teachers have a strong sense of confidence in their ability to speak to Te Reo. With an average of 3.02 out of 5, only 38.77 per cent of the teachers surveyed indicated '*Agree*' or '*Strongly Agree'* when asked about their

sense of confidence in their ability to speak Te Reo. One teacher surmised her level of confidence with Te Reo with the following comment.

> *'Even though I lack confidence to speak te reo, our school is now holding weekly te reo lessons for beginners, middle and advanced abilities for all staff. This has allowed me to identify as a learner and is increasing my confidence as a te reo speaker.'*
>
> (Respondent #39)

5.2.9 Theme 9: There are teachers who do not value Māori language/culture/identity in mainstream primary schools. Seventy three per cent of teachers indicated '*Agree*' or '*Strongly* Agree' when responding to the statement, '*All the teachers at my school value Māori language, culture and/or identity*' (Average = 3.90 out of 5). This was similar to another item in the survey where 75.51 per cent of teachers indicated '*Agree*' or '*Strongly Agree'* when responding to the statement, '*All the teachers at my school make genuine efforts at ensuring Māori language, culture, and identity is an integral part of their classroom'* (Average = 4.06 out of 5).

> *'...as I have seen teachers deliver Maori but not promote it positively. Like it's a massive chore for them. I'm a firm believer in what I teach.'*
>
> (Respondent #11)

Aligned to this was an assertion by one of the respondents that they were 'colour-blind' and chose not to see students for their race.

> *'I don't see the students for their race, I try to teach the 'whole person'. As a school, we don't have Kapa Haka, as we are*

trying to promote things correctly - with the right Tikanga - not just to tick boxes.'

(Respondent #24)

5.2.10 Theme 10: Teachers feel undervalued and sense a lack of support by the Ministry of Education to enact Ka Hikitia. Data from the survey indicate that teachers largely feel unsupported by the Ministry of Education in relation to enacting the *Ka Hikitia* policy. Reinforcing this is an overwhelming sense from teachers that the Ministry of Education does not trust or value them. The following survey items and comments below speak to this.

Table 14: Summary of Phase Two Items: Theme 10

Survey Item	***'Strongly Agree' or 'Agree' indicated (%)***	***Average (out of 5)***
I feel supported by the Ministry of Education to enact Ka Hikitia	*18.37*	*2.94*
The Ministry of Education is genuinely interested in supporting teachers' enactment (putting into practise) of Ka Hikitia and does not see it as simply a 'box-ticking' or 'target-meeting' exercise	*20.41*	*2.96*
I feel supported by the Ministry of Education to ensure Māori students achieve as Māori	*22.45*	*3.02*
The Ministry of Education has a high level of trust of teachers	*22.45*	*2.69*

'I don't feel that the MOE do trust or value teachers. We are not treated as professionals.'

(Respondent #60)

> *'We had the NZ auditors through earlier in the term, they were displeased with our appraisal system. When I asked them about how I'd integrated Tataiako and Ka Hikitia into it and if this was appropriate they were unsure of these documents. I was hoping for discourse on how pedagogy is important in providing opportunities for 'Maori to learn as Maori'. This didn't happen because they were more concerned with data. I think that if you are part of the ERO review office it behooves* [sic] *you to be aware of the very documents that underpin pedagogy within the NZ curriculum. I'm frustrated by how little knowledge a group of auditors has about the Bi-cultural heritage of New Zealand and the importance of Te Ao Maori. I'm also saddened at how insistent they are in comparing Maori with NZ European. A comparison of data is NOT what Ka Hikitia or Tataiako are about.'*
>
> (Respondent #25)

5.2.11 Theme 11: Teachers support the notion that incorporating Māori culture, language, and identity into classrooms and schools, improves Māori student engagement. A total of 95.92 per cent of the survey respondents indicated '*Agree*' or '*Strongly Agree'* with the statement, '*Incorporating Māori culture, language and identity into classrooms and schools, improves Māori student engagement*' (Average = 4.43 out of 5). A number of respondents commented in support of this.

> *'Recognising and valuing a students* [sic] *cultural background is usual and good teacher practice. Every individual brings their own story into our class- all are equal and worthy. As tangata whenua, for Maori learners a level of respect and recognition of this is deserved. Aotearoa/ New Zealand is multicutural, but the history-tikanga and Maori 'ways' of doing things is the Kiwi way and what makes us unique as a country. When it is imposed or didatic, it undermines the very values. When it is real and a normal part of a classroom day, it is vibrant-fun and a common meeting point for all.'*
>
> (Respondent #34)

'Acknowledging and celebrating a child's heritage is extremely important to their self-confidence and worth.'

(Respondent #23)

'validation of identity, centre of who you are and how you learn best, security in being you.'

(Respondent #13)

'I also think it gives Maori students a sense of belonging, which encourages them to want to learn.'

(Respondent #56)

'I had a child in my class who was very shy and lacking confidence, however, the day she stood in front of the rest of the school and said her mihi she blew me away.'

(Respondent #60)

'Really important to value everything each learner brings to the class- it is who they are.'

(Respondent #34)

5.2.12 Theme 12: Teachers support the notion that incorporating Māori culture, language, and identity into classrooms and schools, improves Māori student achievement. Nearly ninety per cent of the survey respondents indicated '*Agree*' or '*Strongly Agree'* with the statement, '*Incorporating Māori culture, language and identity into classrooms and schools, improves Māori student achievement*' (Average = 4.35 out of 5). Several teachers provided additional comments in support of this.

'It improves all students achievement, not just Māori.'

(Respondent #39)

'It's common sense really. Maori students offer a unique and interesting perspective. The styles for learning fit well into a classroom with the group and whanau approach. Values such as manaakitanga, tika, pono are neat to use in class and ALL the students relate well to these values. I agree with them too...obviously! There should be a special place and importance put on Maori- this is New Zealand!'

(Respondent #34)

One teacher commented against the majority, stating that engagement and achievement are complex phenomenon and that simply 'adding' Māori aspects will not necessarily meet the goals articulated in *Ka Hikitia*.

'Whilst some might believe 'strongly agree' is the correct choice. In my opinion, simply incorporating these factors is not enough. The nature of learning is so complex that I'm unsure that these alone would improve engagement… If I were to change the language in the sentence would it still be true. "Incorporating Jedi culture, language and identify into classrooms and schools improves Jedi student achievement". Simply providing light sabres does not a Jedi make. Speaking the Jedi language does not simply improve one's understanding of said language.'

(Respondent #25)

5.2.13 Theme 13: Most teachers support the notion that social factors impact upon Māori student achievement to a greater degree than the role of teachers incorporating Māori culture, language, and identity in classrooms. Fifty seven per cent of the survey respondents indicated '*Agree*' or '*Strongly Agree'* with the statement, '*Social factors outside of a teacher's control such as parental income, standard of living and socio-economics background impact upon Māori student achievement to a greater degree than the impact of teachers incorporating Māori*

culture, language, and identity into classrooms and schools' (Average = 3.63 out of 5). A couple of teachers commented on this stating that while teaching practices can make a difference to lives of Māori children, these factors have such a huge impact on their life chances and overshadow the positive impacts that incorporating Māori culture, language, and identity might otherwise do.

> *'This is such an important statement. The achievement and general harmony of students at our school are fantastic and I strongly believe it is because their parents are employed, live in quality homes and are supported medically, socially, etc.'*
>
> (Respondent #22)

> *'We only have the children at school for a small part of their lives. There are so many factors that impact on their learning that we cannot control.'*
>
> (Respondent #60)

> *'…sometimes what goes on at home is way more powerful than what can/does go on at school.'*
>
> (Respondent #32)

> *'I believe strong teaching practices do make a difference, however regular absences-cyclic abuse within families be it drug or alcohol does have a huge long term effect on ANY student. There seems to be an increasing group of students whose parents shift them around LOTS of schools, for genuine reasons or otherwise and these kids are impacted.'*
>
> (Respondent #34)

> *'How prepared or ill-prepared to learn akonga are at the start of their school careers does affect kaiako ability to teach. BUT, I'm not saying that's because of parental income. It could be the standard of living or access to income that makes it*

difficult for these akonga to come with a wider range of vocabulary or world experiences to access learning experiences and make connections when they begin school. This to me has a greater impact than the positive degree of impact incorporating M-C.L.I into the classroom.'

(Respondent #25)

One teacher commented that they were unsure of the answer to the question but the statement they made summarises their perspective succinctly about the attitude teachers ought to have towards valuing Māori culture, language and identity.

'I don't know the answer to this question. In saying that, I can't control a students' parental income or standard of living, but I can control whether or not I value Maori culture, language and identity in my classroom.'

(Respondent #48)

5.2.14 Summary of Phase Two Themes. This section of the chapter has outlined the thirteen themes elicited from the second phase of the study. The themes have identified the degree to which teachers understand *Ka Hikitia*. It outlines a range of enactments that teachers and schools put in place to support the culture and identity needs of their Māori students. The themes identify a range of subjective and contextual factors that impact upon teacher enactment of the policy. These include the contextual factors of senior school leadership, an overcrowded curriculum, and a lack of support from the Ministry of Education. The subjective factors of positive and poor teacher attitudes and sense of value of Māori culture, language, and identity held by teachers were also identified.

There is a strong sense amongst teachers that incorporating Māori culture, language, and identity into classrooms and school improves Māori student engagement and achievement. However, just over half of the teachers support the notion that social factors impact upon Māori student achievement to a greater degree than the role of teachers incorporating Māori culture, language, and identity into classrooms.

5.3 Complementarity of Thematic Findings

This final section of the chapter compares and integrates the key themes from both phases of the mixed-methods study into a coherent set of complementary themes. While the study followed a sequential, qual→QUAN mixed-methods research design, weight in comparing and integrating the results is afforded to the second phase of the study. With this in mind, complementarity ensures that the final set of coherent themes bring forth illustration, elaboration, and clarification of phase one findings with the findings of the second phase whilst also highlighting any areas of divergence. *Table 15* below outlines the key complementary themes elicited from the findings of the study. These themes will form the backdrop to the discussion chapter that will follow.

Table 15: Summary of Complementary Themes

Theme
Theme 1*: While a number of teachers are able to interpret the purposes of Ka Hikitia, there is a large proportion of teachers who know very little or nothing about it.*
Theme 2*: Principals and senior leaders provide a key contextual backdrop for teacher enactment of Ka Hikitia.*
Theme 3*: Teachers employ a range of enactments in their classroom related to Ka Hikitia, some of which are perfunctory in nature.*

Theme 4*: Some teachers do not value and/or have a poor attitude towards Māori language, culture, and identity.*
Theme 5*: Teachers struggle with enacting Ka Hikitia due to having many others priorities to juggle.*
Theme 6*: Teachers sense a lack of support and trust and feel undervalued by the Ministry of Education.*
Theme 7*: Teachers strongly believe that incorporating Māori language, culture, and identity into mainstream classrooms improves Māori student engagement and achievement.*
Theme 8*: Most teachers support the notion that social factors impact upon Māori student achievement to a greater degree than the role of teachers incorporating Māori language, culture, and identity into classrooms.*

5.3.1 Complementary Theme 1: While a number of teachers are able to interpret the purposes of Ka Hikitia, there is a large proportion of teachers who know very little or nothing about it. While the initial phase of data findings suggested that most teachers interpreted the *Ka Hikitia* policy well, the second phase revealed a deeper lack of clarity for some teachers about the policy's purposes and intent. There was evidence that recently graduated teachers had not encountered it in their studies and some teachers had interacted with the policy in a very brief way within their school.

5.3.2 Complementary Theme 2: Principals and senior leaders provide a contextual backdrop for teacher enactment of Ka Hikitia. The findings from both sets of data clearly indicate that, negatively or positively, principals and senior leaders of schools provide a strong influence in relation to the level of enactment of the *Ka Hikitia* policy. The contextual influence that principals and senior leaders have over whether Māori culture, language, and identity is prioritised within their schools comes through the range of data where leaders are either held up as positive conduits of Māori cultural transmission or as disinterested bystanders.

5.3.3 Complementary Theme 3: Teachers employ a range of enactments in their classroom related to Ka Hikitia, some of which are perfunctory in nature. Both sets of findings show that teachers within the Mānawatū region employ a range of enactments within their classrooms related to *Ka Hikitia*. These include enactments such as teaching Te Reo, children learning their pepeha, and observing karakia. There are more perfunctory enactments that come through both sets of data. These include enactments such as giving commands in Te Reo, using Māori legends, and having a Māori language wall on display in the classroom.

5.3.4 Complementary Theme 4: Some teachers do not value and/or have a poor attitude towards Māori language, culture, and identity. While the data suggests that the majority of teachers and their co-workers have a positive attitude towards Māori language, culture and identity, it was clear that some teachers encountered co-workers who did not value a specific focus on it. This theme was evident in both sets of findings and some teachers closeted their attitudes in phrases such as ‘I don’t see colour’.

5.3.5 Complementary Theme 5: Teachers struggle with enacting Ka Hikitia due to having many others priorities to juggle. This theme was evident in both phases of the study. Teachers talked about how they struggled to prioritise Māori language, culture and identity within their classrooms due to issues such as timetabling constraints, the crowded curriculum and having to juggle so many different pedagogical priorities.

5.3.6 Complementary Theme 6: Teachers sense a lack of support and trust and feel undervalued by the Ministry of Education. This theme came through strongly in both sets of findings. There is a clear sense of ambivalence that teachers have towards the Ministry of Education. The data suggests that teachers sense a lack

of support to not only enact the *Ka Hikitia* policy, but generally they also sense a strong feeling of disconnect and a level of mistrust from the Ministry of Education.

5.3.7 Complementary Theme 7: Teachers strongly believe that incorporating Māori language, culture, and identity into mainstream classrooms improves Māori student engagement and achievement. This theme came through strongly in the second phase of the study with high averages and a sense that *Ka Hikitia* enactment improves Māori student engagement and achievement in mainstream schools. This contrasts to a number of statements made in the first phase of the study which suggested that teachers believed that *Ka Hikitia* was limited in its scope to effect positive change for Māori in education.

5.3.8 Complementary Theme 8: Most teachers support the notion that social factors impact upon Māori student achievement to a greater degree than the role of teachers incorporating Māori language, culture, and identity into classrooms. This theme was evident in both sets of data. The participants from the first phase strongly emphasised the notion that Māori student achievement was due to strong parent, whānau and community support and that Māori students who underachieved did so due to poor parenting linked to poverty and socio-economic factors. Most teachers in the second phase of the study agreed that social factors impacted upon Māori student achievement to a greater degree than teacher enactment of Māori culture, language and identity in mainstream classrooms.

5.3.9 Theme Divergence. There were two matters of divergence from the findings of the two phases. With the first, in the survey phase of the study, *Theme 8* outlined that very few teachers have a strong sense of confidence in their ability to speak Te Reo. This was not picked up in the initial phase of the study. One reason might be that those who volunteered for the one-to-one depth interview phase were

more interested and perhaps more skilled and confident in Te Reo and culture than the majority of those who were surveyed in phase two. This needs further examination as teachers play a vital role model in Te Reo usage. If lacking in confidence is a widespread phenomenon, more needs to be done to support teachers to gain skills and increase confidence levels.

With the second matter of divergence, one of first phase themes noted that teachers find that involving whānau in the education of their tamariki can be tricky. This was not a strong theme in the second phase of the study. Instead one of the themes noted that relationships between schools and iwi are not simple and straightforward. This was not evident in the initial findings of the study. A research study that investigated and described the positive and negative factors that impact upon school/teachers and whānau/iwi relationships would alleviate the conundrum from the findings in this study.

5.4 Summary

This chapter has outlined the thematic findings from the two phases of the study. There were twelve interpretive themes from the one-to-one depth interviews carried out with for the first phase of the study. This data was then used to help formulate a survey that was sent out to a set of schools for teachers to voluntarily complete in the Manawatū/Palmerston North area. Forty-nine surveys were used in the findings for phase two. Thirteen interpretive themes were identified from the survey data and these were explicated upon in this chapter. The data from both phases were then analysed, compared and contrasted to see what complementary interpretive

themes could be elicited. Eight complementary themes were elicited from the two phases of the research and these have been outlined above.

CHAPTER SIX: DISCUSSION

6.0 Introduction

This chapter signals the challenge it has been to draw together the findings of the study and the literature in light of the three key theoretical tools: *an 'uncertain' Kaupapa Māori theory* (Mika, 2017), *policy enactment* (Ball, Maguire, & Braun, 2012) and *policy-as-discourse* (Bacchi, 2000). It has become apparent throughout the research process that my initial questions, while moving away from a policy implementation research approach, are somewhat problematic in light of the findings and the theoretical tools I have chosen to 'see' and 'interpret' the data. My initial research questions made the linear presumption that policy interpretation occurs prior to policy enactment, namely, that the act of interpretation directly impacts upon the 'what' and the 'how' of teacher enactment of *Ka Hikitia*. Also, the intent behind the question of interpretation was one of an initial reading and making sense of the *Ka Hikitia* policy. In retrospect, the term that would have been more suited to the study is 'translation'. Translation is closer to the language of teachers as practitioners which examines teacher plans, classroom artefacts, how they borrow ideas from other schools and work with iwi. Translation as a "process of invention and compliance" (Ball, Maguire, & Braun, 2012, p. 48) connects the terms interpretation and enactment into one dynamic process where it is hard to delineate where interpretation finishes and enactment begins. The findings of the study and the theoretical tools used to interpret these findings suggest a more complex rendering of *Ka Hikitia* policy interpretation and enactment.

While difficult to articulate without resorting to the academic propensity towards definitiveness and 'enframing' (Heidegger, 1977, in Mika & Stewart, 2016), such complexity and dynamism, is validated and privileged through the theoretical tools of an 'uncertain' Kaupapa Māori theory, policy enactment and policy-as-discourse. Taking into account the findings of the study, the literature and the theoretical tools utilised, this chapter will begin by addressing the first two research questions.

1. How do mainstream primary school teachers interpret and enact the *Ka Hikitia* policy focus of incorporating Māori language, culture and identity into their classrooms and schools?
2. Which contexual and subjective factors influence how Māori language, culture and identity is enacted by mainstream primary school teachers?

In citing Ball, Maguire, and Braun (2012) who articulate that teachers inevitably read policies from the "position of their identities and subjectivities," (p. 15) this research confirms that *Ka Hikitia* is indeed read by such teacher subjectivities but that this is tempered by a set of institutional and locally oriented contextual factors. Context acts as a key analytic device in making sense of teachers' enactment of the *Ka Hikitia* policy.

This study has supported the notion that rather than being a straightforward, normative and linear process whereby policy is communicated, and teachers merely respond, *Ka Hikitia* is interpreted, considered and enacted by teachers in such a

dynamic way that isolating, identifying and discussing 'moments of interpretation', 'moments of enactment', and 'moments of contextual influence' might not fully grasp the degree of interplay that occurs within and between such moments. Ball, Maguire, and Braun (2012) note this characteristic of interplay and interconnectedness when they state that singling out a 'moment' of policy enactment is problematic.

From a policy enactment perspective, teachers as actors and subjects of policy are "meaning makers" (Ball, Maguire, & Braun, 2012, p. 138). However, from a Māori ontological and epistemological position, teachers are not deemed to be at the 'centre' of meaning making when it comes to policy. Mika (2014) proffers that what is of paramount importance is that the nature of the self is as a meaning making entity among other meaning making entities (i.e., human, concepts, language, context). From this perspective, human individuals (teachers) are not framed as transcendent and autonomous meaning making entities (Mika, 2014). They are understood to be part of the interplay of 'connectedness between self and the world such that neither can be understood without reference to the whole' (Gillett, 2009, in Roberts, 2013, p. 110). The discussion that follows will outline each of the identified factors but rather than be seen in isolation and with definitiveness, it is understood that these factors 'speak' to teachers, they 'speak' to one another and also teachers 'speak' back to them in such a dynamic and inter-relational manner giving shape to a range of enactments that teachers perform in light of *Ka Hikitia*. It is with this understanding that the organisation of the chapter is outlined.

The first section identifies three types of teacher enactment of *Ka Hikitia* that have come out of the study. These will be examined in relation to the critical policy enactment literature and theory. The three forms of policy enactment identified among teachers from the study to be discussed are *considered enactment*, *perfunctory*

enactment, and *enactment resistance*. Perfunctory enactments will be examined in greater depth as it will be posited that such enactments are not necssarily performed by teachers solely as a result of cynical compliance or to create a ‘spectacle’ (Ball, 2003, in Singh, Heimans, & Glasswell, 2004) but that the broad institutional factors such as an overloaded curriculum, multiple and, at times, contradictory, policy demands upon teachers and the decentralised approach to policy in New Zealand needs to be given more consideration and critique than they are currently receiving in the critical policy literature.

The second section will discuss and examine the subjective factor of teacher attitudes. While it is difficult to determine the degree of impact of both poor and positive attitudes on teacher enactment of *Ka Hikitia*, there was a clear indication that attitudes were a perceived key factor articulated by teachers in this study. Of concern is the view that a number of practising, New Zealand teachers do not value and/or have a poor attitude towards Māori language, culture, and identity.

The third section will consider four local and broader institutional contextual factors that shape teacher enactment of *Ka Hikitia*. They are school leadership, school context, broad institutional/governmental context and the context of juggling multiple policy demands. There will be a specific critique of the often taken-for-granted decentralised approach that dominates the New Zealand policy landscape and how it needs to be considered as a factor that impacts upon what, why, and how teachers enact *Ka Hikitia*.

Following this, there will be a brief section that pulls the range of subjective and contextual factors together to challenge the traditional notion of teachers as mere ciphers of policy. It will contend that rather than apportioning blame solely upon teachers for Māori student underachievement, as they are alleged under a linear input-

output policy model, a range of factors (i.e., subjective, local contextual, institutional) impact upon what teachers enact in relation to *Ka Hikitia*. It will purport that these factors need to be given more critical attention and focus by those responsible for creating and monitoring the 'output' of the *Ka Hikitia* policy rather than seeking to hold teachers solely responsible for its enactment.

Subsequently there will be a focus on addressing the third and final research question.

3. What benefits and constraints do mainstream primary school teachers sense in regard to the incorporation of Māori language, culture and identity to address the issue of disproportionate Māori student underachievement?

This study has found that a number of teachers support the philosophical and theoretical underpinnings of *Ka Hikitia* and its culturally responsive pedagogical mandate. Teachers largely contend that their enactment of incorporating Māori language, culture, and identity into mainstream classrooms and schools improves levels of Māori student engagement and achievement. A discussion will ensue on this finding and its connection with the theoretical notion of policy intensions (Webb & Gulson, 2013). It is posited that the notion of policy intensions, which distinguishes itself from the process of interpreting policy, is useful in examining the 'unseen' ways in which teachers sense and are 'folded' affectively by policy.

Conversely, just over half of the teachers surveyed felt that social and economic factors influence Māori student achievement to a greater degree than the

cultural dissonance factors that underpin the *Ka Hikitia* policy. This perspective argues that factors such as family poverty, socio-economic status, and the lack of home resources influence Māori student achievement to a greater degree than the lack of Māori culture, language and identity in mainstream schools. A number of teachers see this as a glaring absence in educational policy that is muted in *Ka Hikitia*. This section of the chapter will consider and discuss this absence within *Ka Hikitia* in light of Bacchi's (1999) '*What's the Problem?*' approach and the policy-as-discourse theoretical position (Bacchi, 2000; Ball, 1993) where it will be contended that *Ka Hikitia* not only limits how the 'problem' of disproportionate Māori student achievement is represented and considered but that its varying policy technologies exercises power, via discourse, through the production of 'truth' and 'knowledge' (Ball, 1993).

This chapter will end with a discussion about whether the argument that social and economic factors influence Māori student achievement to a greater degree than the cultural dissonance factors that underpin the *Ka Hikitia* policy ought to be constructed as *teacher deficit theorising*. This prevailing 'truth' that underpins much Māori culturally responsive pedagogy and discourse will be critiqued. This will be followed by a call for Māori academics to broaden the purview upon which education spaces for Māori can be transformed. While enacting Māori culture, language and identity within mainstream classrooms and school is a vitally important strategy whereby space is 'taken up', it is only one part of the landscape that is currently being considered in *Ka Hikitia*. Rather than solely seeing it as deficit theorising, Māori academics must critically examine the terrain of inequitable economic and socio-political structures that impact upon Māori educational achievement. By engaging with the 'uncertain' rendering of Kaupapa Māori, enactment and policy-as-discourse

theories, a more broadly conceived policy or set of policies that address a wider range of factors that impact upon Māori educational achievement might be realised.

6.1 Ka Hikitia: Three Types of Teacher Enactment

Policy enactment theory argues that teachers are 'actors and subjects, subjects to and objects of policy' (Ball, Maguire, & Braun, 2021, p. 3). This section examines the three different forms of teacher enactment of *Ka Hikitia* that were evident from the study. A range of different enactments, and refusals to carry out particular enactments, were identified by participants. These were categorised in three distinct ways: *considered enactment*, *perfunctory enactment*, and *enactment resistance.* It will engage with the literature and theory in such a way that both complements and challenges how culturally responsive educational policy is said to 'travel'.

6.1.1 Considered Enactment. The first form of teacher enactment of *Ka Hikitia* is what I have termed *considered enactment*. Such enactments are those performed by teachers as part and parcel of either an overall, school-wide culturally responsive strategy or those that are carried out as part of an individual teacher's commitment to Māori language, culture, and identity in spite of a lack of an articulated Māori advancement focus within their school context. Behind such enactments is a discourse of culturally responsive pedagogy underpinned by a commitment to ensure teachers and schools privilege and give adequate space to Māori language, culture and identity across the curriculum. Such enactment understands the critical roles teachers and schools play in redressing the detrimental impact that mainstream schooling historically has had upon Māori in New Zealand. In the second phase of the study over 75 per cent of teachers surveyed indicated that they enact *Ka Hikitia* in the following

ways within their own classrooms: regularly observe and practise tikanga, initiate warm relationships with Māori students' whānau, ensure Māori student success is celebrated, ensure Māori children have support to achieve academically, observe karakia, celebrate Matariki, integrate Māori knowledge into other curriculum areas, ensure children learn their pepeha/mihi, regularly teach Te Reo, lead/assist in teaching waiata, and use Māori pedagogy. What is clear, however, is that it is not the enactment itself that lends it towards being considered or not. Rather, it is the 'deep' pedagogical, philosophical and political work that a school does or that individual teachers do that sits behind teacher enactments that ascertains its 'level' of cultural responsivity.

A range of experiences assisted in shaping teachers' perspectives on ensuring their enactments were considered. These included but were not limited to participating in in-service culturally responsive professional development courses and having a range of school-wide culturally responsive approaches and expectations that they embraced within their classrooms. Considered enactment of *Ka Hikitia*, has shown teachers to be conscious policy actors who understand the critical role that they play in supporting the mandate for mainstream schools to be culturally responsive to Māori.

Aligned to the concept of considered enactment is the notion of policy intensions (Webb & Gulson, 2013). This study notes that a number of teachers willingly folded themselves within the prevailing discourse of culturally responsive pedagogy that underpins *Ka Hikitia*. Such teachers had a strong sense of justice and commitment with their affect toward the *Ka Hikitia* policy being one of positivity. Webb and Gulson (2013) have described the concept of policy intension as the practice of folding which is "used to disorient subjects and reorient their relationships with themselves in various ways once policy is sensed, embodied and enacted" (p. 64). They connote that policy actors "sense, encounter, embody, and respond to policy

desires, often without recognising particular policy desires" (ibid, p. 57). I would propose that this rendering of the concept of policy intensions appears to be overly deterministic of the negative impact of policy upon policy actors. While the concept can be directed negatively, data from the study suggests that policy intensions can be directed positively. Webb and Gulson fail to take into account the conscious agency with which teachers of considered enactments carry out their work. Rather than being disoriented and reoriented, a number of the policy actors in this study recognised and aligned with the values and rationale of *Ka Hikitia*. A sense of symbiosis and rational contiguity between the *Ka Hikitia* policy and policy actors meant that the 'folds' experienced by these teachers had a degree of alignment with *Ka Hikitia*.

Further research is needed to explore the phenomenon of *considered enactment* and the synchronicity that exists between policy actors and education policy. This study has shown that the theoretical concept of policy intensions can be expanded to more broadly integrate renderings of the interplay between teachers and policy.

6.1.2 Perfunctory Enactment. Secondly, in light of *Ka Hikitia*, teachers may also carry out what I term *perfunctory enactments*. This has been well documented in the literature and aligns with Bishop's (2012) acknowledgement aforementioned whereby teachers provide a learning context for Māori students by seeing Māori culture, language, and identity in terms of the teacher's own needs to incorporate cultural iconography and/or incorporate Māori examples into their classroom. Here, the focus is not on being culturally responsive but rather culturally performative. Perfunctory enactment puts the teacher and their interpretations of Māori culture at the centre of Māori students' learning. Such enactments may or may not be performed with a clear school-wide strategy and rather than engaging and coming to a personal or collective understanding of the culturally responsive mandate underpinning *Ka*

Hikitia, a conscious awareness of considered culturally responsive pedagogy is side-lined, giving way to a form of enactment where teachers' needs to incorporate Māori language, culture and language dominates, doing little to advance Māori aspirations in education and doing little to be responsive to Māori students' needs. It must be noted that such enactments are not perfunctory in and of themselves. Rather, they are perfunctory in the sense that they are underpinned by a motive of feeling compelled, consciously or otherwise, to having to perform them to tick the culturally responsive box or as Ball (in Singh, Heimans, & Glasswell, 2004) articulates, so as to create a spectacle or performance, acting in compliance.

Perfunctory performances of *Ka Hikitia* by teachers were evident in a range of descriptions that participants gave in the study both in relation to themselves and their colleagues. The sense that they were 'doing the hard work' required of them through such enactments seemed unwarranted when coupled with attitudes such as being blind to students' race and/or ethnicity. Perfunctory enactments included making sure Māori myths and legend library books were included in classrooms, calling the morning register in Te Reo, exploring Māori patterns in art, putting the date in Māori on the whiteboard or, as one participant stated, 'trying to do that cultural thing where in the morning as soon as we've done the roll, so it's setting the tone for the day' (Teacher, P3). Again, it must be reiterated that, such enactments are not deemed perfunctory in and of themselves. They are perfunctory in the sense that they are connected to a sense of compulsion to perform by teachers, giving others' the impression that they are being culturally responsive when in actuality there is lack of understanding of or begrudging attitude towards considered Māori culturally responsive pedagogy.

Distinguishing between considered and perfunctory enactments is an area that requires further exploration. In privileging an uncertain Kaupapa Māori theory,

considered and perfunctory moments of enactment are inherently connected. They co-exist in view of one another and speak to and in tension with policy actors on a day-to-day basis in the classroom. Thus, while helpful for purposes of description, distinguishing between considered and perfunctory enactments inevitably minimises the degree of interplay that occurs between and through such representations.

When examining the compulsion to perform, there are expectations and pressures that are placed upon teachers by senior school leaders, varying accountability measures (i.e., appraisal and teacher registration criteria) and the Ministry of Education. Ball, Maguire and Braun (2012) suggest that some policies encourage performative responses from teachers. I would go further to suggest that policies and their associated tools of accountability are not the only factor that encourages this sort of response from teachers. Woven around such perfunctory responses are a range of social, political, and historical factors that have contributed to some teachers' understandings of the 'place' (or otherwise) of Māori culture, language and identity in mainstream schools. While teacher attitudes will be explicated in the next section of this chapter, perfunctory enactments were evident from teachers who held strong egalitarian views and sensed that Māori culturally responsiveness was an act of bias and partiality. Such teachers held a view that schools should be culturally neutral and acts associated with privileging Māori language, culture, and identity were seen as antithetical to their senses of democracy.

Teachers are unable to 'escape' the performative expectations placed upon them by *Ka Hikitia*. It is suggested that teachers who act out smatterings of 'performances' aimed at creating the illusion of cultural and linguistic attentiveness is problematic. However, this discussion poses another layer of concern. This research has also identified that perfunctory performances are not limited to teachers who hold

less than favourable views and attitudes towards Māori language, culture, and identity. A number of teachers, who articulate positive attitudes toward Māori language, culture, and identity also seemed trapped within a mode of *Ka Hikitia* perfunctory enactment.

Evidence from this study suggests that 'well-meaning' teachers who identify themselves as holding positive regard for Māori language, culture, and identity carry out perfunctory enactments including counting (i.e., tahi, rua, toru) and giving commands to children in Te Reo (i.e., haere mai, haere atu), singing the New Zealand national anthem in Māori, pronouncing Māori children's names correctly, teaching different colours in Māori and letting Māori children share about their marae. As before, it must be reiterated that such enactments are not deemed perfunctory in and of themselves. They are perfunctory in the sense that they are animated by teachers who say that they are 'doing the work' of culturally responsive pedagogy narrowly and without considering the broad and changing forms of Māori culturally responsivity. However, this is not to point the finger at teachers as is readily done from a traditional policy implementation perspective. As this chapter progresses, a range of subjective and contextual factors will be outlined highlighting the messy interplay that impacts upon teacher enactment of *Ka Hikitia*.

Further investigation into this form of perfunctory enactment by mainstream primary school teachers across the sector is needed. It would assist in understanding and clarifying the specific contextual pressures and demands of external requirements that teachers face and how such pressures contribute to the production of a culturally responsive 'spectacle' (Ball, 2003, in Singh, Heimans, & Glasswell, 2004, p. 828) within their classrooms.

6.1.3 Enactment Resistance. A third, and difficult to distinguish, form of enactment is what has been termed in the literature as policy resistance (Meyer et al., 2010), or what I have termed *enactment resistance*. The form of enactment resistance that will be discussed is often clouded by enactments of a more perfunctory nature. From this study, enactment resistance was shown to have two forms. One form was teacher resistance toward perfunctory enactment and the other was teacher resistance to considered enactment resistance.

Resistance toward enacting considered Māori culturally responsive pedagogy in mainstream primary schools was reported by teacher participants in both phases of the study whereby they openly acknowledged that they or fellow teachers resisted the enactment of specific aspects of culturally responsive pedagogy that were expected of them within their school contexts. One instance below is where a teacher identifies how some of her colleagues turn down opportunities to participate in culturally responsive professional development and in response only do the bare minimum necessary to meet appraisal requirements. She states that,

> *'I just think some of them (fellow teachers) don't think it's important, personally. I think that's probably…they just don't think it's important. Or they're just too busy, got other things on but we've got a lot of Māori students in here, you would think that that would be like a priority way of getting 'in' and building those relationships…cos' that's what I think a lot of it is about… Because well we've got some, we've got to do something around this so let's just put some phrases on the board and let's say, 'Kia-ora' every morning…Maybe it's a bit tokenish. I wouldn't say across the board in the whole school. But maybe some staff only do what they have to do especially as part of our appraisal process.'…'I don't think… it's not ingrained. It's not part of their culture of their room. It is because we…like school wide, um, the whole school does karakia every morning and karakia every evening… Well in your classroom, the expectation is that you do karakia in the morning and karakia after sport as you leave. And um… so*

> *kids like, you know, kids know, 'Oh, you didn't do karakia', 'Oh, we don't do that in our room.' So, it's pretty obvious.'*
>
> (Teacher, P9)

This anecdote represents enactment resistance in one key way, a resistance to participate. Firstly, teachers are identified as resisting schoolwide expectations of culturally responsive enactments such as performing karakia. This resistance is articulated by the teacher as coexisting with enactments of a more perfunctory nature. Secondly, leading into this anecdote, the above teacher talks at length about a number of staff who choose to resist participating in culturally responsive professional learning opportunities offered after school. While a number of reasons are cited for such resistance, the teacher makes a point of highlighting that she thinks because of their high Māori student population staff ought to make it a priority to help build relationships with their Māori students.

Examples of enactment resistance were evident in a report (Meyer et al., 2010) regarding the implementation of the Te Kotahitanga programme, a culturally responsive professional development approach run in a number of New Zealand high schools. The approach caused some division amongst staff members, especially amongst those whose different perspective on enhancing student achievement resulted in resistance. While this study has not largely focused on this phenomenon, this study identifies that a measure of enactment resistance, clouded by enactments of a more perfunctory nature, is present amongst some teachers when they encounter Māori culturally responsive pedagogy and/or policies.

Ball, Maguire, and Braun (2012) have stated that they have found little evidence of policy resistance in their policy enactment research work. Rather than

resistance, they argue that they have found evidence of teacher "dis-ease and discontent, murmurings and indifference" (p. 150) towards particular policies. Anecdotes from participants in this study note refusals from fellow teachers to participate in school-wide culturally responsive practices (i.e., classrooms observing and practising daily karakia, teaching Te Reo). Further research and critical engagement with why some New Zealand primary school teachers resist enacting culturally responsive pedagogy is needed. With matters of ethnicity, culture, and race in education often being a point of contention in varying facets of New Zealand society, culturally responsive education policy might have more instances of resistance than has previously been recognised in enactment research.

A second form of enactment resistance was evident in the study. Quite different from that previously described, a number of teachers openly discussed resisting calls from senior primary school leaders and appraisers to implement certain approaches that they deemed as inauthentic or token. Examples cited, that were refused, include the expectation to label classroom objects in Te Reo, displaying karakia or having pepeha of all children in the class up on the classroom wall. Arguing that such enactments were token or that such edicts refused to acknowledge a Māori preference for learning karakia and pepeha off-by-heart positioned some teachers as *resisting token enactment*. This closely relates to the contextual factor of senior school leadership that will be discussed later in this chapter and the notion of performativity. Ball, Maguire, and Braun (2012) articulate that school leaders and managers will "sometimes consciously 'draw attention' to the substance of policy through the production of visual materials and resources that document/illustrate…what is desirable conduct" (p. 121). Like that experienced by the teachers above, *Ka Hikitia* has inadvertently created a policy directionality that serves to reinforce acts of

performativity. There is evident pressure upon teachers around the need to produce particular representations of the policy in schools, some of which are interpreted and read as token by those charged with their enactment. If performance is a master discourse of schooling that drives policy enactment in the twenty-first century as suggested by Ball, Maguire, and Braun (2012), then *Ka Hikitia* is no less susceptible to this than any other education policy. While acts of performativity were noted in this study, it must be acknowledged that there were also examples of resistance to certain instances of policy performativity.

6.2 Subjective Factor: Teacher Attitudes

This section will be the first to start analysing and discussing factors that impact upon the different forms of enactment that have just been explicated. It will begin by examining one layer of the terrain that impacts upon teacher enactment of *Ka Hikitia*, the subjective factor of teacher attitudes. There was a clear indication that personal attitudes were a perceived key factor articulated by teachers in this study. Of concern is the view that a number of teachers do not value and/or have a poor attitude towards Māori language, culture, and identity.

This research supports the notion that teachers enact policies from positions of their own personal identities and subjectivities (Ball, Maguire, & Braun, 2012). Anecdotes from this study would suggest that teachers bring varying life experiences, political perspectives, views on the value of Māori language, culture, and identity and confidence in engaging with Māori worldviews and social norms, to the classroom. This is supported in the literature when it is articulated that teachers are positioned and

subjected differently in relation to policy (Ball, Maguire, & Braun, 2012), bringing with them a gamut of emotions and competencies.

A number of teachers talked candidly about the negative and complacent attitudes that they themselves or their teacher colleagues held. What has come through the research is an understanding that poor attitudes have their social roots in New Zealand's history of colonisation and the perceived lower status of Māori people, language, and culture. Such negativity and complacency can be argued to stem from our historical colonial context whereby poor attitudes towards Māori language, culture, and identity were reinforced in law, education, and almost every facet of early New Zealand society. While it is difficult to ascertain from this study that positive attitudes towards Māori language, culture, and identity lead to more considered forms of teacher enactment of *Ka Hikitia*, there is a clear indication that poor teacher attitudes are an area of concern. The discussion will focus on the factor of positive and poor teacher attitudes with a call urging more research in this area to be carried out.

A large proportion of the teachers in this study indicated a degree of positivity and sense of value amongst their teaching colleagues with respect to ensuring Māori language, culture, and identity is an integral part of mainstream classrooms and schools. As has been noted in the findings chapter, 73.47 per cent of teachers indicated '*Agree*' or '*Strongly* Agree' when responding to the statement, '*All the teachers at my school value Māori language, culture, and/or identity*' (Average = 3.90). This was similar to another item in the survey where 75.51 per cent of teachers indicated '*Agree*' or '*Strongly Agree'* when responding to the statement, '*All the teachers at my school make genuine efforts at ensuring Māori language, culture, and identity is an integral part of their classroom'* (Average = 4.06). Where does such positivity and sense of value come from when comparing this snapshot with the historical place of Māori

language, culture, and identity in mainstream New Zealand classrooms and schools? Anecdotal evidence from the study connotes this positivity, providing a glimpse of the positive teacher attitudes that sit behind why they value Māori language, culture, and identity. Some teachers noted their journey to discover their own identities as Māori as prompting a sense of value and wonder about their whakapapa and how that impacts upon their roles as teachers. Other teachers talked about how the experience of living and teaching overseas gave them an insight into the uniqueness of Māori language, culture, and identity when they returned to New Zealand. Such an appreciation of the importance of Māori customs, traditional and values after a period of teaching abroad impacted upon how these teachers saw their role not solely as cultural custodians and upholders of Te Reo in mainstream classrooms, but also as learners themselves who began journeys of their own in to te ao Māori.

Furthermore, there were teachers from the study that talked about their own interests in Te Reo and te ao Māori and the positive attitude they had towards Māori language, culture, and identity despite not identifying as Māori themselves. They noted how important it was to demonstrate to the children they were teaching that they themselves are learners and while passion might not equate to skill level, communicating this through active modelling within the classroom seems worlds away from mainstream schools of the past where Te Reo use was actively discouraged and even punishable. While it was noted that a large number of mainstream primary school teachers hold positive attitudes towards Māori language, culture and identity, there still remains a sizeable proportion of teachers who hold poor attitudes.

Whereas positive teacher attitudes towards *Ka Hikitia* and its culturally responsive mandate centre on teacher exposure to culturally responsive pedagogy and the inherent benefits that are argued to derive from such enactment, poor teacher

attitudes can be traced to their root in the context of New Zealand's history of colonisation and the perceived lower status of Māori language, culture and identity when compared to European, and in particular English, language, culture and identity. Tied to this is the notion that New Zealand schools have historically provided a contextual backdrop whereby Māori language, culture, and identity were deemed unnecessary and to be left at a school's front gate. Generations upon generations of New Zealanders, Māori and non-Māori, have taken on and subjectively owned this 'truth' that Māori are inferior, that speaking Māori is of no value, and that enacting Māori culture within mainstream schools is itself a racist act which privileges Māori. Acquiescing to the egalitarian notion that some teachers default to whereby it is argued that they 'don't see colour' or that by incorporating Māori language, culture, and identity into mainstream schools affords Māori privileges that are not given to other ethnic groups, mirrors an uncritical whiteness (Milne, 2013) that denies the very privilege upon which such statements are made.

First phase participants spoke candidly about specific staff members that they believed held negative attitudes towards Māori language, culture, and/or identity with the concomitant description of such teachers performing perfunctory enactments or resisting enactment. This was reiterated in findings from the second phase of the research where only 73.47 per cent of teachers indicated '*Agree*' or '*Strongly* Agree' when responding to the statement, '*All the teachers at my school value Māori language, culture and/or identity*' (Average = 3.90). This was similar to another item in the survey where 75.51 per cent of teachers indicated '*Agree*' or '*Strongly Agree'* when responding to the statement, '*All the teachers at my school make genuine efforts at ensuring Māori language, culture, and identity is an integral part of their classroom*' (Average = 4.06). The findings would suggest that surveyed teachers

believe that most of their colleagues hold positive attitudes. However, it also suggests that there are others that they work alongside that hold poor attitudes towards Māori language, culture, and/or identity.

Such a picture of poor teacher attitudes towards Māori and other indigenous cultures in mainstream education locally and internationally has been well documented in the literature. While this research did not investigate the specificities as to why teachers held such perspectives, some connections to the literature might help to examine and critique a number of the underlying attitudes held by some primary school teachers towards Māori language, culture and identity.

One potential point of disconnect that teachers might have towards Māori language, culture, and identity is a one-sided or skewed perspective on Māori history and the impact of British colonisation. Ma Rhea (2012) has discussed how non-indigenous teachers in Australia lack a deep understanding of the history of Australian Aborigines and Torres Strait Islanders and the same needs to be said about some non-indigenous teachers in New Zealand. There is evidence that some New Zealand teachers have a deep-seated naivety of the impact of colonisation throughout generations socially, economically, spiritually, and ideologically upon Māori. This was evident in a number of statements made by one teacher from the initial phase of the study and a couple of teachers from the second phase who blamed Māori themselves for having a poor understanding of their own culture and identity. When a people-group has been stripped of their culture and language methodically and intentionally through historical colonial practices of eradication, assimilation and integration, it is no wonder that following generations of that people-group are culturally dislocated. There are a number of factors that contribute to teachers' ignorance or misunderstanding of New Zealand's history.

Firstly, teachers may ignore or not understand the pressure placed upon many generations of Māori who have denied their own Māori identity due to feelings that 'to be Māori' one would be perceived as inferior and lacking in intellectual capacity. This very real pressure exists today in a number of guises for some of our young tamariki and for generations of Māori families, from denying one's whakapapa and taking on the ethnic identity of a group deemed more acceptable and palatable to the dominant 'Other', to feelings experienced by a number of Māori parents and elders in regard to mainstream schools which literally beat the Māori language out of them during their experiences at school where, as has been mentioned in the literature, they had to leave their Māori language and culture at the school gate before they entered.

Secondly, a prior reliance on deficit theorising can lead teachers to blame Māori and their whānau for not knowing about their own language and culture. Such deficit theorising seeks to blame Māori for educational underachievement while ignoring larger social, economic and historical forces that have their genesis in colonisation. Research carried out by the likes of Bishop, Berryman, Tiakiwai, Richardson (2003) and other academics (Donaldson, 2012; Macfarlane, 2004) have articulated how problematic teacher deficit theorising is upon Māori educational achievement. As a collective, many Māori academics have sought to remedy this via teachers undertaking some form of culturally responsive training and/or professional development. While the Kotahitanga professional development programme has had some success in changing the attitudes of some teachers within New Zealand high schools, there has been a dearth of support to help address this anomaly in New Zealand primary schools. Without a clear programme of professional development that is aimed specifically at addressing teachers' personal attitudes, expectations and understanding of Māori history, culture, language and identity, there will still be a

large group of primary school teachers who maintain and will replicate the longstanding deficit view of Māori.

Aligned to the point of disconnect that some teachers have towards Māori language, culture, and identity is the attitude that Māori just have to get over colonisation. This argument maintains that colonisation happened a long time ago and that Māori ought not still be blaming the government for their losses, nor should they be protesting to have land returned, nor should they be demanding that mainstream schools change to accommodate Māori language, culture, and identity. One teacher articulated this view quite fervently when she stated that some Māori children that she has taught have carried historical baggage that has been passed down to them through generations, so much so that educational success would never happen for them because they kept playing 'the victim'. This teacher is articulating that while colonisation happened to Māori, if Māori want to have success in life, they must move on from the past and stop blaming colonisation for their problems. Such historical blindness is a convenient way of not only negating the core principles of the Treaty of Waitangi, but it also helps to explain the rationale of some New Zealand teachers who do not see the value of enact culturally responsive pedagogy in mainstream, New Zealand schools.

The findings of this research also noted that there are groups of parents, a highly influential part of the schooling landscape in New Zealand who, like the teachers described above, do not see the value in enacting Māori culture, language, and identity in mainstream schools. Some of the terms used to describe having Māori culture, language, and identity enacted within mainstream schools by teachers and parents quoted by teachers from this study included, '*Such a waste of time*', '*There are a few voices in our school community who do not value Māori language and practices*', and '*Our school is a very conservative rural school where many of the*

parents are resistant to learning Te Reo'. Such resistance employs an ideological position whereby Māori are said to be pushing their language and culture onto everyone else (i.e., non-Māori) and that Māori should not be given what is seen as 'special treatment' due to their ethnicity in our 'colour-blind' society.

One teacher (Respondent #24) from the second phase of the study emulated this view, not placing culturally responsiveness as a priority in her role as a teacher. At the time of the survey, she had taught for between 11-20 years and claimed that, '*I only found out about "Ka Hikitia" as a policy when your survey came through, nor had I heard about the previous policy*', Despite having no knowledge of *Ka Hikitia*, she articulated that she observes karakia, incorporates Māori legends into her class, give commands in Te Reo and celebrates Matariki and that she values Māori language, culture, and identity as a teacher. What differs is that this teacher made a number of comments that would give the impression that being culturally responsive was not high on her agenda as a teacher. Where Hetaraka (2019) talks about a lack of provision in *Ka Hikitia* for the acknowledgement of how teachers might be able mediate the loss of identity as Māori caused by the intrusion of colonisation, it seems that she was talking about the likes of this teacher who stated,

> '*In my experience (over the past 20 years), it is often the Maori [sic] students who have no connection with their own tikanga. Most don't even realise that they ARE Maori [sic] or they dispute it when you make any suggestion to their heritage*'.

This teacher's comments indicates a lack of consideration for the social and psychological effects of colonisation that run through the generations, with many

Māori who would deny their identity as Māori for fear of being constructed as and seen to be inferior.

The same teacher also makes an interesting statement about being someone who is 'colour-blind' to race. She contends, '*I don't see the students for their race. I try to teach the 'whole person*'. Such a statement implies that ethnic identity ought not to be a feature taken into consideration within the mainstream classroom. The same teacher goes on to say that, '*If the students are unaware of their heritage or have access to marae, etc, how will they develop a true appreciation if they only have access through teachers?*' This teacher is able to maintain two seemingly contradictory positions. First, she enacts a positive attitude towards Māori language and culture and a strong sense of confidence in her ability to teach Te Reo. Second, she positions her role as a teacher as one that does not include 'maintaining' the Māori culture. Even though she identifies her talent with Te Reo Māori, this second position allows her to decouple her role as a teacher from the cultural lives and resources of her Māori students.

Another surprising find in the data was the fact that a couple of teachers held strong views on the place of race and ethnicity in schools. Two respondents expressed that they do not see students' race in their classroom. One spoke at length about how she got upset during her time at university when being confronted with Māori culture and seeing that Māori were to be viewed and considered differently in her prospective role as a teacher. Lee (2008) has outlined how teachers holding a 'colour-blind' discourse are often motivated by a form of non-discriminatory egalitarianism. They contend that their sense of egalitarianism usurps the need for culturally responsive pedagogy. With claims of being 'too culturally sensitive' and acknowledgement that she 'has' to incorporate Māori culture, language, identity into her classroom, there is

a begrudging attitude towards the culturally responsive mandate of *Ka Hikitia* that appears through teacher performative enactment. Different from enactment of a more perfunctory nature, performative enactments are underpinned by the need of teachers to create a spectacle. They begrudgingly enact for the purpose of being seen to be doing the 'right thing'. This colour-blind/egalitarian subjective perspective impacts upon teachers' interpretation of *Ka Hikitia*, which in turn breeds a form of cynical compliance (Ball, 2003, in Singh, Heimans, & Glasswell, 2004) where what "superficially maps" (Spillane, 2004, in Ball, Maguire, & Braun, 2012, p. 10) on to current practices is given precedence with any potential for innovatory change avoided.

Despite claiming to be colour-blind to race/ethnicity and holding egalitarian motives, such teachers also espoused what Hetaraka (2019) articulates as a colonial need to define and control the 'Other' through measuring students' levels of 'Māori-ness'. This was evident in a number of statements made by teachers when questioning the ethnicity of Māori students in their classroom. One teacher was justifying 'who is' and 'who isn't' a 'real Māori' in her classroom despite her reasoning that she sees individuals and doesn't see her Māori students as culturally located beings. She alludes to a number of stereotypes and assumptions about Māori, appearing to 'Otherise' Māori in a definitive and controlling manner. From her perspective, 'real Māori' equates to doing kapa haka, having ancestry and history important to them, being able to lay down a hangi, having a general lifestyle pattern that Māori ought to follow, and have historical bitterness. This is cognisant of the smokescreen some Pākehā teachers create, as described by Lee (2008), who are in denial of the fact that New Zealand schools manufacture and normalise whiteness. Some Pākehā teachers embrace an imagined neutral position that sees the educational system as apolitical and acultural

and anything ‘Māori’ is seen as discriminatory and culturally biased and, ultimately, a waste of time. In citing the work of Fine (2004), Lee (2008) has also noted that teachers who deny ‘seeing colour’ often place emphasis on individual diversities within their classrooms using the, ‘I see individuals *not* culture/race’ tagline.

Teachers who solely acknowledge Māori students as individuals reinforces to every child in their classroom, as Judith Simon (1984 in Lee, 2008) argues, that Māori culture, language, and identity is not important. Evidence from this study suggests that we have a number of mainstream primary school teachers who reinforce this message and urge for schools and classrooms to be apolitical and culturally neutral spaces.

In contrast to this, there has been a suggestion in the literature that *Ka Hikitia* fails to acknowledge Māori as individuals (Hetaraka, 2019). The position taken up by Heteraka differs to that taken up by teachers who hold a colour-blind, ‘only see individuals’ subjective perspective. Heteraka asserts that *Ka Hikitia* is limited in its scope when asserting the policy desire for Māori to achieve ‘as Māori’. There is concern that the end of this phrase, ‘as Māori’, could indirectly become a ‘white space’ where Māori are defined in purely cultural terms. Whereas teachers of a colour-blind, ‘only see individuals’ perspective assert that *Ka Hikitia* unnecessarily privileges Māori culture, language, and identity in a mainstream space that should be culturally neutral, Heteraka suggests that a ‘cultural thesis’ rendering of *Ka Hikitia* limits seeing Māori students as individuals *and* culturally located beings. There are remnants of such stereotypical perspectives of what constitutes a ‘real’ Māori as evident in the attitudes of some non-Māori teachers in this study. Framing Māori as primarily cultural beings might have a similar impact upon having an attitude of only seeing Māori as individuals by isolating Māori as inferior or identifying their importance in strictly cultural terms that maintains their ‘Other’ status.

Poor and positive teacher attitudes towards culturally responsive pedagogy all have a whakapapa that can be connected to history, to colonialism, to experiences, to ideas about culture, language and identity, to politics or to family connections. While a large number of teachers display a positive attitude toward enacting Māori culture, language, and identity in their mainstream classrooms, others hold negative attitudes. The landscape of teacher attitudes toward Māori culture, language, and identity enactment in mainstream schools needs further examination. This exploration through future research might help identify specific pinpoints for talking back to and breaking down such poor attitudes and beliefs held by both preservice and current teachers across New Zealand.

6.3 Contextual Factors: Institutional Impacts

This section will outline and discuss four key contextual factors from the study that have shown to impact upon teacher interpretation and enactment of *Ka Hikitia*. Following the work of Datnow and Park (in Webb and Gulson, 2013) where they contend that policies ultimately depend on how individuals within the local context interpret and enact them, this study supports the notion that context is a key factor that influences teacher enactment of *Ka Hikitia*. Context is articulated in the literature as an active force that initiates 'policy processes and choices which are continuously constructed and developed' (Ball, Maguire, & Braun, 2012, p. 24). The four contextual factors identified in this study are: 1) school leadership; 2) the 'sensing' of school context; 3) the broader institutional context; and 4) the juggling of multiple policy priorities.

The factor of school leadership will examine how pivotal senior school managers and principals are in the landscape of teacher enactment of *Ka Hikitia*. The factor of 'sensing' the school context will examine the professional environment in which teachers sense the normative behaviours and expectations of those around them to make judgments on what to enact. The factor of the broader institutional context will critique the often taken-for-granted decentralised approach that dominates the New Zealand educational policy landscape and how it must be considered as a factor that impacts upon teacher enactment of *Ka Hikitia*. The factor of juggling multiple policy priorities will outline the pressure teachers face in their roles. Rather than being understood solely as an excuse made by teachers to excuse themselves of enacting culturally repsonsive pedagogy, it is considered here as a critical factor that impacts upon teacher enactment of *Ka Hikitia*.

6.3.1 School Leadership. It is evident from the findings that teachers view school leaders, and school principals in particular, as playing a pivotal contextual role in providing support and strategy for individual teachers' enactment of *Ka Hikitia*. Such leadership that equips staff to become more culturally conscious of local iwi, language, and protocols, has shown to direct teachers towards performing enactments of *Ka Hikitia*. Principals and other senior school leaders do this by placing school-wide expectations upon teachers to perform a range of culturally responsive enactments. An awareness of an overarching, school-wide 'Māori strategy/Māori potential approach' was noted by participants from both phases of the study whereby senior leaders evidence their school's commitment to realising the potential of Māori students, their language and culture via expectations of staff for recognising and lifting the profile and visibility of Māori culture across the school, and by building strong connections with whānau and local iwi. Such a strategic focus by senior school

leadership in schools, guides teachers to perform a range of enactments within and across their respective classrooms.

Evidence of the contextual impact of school principals and senior school managers is noted in the literature as '*culturally responsive instructional leadership'* (Mugisha, 2013). Here, the role of school leaders is seen as one of encouraging, supporting and motivating teachers to teach students according to their culturally preferred pedagogies and cognitive styles, giving value to minority students' culture and language so as to enhance their levels of achievement. ERO (2010) supports this when they state that school leaders have an understanding of the centrality of te reo me ngā tikanga in the curriculum of the school. Hynds et al. (2011) also note how leadership can positively contribute to teacher enactment of culturally responsive pedagogy by providing professional development for staff.

A rarely mentioned but important contextual aspect of teacher enactment of *Ka Hikitia* as found in this study is that of a school's Board of Trustees. One teacher from the first phase of the study talked in length about how his Board of Trustees carried out a cultural audit on itself via a specific *Ka Hikitia* policy tool, *Hautū* (New Zealand School Trustees Association & Ministry of Education, 2021). The teacher articulates the rationale that sits behind the cultural audit of the Board of Trustees, highlighting the need to improve Board members' cultural competence and understanding to better enable them to evaluate the school's broader commitment to the needs of their Māori students. This stands in stark contrast to the experience of the same teacher when outlining how, at a previous school, there were often other priorities that meant enacting *Ka Hikitia* was not of primary importance to the Board of Trustees and senior school leaders.

This lack of interest in enacting *Ka Hikitia* by Boards of Trustees and senior school leaders is iterated in the account of another teacher from the second phase of the study. When wanting to start to engage with their school's Māori community, her efforts were met with a degree of stonewalling from her principal. She articulates how this lack of leadership led to there being some level of enactment of *Ka Hikitia* within her class but this was not widespread due to there being no school-wide expectations, no culturally responsive instructional leadership and no mandate from the Board of Trustees and senior school leaders for enacting Māori culture, language, and identity within classrooms.

What is of concern from the findings is that approximately one third of the teachers surveyed noted that they had school leaders who were not genuinely interested in enacting *Ka Hikitia*. While more research needs to be carried out regarding the impact of a lack of culturally responsive instructional leadership, it is suggested here that some teachers enact *Ka Hikitia* (i.e., considered and/or perfunctory enactment) in spite of a dearth of leadership, direction, and guidance. Some teachers from the study have suggested that a lack of culturally responsive instructional leadership from principals might be due to low numbers of Māori students being present within their school. As it was seen as a Māori policy for Māori students, some teachers suggested that senior school leaders saw no need to develop schoolwide expectations for teacher enactment of *Ka Hikitia* due to low numbers of Māori students. This form of enactment resistance was reported by teachers in this study.

Another aspect related to school leadership raised in the literature by Goren (2009) is the fact that *Ka Hikitia* was launched alongside at least fourteen other Ministry of Education policy strategies. He notes that school leaders were bombarded with multiple education initiatives annually. While no principals were interviewed or

surveyed for this study, there is a strong sense from teachers that principals not only impact upon the types of actions that teachers enact within mainstream classrooms but are themselves impacted by specific contextual factors faced only by school leaders. Further research is needed to examine the range of subjective and contextual factors that have an impact upon school leaders' and principals' levels of enactment of Māori culturally responsive pedagogy within their schools.

6.3.2 'Sensing' Ka Hikitia. All teachers from the first phase of the study understood the core tenets of the *Ka Hikitia* policy as being about Māori enjoying success as Māori and improving rates of Māori student academic achievement. This was in contrast to only 69 per cent of teachers surveyed in the second phase of the study who stated that they were able to describe the purposes of the *Ka Hikitia* policy. This was in contrast to just over 30 per cent of teachers surveyed indicating that they knew very little or nothing about it.

Firstly, those teachers who knew details about the purposes of *Ka Hikitia* were able to explicate ways in which they had engaged with the policy. Some engagement came through experience with culturally responsive pedagogy in previous schools and others talked about the exposure they have had within their current school via professional development and school-wide teacher engagement. One teacher discussed the synthesising of *Ka Hikitia* into their school policy, which led to school-wide agreement whereby, following a logic of implementation, teachers were expected to develop inquiry goals with a specific focus on an aspect of *Ka Hikitia*. Goals were reflected on at least once per term and this form of policy performativity has been noted in the literature whereby pressures or expectations are placed upon the shaping of particular enactments of policy (Perryman et al., 2011, in Ball, Maguire, & Braun, 2012).

In tracking the responses of a second phase survey participant with between 11-20 years' experience, this teacher is able to describe the purposes of *Ka Hikitia* well. In her classroom she enacts *Ka Hikitia* in a range of different ways including teaching Te Reo regularly in her class, observing karakia, assisting during kapa haka, and giving commands in Te Reo. She regularly embraces Māori pedagogy in her class and ensures that Māori students have the support necessary to achieve academically. While valuing Māori language, culture and, identity she does not have a strong sense of confidence in her own ability to speak Te Reo but has the support of Māori staff members and students to help her when she makes mistakes. She articulates that there are strong in-school leaders that organise professional development to support staff in enacting *Ka Hikitia* and that while Te Reo might not necessarily be a 'living language' at her school, the principal and other senior management staff are genuinely interested in supporting the enactment of *Ka Hikitia* and they do not see it as simply a 'box-ticking' or 'target-meeting' exercise. The responses from this participant were similar to a number of other teachers who stated that they understood *Ka Hikitia* and were well supported in their school to enact it.

In contrast to this, another participant, who identifies as a beginning teacher, strongly disagrees with the statement, '*I am able to describe what the purposes of the Māori education policy, Ka Hikitia, are.*' She notes that she has little to no knowledge of the contents of *Ka Hikitia* and in regard to her enactment of culturally responsive pedagogy, the participant identifies that she helps to teach waiata, observes karakia in her class and children recite their pepeha or mihi. She gives commands in Māori and celebrates Matariki. She has strong school leaders who are genuinely interested in supporting staff to enact *Ka Hikitia* but notes that Te Reo is not a living language at her school, teachers are not expected to teach using Māori pedagogical preferences

and Māori language, culture and identity is not readily integrated into other curriculum areas within her school. She notes that while she values Māori language, culture, and identity there are parents/caregivers and fellow teachers who do not. She lacks a lot of confidence in her ability to speak Te Reo and does not feel confident when immersed in Māori culture.

There is clear evidence in the data that a number of teachers understand the crux of *Ka Hikitia* and what its aims and purposes are. Despite this, there are still a number of current practising teachers who have not had the policy introduced to them or had very minimal professional development and/or engagement with *Ka Hikitia* in their schools. While it is evident that teachers have different levels of interpretation and hence understanding (or lack thereof) of the *Ka Hikitia* policy, in spite of this, teachers carry out a range of enactments that they articulate as being culturally responsive to Māori.

This notion of teachers having minimal or no understanding of a specific policy document has shown up in the research. Following the work of Datnow and Park (in Webb & Gulson, 2013), teachers who are unaware of any policy primarily draw from a range of local contextual and personal subjective sources to interpret and enact it. The theoretical concept of *policy intensions,* as noted by Webb and Gulson (2013), helps to examine how teachers are 'folded' within policy so as to examine their subjectivities, which can often be obscured. They contend that if a teacher has no knowledge of a particular policy or its purposes and aims, they will inevitably draw from their own subjectivities and their particular institutional context (i.e., school) to sense and, hence, enact. Ball, Maguire, and Braun (2012) support this when they state that teachers "make sense of their practice in institutional, departmental and year team contexts, all of which refract policy and offer readings of policy" (p. 29). Whereas

some teachers interpret and enact *Ka Hikitia* through their history of work in previous schools, their preservice and in-service training experiences or their own personal subjectivities, how do teachers who know little or nothing at all about *Ka Hikitia* enact it? This study suggests that such teachers are subjectively 'folded' and affectively 'sense' the prevailing policy discourses and responses of their school context when making choices of what to carry out as culturally responsive enactments.

As has been noted in the findings, just over 30 per cent of the teachers surveyed knew very little or nothing about the *Ka Hikitia* policy. Webb and Gulson (2013) remind us that despite having no understanding of policy directives and goals, teachers inevitably will interpret and enact policy by drawing from their subjectivities and school context to do so. In total, 15/49 respondents of the survey knew nothing or very little about *Ka Hikitia*. For the sake of this section of the discussion, I have termed this group the *'in absentia'* cohort. Eight per cent of these 15 respondents identified as NZ European/Pākehā, with the other 20 per cent identifying as being from varying overseas English-speaking countries. In most respects, the percentage rates of survey items for the '*in absentia'* (*n=15*) cohort matched the percentage rates of survey items for the '*whole group'* (*n=49*) survey items. There were a few items that had some marked discrepancies that will be part of the following discussion.

The range of schoolwide *Ka Hikitia* enactments in which these '*in absentia'* teachers were 'folded' within were similar to those of teachers who were cognisant of *Ka Hikitia* and its purposes and aims. Their schools regularly sung waiata, had kapa haka, expected students to participate in karakia, and learn their pepeha/mihi. Similarly, the contexts of these school held pōwhiri, participated in Matariki, used whakataukī across the school, and had buildings within their school grounds that were named to reflect a Māori worldview. Both sets of teachers' schools actively pursued

relationships with whānau, Te Reo Māori was seen as a living language at a similar rate and teachers were expected to integrate Māori language, culture, and identity into other curriculum areas. In terms of senior school leadership, similar rates of agreement on items between the *'in absentia'* cohort and the *'whole group'* cohort were present in regard to the level of leaders' interest in supporting *Ka Hikitia* and Māori culturally responsive enactment throughout the school.

In terms of teacher enactment of *Ka Hikitia* within their own classrooms, the rate of enactment of specific items were similar to those teachers who were aware and cognisant of *Ka Hikitia*. '*In absentia'* teachers enacted the following on similar rates to those of the whole group: lead and assist with the teaching of waiata, children recite pepeha/mihi in the classroom, Māori student success is celebrated, give commands in Te Reo, incorporate legends into learning programmes, use Māori symbols and approaches in art, use whakataukī in the class, regularly teach Te Reo, and develop warm relationships with the whānau of Māori students. One item that differed markedly from an enactment perspective was that '*in absentia*' teachers indicated '*Strongly Agree'* or *'Agree*' in regard to the statement, '*I actively promote the values of Ka Hikitia*' at a rate of 46.67 per cent compared with the full cohort who indicated '*Strongly* Agree' or '*Agree*' at a rate of 73.47 per cent. This is an obvious difference as it clearly shows that the '*in absentia'* group have a degree of disconnect from the language of the policy. Compared with the full cohort, they are more unsure about whether or not their enactments align with the values of the *Ka Hikitia* policy text.

In terms of subjective factors, there was one item from the survey that differed quite markedly between the '*in absentia'* cohort and the whole cohort. The '*in absentia'* group had a very strong view on the impact of social factors upon Māori student achievement. While 57.15 per cent of teachers surveyed indicated they

'*Strongly Agree*' or '*Agree*' with the following statement: '*Social factors outside of a teacher's control such as parental income, standard of living and socio-economic background impact upon Māori student achievement to a greater degree than the impact of teachers incorporating Māori culture, language and identity into classrooms and schools*,' the '*in absentia'* teachers indicated '*Strongly Agree*' or '*Agree*' at a rate of 86.67 per cent. A few observations behind this difference are noted.

The first observation is that teachers who have engaged with *Ka Hikitia* enact similar things in their classrooms to those who have little or no knowledge of the policy. This would strongly suggest that the multi-faceted professional contexts that teachers are a part of, play an active role in *Ka Hikitia* teacher enactment. From this it would seem that, despite enacting *Ka Hikitia* in a similar vein to the whole cohort of respondents, there is a sense that the '*in absentia'* teachers might be more predisposed to holding a subjective view that suggests that social factors outside of a teacher's control (i.e., parental income, standard of living, socio-economic status) have a greater impact upon Māori student achievement than the impact of teachers and schools being culturally responsive. Thirdly, this might even suggest that '*in absentia'* teachers could be more likely to hold a cultural deficit or teacher deficit theorising perspective (Bishop, Berryman, Tiakiwai, & Richardson, 2003), negating the import of Māori culture, language and identity in mainstream classrooms and schools. This will be expounded on further in this discussion chapter. Finally, one could suggest by drawing from the theoretical work of Webb and Gulson (2013) that the '*in absentia'* teachers have enacted *Ka Hikitia* by being primarily 'folded' within and 'sensing' the surrounding enactments of fellow teachers, school-wide expectations within their schools and via the support and guidance from senior leaders and principals. Further research and analysis of how '*in absentia'* teachers are folded affectively from varying

pressures to 'conform' their enactments to those teachers around them and from the expectations of senior management via accountability measures is needed.

In summary, '*in absentia'* teachers who know nothing or very little about *Ka Hikitia* tend to hold a subjective view that asserts that students' home lives have a bigger impact on Māori student achievement and they predominantly use their contextual surroundings to enact *Ka Hikitia*. Further research is needed to examine the particularities pertaining to whether such teachers' subjectivities shift over the course of their careers in regard to the relative impact of Māori students' home lives on achievement outcomes toward a more favourable view on the influence of culturally responsive pedagogy within New Zealand schools and classrooms.

6.3.3 Broad Institutional Context. There are two key contextual factors associated with the broad institutional context that impacts teachers' ability to enact *Ka Hikitia.* The first is a sense that a large proportion of teachers feel unsupported by the Ministry of Education in relation to enactment of *Ka Hikitia*. A brief examination of the findings in light of the literature will follow. The second is the taken-for-granted, decentralised nature of the process that sits behind policy which reproduces a sector wide fragmented approach to culturally responsive enactment that is linked to mechanisms of accountability and culpability that absolves the Ministry of Education of issues such as disproportionate rates of Māori student achievement, placing responsibility squarely on schools in general and teachers in particular. This mirrors a traditional linear approach to policy analysis.

Firstly, primary teachers argue that there is a lack of adequate support for them to enact *Ka Hikitia*. The Ministry of Education is seen as the primary target of culpability with a very clear sense that teachers have largely felt unprepared, unsupported and unequivocally let down by the very makers of the policy which they

are to enact. A breakdown of the different survey items in the findings chapter highlights the chasm that exists between those who create policy and those who enact policy. This finding is supported in the literature.

It has been highlighted by an independent evaluation of *Ka Hikitia* (Goren, 2009) and via an audit of *Ka Hikitia* carried out by the Office of the Auditor-General (2013) noting that *Ka Hikitia* has had poor planning and project management and that the Ministry of Education has communicated ineffectively with schools in regard to its enactment. A number of years on from these reviews, the situation from the perspective of classroom teachers remains the same. There is an evident lack of guidance and support from the Ministry of Education regarding how teachers ought to enact *Ka Hikitia*.

With this lack of overarching support there is an evident frustration from the voices of a number of the teachers. Goren's (2009) independent evaluation of the *Ka Hikitia* strategy noted this dearth in guidance for teachers citing a lack of professional development and a lack of instructions for enacting *Ka Hikitia* leaving many teachers ill-equipped. The Office of the Auditor-General (2013) iterates that without the appropriate guidance and support many teachers have been left adrift with the policy having little or no impact upon their professional practice. It is worth discussing whether or not it can be claimed that teachers are apportioning blame to the Ministry of Education as a means to excuse themselves of their responsibility towards Māori students. A more critical perspective would suggest that this contextual factor needs to be examined and further analysed.

Through this study, primary school teachers expressed a sense of feeling unprepared to enact *Ka Hikitia* in both pre-service and in-service contexts and this is outlined in the literature (Goren, 2009; Office of the Auditor-General, 2013) where

teachers noted that there was a lack of professional development in this area and they were short of instructions for integrating and implementing it. Why would this shortfall in guidance and support continue to be the case with varying iterations of the *Ka Hikitia* strategy over quite a period of years?

It is interesting to note that in the policy enactment literature, Ball (1994) contends that policies do not normally tell teachers with any degree of specificity, what they are to do. Rather policies 'create circumstances or conditions in which the range of options available in deciding what to do are narrowed or changed, or particular goals or outcomes are set' (Ball, 1994, in Ball et al., 2012, p. 8). *Ka Hikitia* indeed narrows the focus on what could potentially be enacted to address the problem of disproportionate Māori student underachievement and this will be discussed later in this chapter. However, one aspect of current critical policy scholarship that is often neglected is that the New Zealand education policy landscape is a decentralised and devolved one.

Purportedly aimed at granting schools and teachers a greater level of autonomy to 'read' their local area so as to enable policy contextualisation and enactment, the taken-for-granted nature of the dominant decentralised policy approach provides a contextual conundrum worth exploring. Does the fact that *Ka Hikitia* is a decentralised education policy contribute to the range of ways in which teachers and schools enact it across New Zealand schools? Does such a decentralised policy approach contribute to teachers' feeling an intensely high level of pressure from the Ministry of Education in regard to Māori student achievement? Does a decentralised policy approach supply the Ministry of Education with the tools to apportion blame and responsibility for low Māori student achievement onto teachers?

Like numerous education policies in New Zealand, *Ka Hikitia* is expected to be read, interpreted and enacted in a devolved and localised manner with the Ministry of Education off-loading responsibility for its output upon schools and teachers. But what of the responsibility of the Ministry of Education? What mechanisms has the Ministry of Education put in place across the sector to enable teacher enactment of *Ka Hikitia*? Findings from this study suggest that there is a lack of consistency and uniformity between teachers and across schools in regard to teacher enactment of *Ka Hikitia*.

One example of the inconsisent resourcing, support and networks across the sector faced by primary school teachers that are particular to the enactment of *Ka Hikitia* include relationships between teachers, schools and local iwi. With iwi being major partners in varying education initiatives around New Zealand, surely mechanisms for relationships between iwi and mainstream schools would be of utmost importance. If this importance is granted by the Ministry of Education, then one would expect processes to be in place across the sector to ensure solid foundations and relationships between Treaty of Waitangi partners. Yet, evidence from this study suggests that there is wide inconsistency across the sector on this matter. Decentralisation has meant that responsibility for this has been left to individual schools.

Another example of poor sector co-ordination raised in the study is the noticeable lack of training and professional development for teachers both at pre-service and in-service levels. One issue noted was how different culturally responsive learning and training for undergraduate teachers in New Zealand can be depending on where one trained. Examples ranged from teachers having no exposure to culturally responsive pedagogy to teachers being challenged by what they were taught. In

relation to the level of professional development provided to current practising teachers across the sector, two teachers talked openly about the lack of professional development, insufficient appraisal processes and the paucity of opportunities for teachers to learn about culturally responsive pedagogy. While in contrast to this, other teachers talked about opportunities afforded to them in regard to culturally responsive professional development in current and previous school contexts like Ministry PLD or staff-wide opportunities to develop Te Reo proficiency and cultural awareness.

A third area of sector inconsistency noted by teachers is the variant levels of importance placed upon culturally responsiveness and the *Ka Hikitia* policy by the likes of the Education Review Office (ERO) team and teacher appraisers. Teachers talked in contrasting ways about their experiences with some feeling very intense pressure from Ministry of Education expectations and teacher registration requirements while others sensed a degree of apathy from those who monitor and appraise teachers and schools. Some teachers sensed a very real and intense pressure and responsibility from the Ministry of Education specifically for Māori achievement. Two teachers noted,

> '*You cannot sit back and blame me for Māori underachievement…I don't think that's fair…I think it is a bit of a slight on teachers and on me I guess as a Pākeha teacher…and I would say to (the Minister of Education) where is the funding? You are saying that you want me, in some case, to work miracles. Well then, you provide me with the magic wand for that, cos' I ain't got it.'*
>
> (Teacher, P1)

> *'…there is always that, 'How are your Māori children succeeding?' 'How are, is the emphasis on, you know, your Māori boys because they are frequently below?' How are we*

> *catering to their needs? There is that, that's out there that schools do feel that pressure.'*
>
> (Teacher, P2)

While these examples of fragmented actions across the sector are not exhaustive, they do provide enough material for additional critique. Further research needs to be carried out on the impacts of a decentralised policy approach upon teacher enactment of culturally responsive pedagogy. While decentralisation is aimed at enabling schools and teachers to make policy relevant to the context in which they are located and thus supposedly granting them a higher level of autonomy, the findings of this study suggest that such an approach lacks high levels of co-ordination with a concomitant absence of support mechanisms across the sector to ably enact *Ka Hikitia*. While Riveros and Viczko (2015) suggest, via the lens of actor network theory, that policy enactment differs from school to school due to the varying networks of human and non-human actors who come together to respond to policies in local contexts, the impact of a decentralised approach to education policy is often an invisible factor that needs to be critiqued and examined more closely in the literature.

6.3.4 Juggling Multiple Demands. A fourth contextual factor that teachers have expressed as impacting upon their ability to enact *Ka Hikitia*, is the notion of having to juggle multiple educational demands. This was provided as a rationale for not giving *Ka Hikitia* and/or culturally responsive pedagogy the space and time it might otherwise deserve. Teachers talked candidly about how jam-packed and crowded their roles had become citing a range of different curriculum priorities within their specific school contexts, accountability measures that had to be adhered to and a

range of policy demands that were placed upon them with increasing amount of performative pressure.

The independent review of *Ka Hikitia* carried out by Goren (2009) noted this sense of pressure upon both school principals and teachers with an increasing degree of expectation to meet a variety of policy demands. Some of these pressures were voiced as being discordant to teachers in this research. One teacher talked about the continual shifting nature of policy demands placed upon him and his fellow colleagues while citing that *Ka Hikitia* was a great idea, but due to pressures of other priorities, the focus can get lost. Further statements from other teachers alluded to a similar sense that primary schools are unique places where there are multiple policy and curriculum demands vying for teachers' attention that what inevitably is enacted is some watered-down form of what potentially could have been innovatory culturally responsive practice.

The literature suggests that the multiple policy demands that teachers face is part of the nascent incoherence that configures the context of schools (Braun, et al., 2010 in Ball, Maguire, & Braun, 2012, p. 71). Ball, Maguire, and Braun (2012) suggest that school contexts are infused with many policy formations but this ought not to be seen as a totalising phenomenon. They go on to note that through their enactment research in schools, there are often strong themes coming through the data that talk about "keeping up", "coping", and sometimes feeling overwhelmed (p. 95). Goren (2009) supports the views expressed by the teachers in this study when he articulates that education initiative after education initiative fall onto principals' and teachers' desks and that school staff fail to keep up with the vast number of them. This same theme strongly featured in this study. While it could be interpreted that teachers have raised the issue of workload as a factor impacting upon their enactment of *Ka Hikitia*

to excuse themselves of responsibility for taking up culturally responsive practices, one must be more critical of the contextual impact that a crowded curriculum and an overload of educational policies has upon teacher enactment of policies such as *Ka Hikitia*. What has been lacking in the current body of research is a critique of the extent to which such overload contributes to a form of culturally responsive policy fabrication by primary school teachers.

While Ball's research has noted that teachers 'may pay some attention to a policy and 'fabricate' a response that is incorporated into school documentation for purposes of accountability and audit, rather than to effect pedagogic or organisational change' (Ball, 2001, in Ball, Maguire, & Braun, 2012, p. 10), little leverage is given to this perspective of teachers and the range of curriculum and policy pressures that they face within their classrooms. Rather than solely creating a spectacle (Ball, 2003, in Singh, Heimans, & Glasswell, 2004) where enactments are of a more perfunctory nature underscored by a degree of cynical compliance, the context of an overloaded curriculum and multiple and, at times, contradictory policy demands upon teachers and the ensuing perfunctory enactments need to be given more consideration than they are currently receiving in the educational policy enactment literature.

Related to the juggling of priorities, raised by a handful of the teachers interviewed was in regard to the contradictory nature of competing policy demands that they are expected to enact. The recently defunct New Zealand educational policy of National Standards was compared to *Ka Hikitia* by some teachers as being a prime example of teachers having to juggle competing and, from their perspective, contradictory policy demands. Further analysis of the impact of competing policy demands upon teacher enactment of culturally responsive practices is needed. While Ball (in Singh, Heimans, & Glasswell, 2004) argues that the demands of external

policy requirements may impact upon the production of a policy 'spectacle' by teachers, such a proposition does not provide an understanding of all policy performances produced by teachers. There is a sense that the pressure of multiple and, at times, contradictory, policy demands and the range of contextual factors related to an over-crowded curriculum and juggling multiple priorities plays a pivotal role in contributing to the enactment of more perfunctory forms of culturally responsive approaches by teachers in mainstream primary schools.

6.4 Benefits & Constraints of Teacher Enactment of Ka Hikitia

This chapter will end with a focus on discussing the final research question.

3. What benefits and/or constraints do mainstream primary school teachers sense in regard to the incorporation of Māori language, culture and identity to address the issue of disproportionate Māori student underachievement?

There are three parts to this section. The first section highlights that the majority of teachers surveyed believe that incorporating Māori culture, language and identity into mainstream primary schools improves not only Māori student engagement but also Māori student achievement. While there are pockets of teachers who are apathetic or dismissive of *Ka Hikitia*, there is a degree of support for Māori culturally responsive pedagogy amongst New Zealand teachers and its mandate for them to become more culturally aware and responsive within their classrooms and schools. Teachers' views on this will be considered alongside that of the literature.

In terms of constraints in incorporating Māori language, culture and identity to address the issue of disproportionate Māori student underachievement, there are a number of barriers that have already been identified throughout this chapter. The range of subjective and local and institutional contextual constraints have already been well examined, yet there are two constraints that need further explication. The second and third parts of this section considers these two constraints.

This first constraint that teachers have sensed is the understanding that they feel specifically responsible for not only enacting culturally responsive pedagogy but also for the disproportionate rates of Māori student achievement. Following a traditional policy approach where the government crafts policy and teachers merely implement, *Ka Hikitia* has been caught up in a raft of policies whereby teachers felt policy was being done to them and not alongside them. *Ka Hikitia* allows the Ministry of Education to fashion the varying policy tools to apportion blame and responsibility for disproportionate Māori student achievement onto teachers rendering the government and the broader education system unencumbered. This part of the discussion will moot that the broader education sector ought to be held accountable when examining and evaluating *Ka Hikitia* enactment and not just individual teachers.

Related to this, the second constraint examines the contestable notion that social factors, such as poverty and socio-economic status, impacts upon Māori student achievement to a greater degree than through teachers redressing the cultural imbalance within mainstream schools by incorporating Māori culture, language, and identity. This perspective argues that factors such as family poverty, socio-economic status, and the lack of home resources impacts upon on Māori student achievement to a much greater degree than the lack of Māori culture, language and identity in

mainstream schools. A number of teachers see this as a glaring absence in educational policy that is muted within the current culturally responsive discourse.

This section of the chapter will consider and discuss this absence within *Ka Hikitia* in light of Bacchi's (1999) '*What's the Problem?*' approach and the policy-as-discourse theoretical position (Bacchi, 2000; Ball, 1993) where it will be contended that *Ka Hikitia* not only limits how the 'problem' of disproportionate Māori student achievement is represented and considered but it will put out a challenge to Māori academics to broaden the purview through which education spaces for Māori can be transformed. Culturally responsive pedagogy is an important part of the landscape aimed at improving educational outcomes for Māori. Māori academics must critically examine the call by mainstream teachers to consider the social, political, and economic factors that many believe impact upon Māori educational achievement. Rather than constructing the problem as one of teacher deficit theorising, an in-depth critique of the inequitable nature of our economic, political and social structures, and how they impact upon Māori student achievement in mainstream primary schools is deemed necessary.

6.4.1 Benefit: Improved Māori student engagement and achievement. A large percentage of the teachers surveyed in the second phase of the study indicated '*Agree*' or '*Strongly Agree*' with the notion that incorporating Māori culture, language and identity into schools improves Māori student engagement (95.92 per cent) and achievement (89.80 per cent.). There is a widely held sense among teachers that doing so plays a pivotal role in ensuring they initiate and cultivate strong relationships with their Māori students and recognise, value and validate the language, culture and identity that their students bring into the classroom and that doing so will improve achievement rates of Māori students.

As noted in the literature, the *Ka Hikitia* policy is underpinned by the 'cultural thesis' (Cooper, 2012) concept. It purports that to alleviate the issue of disproportionate Māori student achievement, mainstream primary school teachers need to be more culturally responsive to their Māori learners. This theory articulates that Māori students are said to suffer a sense of cultural dislocation in monocultural, Pākehā dominated schooling structures and the primary means by which Māori learners can recover academically is for teachers to ensure that their Māori students achieve educational success as Māori. It is clear from the data and anecdotal evidence from the second phase of this study that many New Zealand mainstream teachers are cognisant of and are willing to acknowledge and ensure that Māori language, culture, and identity are integral parts of their classrooms. They recognise the importance of validating Māori students and the cultural capital that they bring to the learning context and assert that it lifts self-confidence and helps Māori students to feel proud in the knowledge that they belong and have a place in mainstream schools. This is a far cry from the schools of the past where Māori students had to leave their language, culture and identity outside the school gate.

A number of teachers from the second phase of the study articulated that acknowledging and celebrating a child's cultural and linguistic background was good teacher practice and an important tool for educators in New Zealand mainstream primary schools. Such acknowledgement was seen to facilitate Māori student engagement, increased motivation and willingness to learn. While a large proportion of teachers hold a strong belief that culturally responsive pedagogy will lift Māori student engagement and achievement, there is a dearth of research that looks into the specificity of the extent to which culturally responsive pedagogy improves achievement at the primary school level. The literature suggests that culturally

responsive professional development leads to improved teacher attitudes and a change of teachers' beliefs towards Māori with a concomitant sense of valuing Te Reo and Māori students' cultural backgrounds (Meyer et al., 2010). While Alton-Lee (2015) carried out a brief report on Te Kotahitanga and noted accelerated shifts in achievement data for Māori students in participating schools, there is a lack of empirical evidence that contends that culturally responsive pedagogy leads to improved achievement rates for Māori at the primary school level. Further research needs to be carried out in New Zealand mainstream primary schools to examine whether culturally responsive pedagogy leads to improved achievement rates for Māori.

6.4.2 Constraint: Teachers as Policy Ciphers. The first constraint impacting upon teacher enactment of *Ka Hikitia* that has come out of this study is the intent focus upon teachers for improving Māori student achievement rates via culturally responsive pedagogy. An implementation approach to policy, where the government creates policy and teachers merely implement, does not help with understanding how particular policies 'travel' nor does it consider the broad ranging institutional contexts within which teachers operate. Instead accountability measures focus on schools in general and teachers in particular, apportioning blame and repsonsibility upon them if specific policy goals are unmet. This has equated to a high level of distrust amongst teachers, as evident in this study, and an overwhelming sense that the Ministry of Education offers little support and fails to ensure that complex sector wide mechanisms are in place to assist teachers in meeting *Ka Hikitia* policy priorities.

Penetito (2010) has iterated how the system often maintains its invisibility and neutrality by employing a traditional policy implementation approach where teachers are regarded as mere ciphers. His theoretical and philosophical critique of the

monocultural nature of the New Zealand mainstream education system also contends that the government prefers operating "under the guise of finding solutions for…the Māori problem… rather than looking at itself. It externalizes the problem and does not bring itself into the equation" (Penetito, 2010, p. 30). It is evident that teachers are subject to a traditional policy implementation approach via *Ka Hikitia*. Such a position perpetuates a silencing of broader institutional factors that impact upon teacher enactment of the *Ka Hikitia* policy.

Georgina Stewart (2016) takes this a step further when commenting on *Tātaiako*, an accompanying document of the *Ka Hikitia* policy. She argues that the policy "does little besides support the fallacious policy notion that classroom teachers, not wider social and historical processes, are responsible for ongoing poor educational outcomes for Māori students" (p. 96). Rather than solely focusing on teachers, it is asserted here that the broader education system ought to be the point of policy assessment, evaluation, and performativity. Such a broadly conceptualised view of policy as enactment, as opposed to implementation, will not only assist in understanding the range of subjective and contextual factors that impact upon teacher enactment of *Ka Hikitia*, but also will help to highlight the institutional sector-wide factors that are often left unquestioned and obscured.

6.4.3 Constraint: The Limits of the Cultural Thesis. Georgina Stewart's (2016) comment about *Tātaiako* and its fallacious policy notion that classroom teachers, not wider social and historical processes, are responsible for ongoing poor educational outcomes for Māori students leads us into this second constraint of teacher enactment of *Ka Hikitia*. The data has shown that 57.15 per cent of the survey respondents indicated '*Agree*' or '*Strongly Agree'* with the statement below:

> *Social factors outside of a teacher's control such as parental income, standard of living and socio-economics background impact upon Māori student achievement to a greater degree than the impact of teachers incorporating Māori culture, language and identity into classrooms and schools*.

There is quite a mixed view from teachers about whether or not enacting culturally responsive pedagogy has more of an impact upon Māori student achievement than social factors that are outside their domain of control. Just over half of the teachers surveyed believe that social factors impact more upon Māori student achievement than the impact of enacting culturally responsive practices in their classrooms. It is asserted here that while there is a definite need and immense benefits for culture, language, and identity to be part and parcel of the mainstream schooling experience for Māori students, *Ka Hikitia* limits how the 'problem' of disproportionate Māori student achievement can be conceived of and addressed in a number of ways.

Ka Hikitia promotes the notion that Māori, despite all our variances and differences, are primarily cultural beings and that to achieve educationally, we only need cultural changes made to monocultural, mainstream learning contexts. Following Bacchi's (1999) '*What's the Problem?*' approach to critical policy analysis, teachers are bound by and constituted within the presuppositions and assumptions that underlie the representation of the 'problem' of disproportionate Māori achievement in *Ka Hikitia*. As has been seen in the data, the varying ways in which teachers largely enact *Ka Hikitia* could be classified as cultural: observing and practising tikanga, perform karakia, celebrate Matariki, learn pepeha/mihi, teach Te Reo, use Māori symbols and approaches in art, use Māori legends, teach waiata, and participate in pōwhiri and kapa haka. It is agreed here that Māori have historically wanted more of Te Reo, Māori knowledge and cultural values injected into the mainstream education system but in

the same vein that Penetito (2010) has critiqued earlier versions of Māori education policies, *Ka Hikitia* primarily focuses on cultural elements to the detriment of structural elements. Other Māori academics have noted this problem of an overindulged focus on culture at the expense of alternative 'solutions' in the literature (Cooper, 2012; Hetaraka, 2019).

Related to this, a number of teachers have noted that both positive and negative social forces have a greater impact upon Māori student achievement than cultural factors. They largely contend that for the disproportionate rate of Māori student achievement to improve, these social factors have to be addressed. From a positive perspective, teachers from the study articulated that Māori students who achieve in their classrooms do so because of strong parental, whānau and community support, have an economically sound base and have robust teacher/student and whānau/student relationships. Teachers mentioned factors such as students having supportive parents, enjoy a good standard of living and having strong and trusting relationships between teacher, student, and whānau. From a negative perspective, participants from the study articulated that Māori students who do not achieve in their classrooms do so because of a lack of support from home, or due to living in poverty and/or substandard housing or because of varying socio-economic related problems within the family. Teachers mentioned factors such as poor attendance, transience, parents without employment and the impact of parental use of drugs and alcohol on their children.

Many would be concerned with the array of negative factors that teachers have cited as impacting upon Māori student achievement. In some circles, the factors that have been cited above are more than likely to be surmised as teachers employing the deficit theorising model (Macfarlane, 2004), also referred to in the literature as 'cultural deficit theory' or 'teacher deficit theorising' (Bishop, Berryman, Tiakiwai, &

Richardson, 2003). According to the literature, deficit theorising refers to attributing Māori educational underachievement to Māori learners and/or their families. How then to deal with this conundrum?

As evident from this study, teacher deficit theorising is a reality. There are teachers who are racist and 'choose not to see colour'. There are teachers who see no value in Māori language, culture, and identity being a part of the mainstream schooling system. There are teachers who make judgements and believe stereotypes about Māori. These behaviours and views need to be called out. But what of the concerns of many teachers that see the day-to-day impact that a range of social factors and poverty has upon children? What of the concerns of many teachers who see children leave their classroom having already attended five other primary schools before age 7? What of the concerns of many teachers who see the detrimental effect upon children of a parent with a drug issue? These are real factors, faced by real teachers, that have real-life impacts upon children and how they perform academically.

A number of academics have articulated that socio-economic status, poverty and home resources account for more of the achievement gaps between Māori and non-Māori (Carusi & Niwa, 2020; Gutschlag, 2007; Marie, Fergusson, & Boden, 2008; Nash, 2001; Song, Perry & McConney, 2014; Wylie, 2001, in Lourie and Rata, 2014). Song, Perry and McConney (2014) note in their findings that the 'educational underachievement of Māori…were, for the most part, explained by their exposure to family socio-economic disadvantage in childhood rather than factors relating to cultural identity' (p. 192).

Likewise, in this study, a number of teachers have expressed their day-to-day experiences and views on the impact of socio-economic status, poverty and home resources on student achievement and learning. Teachers were unequivocal in stating

that socio-economic status, poverty, and home resources has an impact on *all* students' learning and achievement and not solely on Māori students'. This insight from teachers is not expressed as deficit theorising against Māori. An underlying ethic of care and aroha underpins a number of the statements that they have made. Teachers have strong relationships with their students and whānau and their views on matters pertaining to the achievement and learning of their students must be taken more seriously rather than be seen as holding a teacher deficit theorising view or being treated as mere ciphers who implement.

Yet, despite the voices of numerous academics and over half of the mainstream primary teachers surveyed, *Ka Hikitia* is silent on the impact of socio-economic status and poverty on Māori student achievement. It is proffered that unless more space is given to understanding the complex socio-economic realities that a number of Māori students and their whānau face, policy aimed at addressing the disproportionate rate of Māori student achievement will continue to miss the mark.

6.5 Summary

This chapter has discussed the notion that rather than following a traditional, linear process, *Ka Hikitia* is interpreted and enacted by teachers in such a dynamic way that isolating, identifying, and discussing 'moments of interpretation', 'moments of enactment', and 'moments of contextual influence' might not fully grasp the degree of interplay that occurs within and between such moments. It has attempted to privilege a Māori ontological and epistemological position whereby teachers are not framed as transcendent and autonomous meaning making entities. They are rather understood to be part of the interplay of connectedness between self and the world.

While a range of subjective, contextual, and institutional factors that give shape to a range of teacher enactment of *Ka Hikitia* are discussed in succession and with definitiveness, it is understood that these factors ‘speak’ to teachers, they ‘speak’ to one another and also teachers ‘speak’ back to them in a dynamic and inter-relational manner.

This chapter has argued that the range of factors (i.e., subjective, contextual, institutional) must be given more critical attention and focus by those responsible for creating and monitoring the ‘output’ of the *Ka Hikitia* policy rather than seeking to hold teachers solely responsible for its enactment.

This chapter has highlighted the necessity of enacting culturally responsive pedagogy in mainstream primary schools to enhance the educational chances of Māori students. What is needed is a reconsideration of the impact of socio-economic factors upon Māori student achievement in education policy.

CHAPTER SEVEN: CONCLUSION

7.0 Introduction

The final chapter begins by outlining the four research aims of the study and how they were achieved. This is followed by summarising how the research questions have been answered through the investigation. A number of limitations are described, followed by a brief overview of areas for future research that stem from the findings and discussion of this study.

7.1 Summary: Research Aims and Questions

There were four research aims for this study that have been achieved. The first aim was to understand the complex contextual and subjective phenomena of how primary school teachers are impacted upon and implicated in the enactment of *Ka Hikitia*. A number of the complementary themes of this study explored the scope of subjective and contextual factors that have an impact upon teacher interpretation and enactment of *Ka Hikitia*. These factors include the role of senior school leaders, poor teacher attitudes, diverse education policy demands, lack of value and institutional support from the Ministry of Education, and the diverse range of teacher knowledge and understanding of the *Ka Hikitia* policy.

The second aim was to inform key stakeholders, including policymakers, about the range of factors that constrain and/or enable the enactment of the *Ka Hikitia* policy by New Zealand primary school teachers. Stakeholders are able to elicit from this study a range of factors across the sector that impact upon mainstream teachers'

enactment of *Ka Hikitia*. Teachers feel largely unsupported by the Ministry of Education in regard to *Ka Hikitia* enactment, school leaders play a significant role in the level of *Ka Hikitia* enactment within schools, teacher attitudes towards Māori language, culture, and identity needs addressing both from a skill perspective and also from a critical educational and historical perspective. The study also urges policymakers and academics to critique the cultural thesis that underpins *Ka Hikitia*. Its overemphasised focus on culture, while a necessary change that has been called for by many for some time, comes at the expense of alternative theories on achievement. Socio-economic factors were indicated by over half of the teachers in this study as having a greater impact upon Māori student achievement than changing the monocultural schooling system. Calling for policy responses that acknowledge the impact of socio-economic forces upon education achievement is the challenge put out to stakeholders by this study.

The third aim was to examine teacher discourses in relation to the place and status of Māori knowledge in mainstream primary schools. This study has shown that while some teachers have a poor attitude towards Māori knowledge many see its value in mainstream schools and its ability to connect to the identity of Māori children. Many teachers articulate that incorporating Māori knowledge improves Māori student engagement and achievement. This study has found that while teachers see the import of Māori knowledge in mainstream schools, a large number of them articulate that socio-economic forces have a greater impact upon Māori student achievement. As iterated above, this study calls policymakers and scholars to reconsider the impact of socio-economic factors upon Māori student achievement and to not always perceive this view as teacher deficit theorising.

The fourth and final aim of this study was to add to the critical policy and Māori education scholarly knowledge bases. This study has drawn from the theoretical base of policy enactment and policy-as-discourse theories to frame the research questions and also to assist in making sense of the findings. Critical policy research has shown little evidence which demonstrates that teachers employ enactment resistance in regard to policy. This study has shown that there are teachers who not only resist calls for culturally responsive teaching approaches in their classroom but that there are also teachers who resist perceived token gestures of culturally responsive enactment as dictated to them by senior school leaders and/or appraisers.

A further way in which this study contributes to the critical education policy knowledge base is through an articulation of three identified forms of enactment: *considered enactment*, *perfunctory enactment*, and *enactment resistance.* This study articulates that all three forms of enactment are closely linked and often exist in view of one another within classrooms and schools.

Another way in which this study adds to critical education policy scholarship is through a rethinking of the notion of policy intensions. Whereas Webb and Gulson (2013) articulate an overly deterministic view of policy's impact upon teachers, this study has shown that policy intensions can be considered in a more positive manner with evidence of alignment and contiguity between *Ka Hikitia* and teachers.

This study contributes to the Māori education scholarly knowledge base by drawing from an 'uncertain' Kaupapa Māori theory to situate and frame the research and findings. As has been noted, this uncertainty stems from a number of criticisms levelled at Kaupapa Māori theorists' including the propensity to employ essentialist binaries and embrace a certainty reminiscent of the Western desire for completeness. By drawing from a Māori worldview and value system that embraces open-endedness

and tentativeness, this study seeks to challenge more certain iterations of Kaupapa Māori theory and research. The results and findings are deemed to be tentative, a snapshot from certain moments-in-time that facilitate an exploration of the phenomenon of teacher enactment of *Ka Hikitia*.

There were three research questions for this study that have been explored and addressed. The first question was, 'How do mainstream primary school teachers interpret and enact the *Ka Hikitia* policy focus of incorporating Māori language, culture and identity into their classrooms and schools?' This study supports the notion that teachers enact policies from positions of their own personal identities and subjectivities. Findings from this study suggest that teachers bring varying life experiences, political perspectives, views on the value of Māori language, culture, and identity and confidence in engaging with Māori worldviews and social norms to the classroom. Teachers also enact *Ka Hikitia* via a range of local and institutional contextual factors. This study supports the notion that context is a primary factor impacting upon teacher interprtation and enactment of *Ka Hikitia*. Three forms of teacher of enactment of *Ka Hikitia* were identified through this study. There were: *considered enactment*, *perfunctory enactment*, and *enactment resistance*. While not well articulated in the literature, policy enactment resistance is an area of critical policy research that requires further research and exploration.

The second research question was, 'Which contexual and subjective factors influence how Māori language, culture and identity is enacted by mainstream primary school teachers?' The contextual factors noted in this study include the role of senior school leaders and the role of school context and how teachers 'sense' the enactment responses of their school to make their deliberate choices of enactment. The study has found that teachers lack support from the Ministry of Education to enact *Ka Hikitia*

and the decentralised approach that dominates the New Zealand policy landscape plays a role that impacts upon teacher enactment of *Ka Hikitia*. The fragmented actions that are evident across the primary school sector in relation to *Ka Hikitia* enactment highlights this conundrum. The juggling of multiple priorities and policy demands has also been highlighted as a contextual factor impacting upon teacher enactment of *Ka Hikitia*.

In relation to subjective factors influencing teacher enactment of *Ka Hikitia*, personal attitudes were highlighted as having impact upon what teachers chose (or refused) to enact. While numerous teachers in the study were positive toward Māori language, culture and identity, evidence from the study suggests that there is still a large group of teachers who hold a negative or poor attitude. Points of disconnect highlighted from the study include: 1) the view that teachers might have towards Māori language, culture, and identity is a one-sided or skewed perspective on Māori history and the impact of British colonisation; 2) blaming Māori and their whānau for not knowing about their own language and culture reinforces a deficit theorising mentality that seeks to blame Māori for educational underachievement and not larger social, economic, and historical forces that have their genesis in colonization; 3) egalitarian and colour-blind discourses held by teachers, suggesting that speaking Māori and/or celebrating Māori culture and identity was privileging Māori in a mainstream school system that should remain neutral. This study highlights the need to 'speak back' to these discourses both at preservice and inservice teaching level and bring about a more critically informed teaching force.

The final research question was 'What benefits and/or constraints do mainstream primary school teachers sense in regards to the incorporation of Māori language, culture and identity to address the issue of disproportionate Māori student

underachievement?' The majority of teachers surveyed believe that incorporating Māori culture, language, and identity into mainstream primary schools improves not only Māori student engagement but also Māori student achievement. In terms of constraints that teachers sense in regard to the incorporation of Māori language, culture, and identity to address the issue of disproportionate Māori student underachievement, on top of the range of subjective, local, institutional, and contextual constraints that have already been noted, two further constraints were identified. This first constraint was that teachers sensed that they were specifically responsible for not only enacting culturally responsive pedagogy but for the disproportionate rates of Māori student achievement. Following a traditional policy approach where the government crafts policy and teachers merely implement, *Ka Hikitia* has been caught up in a raft of policies whereby teachers felt policy was being done to them and not alongside them. Teachers sense that there were varying policy tools to apportion blame and responsibility for disproportionate Māori student achievement onto them, rendering the government and the broader education system unexamined. The second constraint examined the contestable notion that social factors, such as poverty and socio-economic status, impacts upon Māori student achievement to a greater degree than through teachers redressing the cultural imbalance within mainstream schools by incorporating Māori culture, language, and identity. A number of teachers see this as a glaring absence in educational policy that is muted within the current culturally responsive discourse.

7.2 Limitations

One of the first limitations of this study was the fact that data was only collected from mainstream primary schools in the Manawatū/Palmerston North area. A larger sample size for both phases of the study would have provided further rich and descriptive data for the research. Considering the time contraints for completing this project and the need for access to participants while working full-time meant that limiting the area to being close to where the researcher resides was deemed to be suitable and manageable.

Another limitation of this research centres around the notion that teacher enactment of the *Ka Hikitia* policy was described to the researcher in a self-reported manner from teacher participants in both phases of study. The policy enactment research work of others in the field have relied on researcher interpretation of school and classroom visits, analysis of artefacts and events and teacher participant face-to-face interviews. Like the first limitation, considering the time constraints for carrying out the data collection while working full-time also meant there were limitations on what the researcher was able to do. While being able to visit classrooms and schools, having the opportunity talk to principals and a host of other policy actors would have added further rich data to analyse, due to time constraints, limiting the way in which data was collected, namely, a small number of one-to-one interviews and an online survey was deemed to be suitable and manageable.

A final limitation lies in the qual→QUAN sequential phase research approach used for this study. Very few studies have been cited that have utilised his two-phase sequential approach to research. Trying to find a model of research in critical educational policy or Māori education that folllowed this approach was not possible.

Furthermore, further rich data may have been collected having a third qualitiative interview phase. This would have made the study a qual→QUAN→qual approach which would have added to the time pressures for carrying out the data collection. As noted previously, it was deemed to be more manageable to maintain the sequential two-phase qual→QUAN approach.

7.3 Further Research

This section outlines seven possible areas for future research and/or theoretical examination that stem from the findings and discussion of this study. They are described below with questions posed for possible exploration.

The first is to theoretically examine Webb and Gulson's (2013) spatial concept of policy intensions in relation to the notion of considered teacher enactment. Webb and Gulson articulate that policy 'folds' teachers and is "used to disorient subjects and reorient their relationships with themselves in various ways" (p. 64). This theorising connotes that policy *acts upon* teachers as they "sense, encounter, embody, and respond to policy desires, often without recognising particular policy desires" (ibid, p. 57). Data from this study suggests that rather than being disoriented and unaware of particular policy desires, a number of policy actors recognised and aligned with the values and rationale of *Ka Hikitia*. This study has noted a degree of conscious teacher agency when they carry out their culturally responsive pedagogical work. Rather than being 'folded' *by* policy, this study has highlighted that numerous teachers sensed a degree of synchronicity with *Ka Hikitia*. The question to pose is, '*How does the theoretical concept of policy intensions render actor/policy synchronicity*?'

A second area of possible research, as noted in *Chapter Six*, is to examine the interrelationship between considered and perfunctory enactments of *Ka Hikitia*. In privileging an 'uncertain' Kaupapa Māori theory, this study has asserted that considered and perfunctory moments of enactment are inherently connected and that teachers can and do carry out 'moments of considered enactment' and 'moments of perfunctory enactment'. They co-exist in view of one another and speak to and in tension with policy actors on a day-to-day basis in the classroom. Thus, while helpful for purposes of description, distinguishing between considered and perfunctory enactments inevitably minimises the degree of interplay that occurs between and through such representations.

While Ball (in Singh, Heimans, & Glasswell, 2004) argues that the demands of external policy requirements may impact upon the production of a policy 'spectacle' by teachers, such a proposition does not provide an understanding of the interplay between considered and perfunctory policy enactments produced by individual teachers. A potential question to pose is, '*How do teachers make sense of their culturally responsive policy enactments (from considered to perfunctory) within their classrooms?*

A third area for further research is to examine why some primary school teachers resist enacting culturally responsive pedagogy. Ball, Maguire, and Braun (2012) have stated that they have found little evidence of policy resistance in their policy enactment research work. Rather than resistance, they argue that they have found evidence of teacher "dis-ease and discontent" (p. 150) towards particular policies. However, anecdotes from participants in this study note there were refusals from fellow teachers to participate in school-wide culturally responsive practices. With matters of ethnicity, culture, and race in education often being a point of contention in

varying facets of New Zealand society, culturally responsive education policy might have more instances of resistance than has previously been recognised in enactment research. Enactment resistance is an area of critical policy research that requires further research and exploration. Possible questions to pose are, '*Why do New Zealand primary school teachers resist enacting culturally responsive pedagogy?*' '*In what ways do New Zealand primary school teachers resist enacting culturally responsive pedagogy?*'

A fourth area of potential research is an examination of the range of subjective and contextual factors that impact upon primary school principals' enactment of Māori culturally responsive pedagogy within their schools. The findings from this study show that teachers view school principals as playing a pivotal contextual role in providing support and strategy for individual teachers' enactment of *Ka Hikitia*. This study has not drawn from the experiences and voices of primary school principals and so a focus on the factors that impact upon their level of culturally responsive leadership would help broaden the purview of *Ka Hikitia* enactment across New Zealand primary schools. Possible questions to pose are, '*How do primary school principals interpret Ka Hikitia?*' '*What factors impact upon their culturally responsive pedagogical leadership?*'

A fifth area for further research that stems from this study is an analysis of the impacts of a decentralised policy approach upon teacher enactment of *Ka Hikitia*. While decentralisation is aimed at enabling schools and teachers to make policy relevant to the context in which they are located and thus supposedly granting them a higher level of autonomy, the findings of this study suggest that such an approach lacks high levels of co-ordination with a concomitant absence of support mechanisms across the sector to ably enact *Ka Hikitia*. While Riveros and Viczko (2015) suggest, via the

lens of actor network theory, that policy enactment differs from school to school due to the varying networks of human and non-human actors who come together to respond to policies in local contexts, the impact of a decentralised approach to education policy is often an invisible factor that needs to be critiqued and examined more closely in the literature. Possible questions to pose are, '*What factors (i.e., historical, social, political, economic) have led to the decentralisation of New Zealand education policy?*' '*How does a decentralised policy approach impact upon New Zealand primary schools?*' '*How does a decentralised policy approach impact upon teacher enactment of Ka Hikitia?*'

A sixth area for further examination is a critical analysis of *Ka Hikitia* and its silence on the influence of socio-economic status on Māori student achievement. This study has highlighted that while culturally responsive pedagogy is a necessary policy avenue to advance Māori student engagement and achievement, a reconsideration of the influence of socio-economic factors upon Māori student achievement in education policy is needed. Using Bacchi (1999) to help frame the areas for critical probing, possible questions to explore include, '*What effects are produced by the cultural thesis mandate represented in Ka Hikitia?*' '*What is left unproblematic in this representation?*' '*How would 'responses' differ if the 'problem' were thought about or represented as an issue of socio-economic status*?'

A final possible area to explore is a theoretical and philosophical examination of an 'uncertain' Kaupapa Māori theory (Mika, 2012, 2015a, 2015b, 2015c, 2016, 2017). In particular, making philosophical and theoretical connections between a tentative approach to the perception of things, the connectivity between the Self and the Thing, and how such a indigenous, Māori worldview converses with policy enactment theory and policy-as-discourse theory. Possible areas to explore include,

'*How does an 'uncertain' Kaupapa Māori theory conceive of policy enactment and policy-as-discourse theories?*' '*How might an 'uncertain' Kaupapa Māori theory contribute to the broader area of critical educational policy scholarship?*'

REFERENCES

Ahenakew, C., de Oliveira Andreotti, V., Cooper, G., & Hireme, H. (2014). Beyond Epistemic Provincialism. De-provincializing Indigenous resistance. *AlterNative: An International Journal of Indigenous Peoples*, *10*(3), 216-231.

Alton-Lee, A. (2015). *Evaluation of Te Kotahitanga Phase 5 (2010-2012).* Wellington, New Zealand: Ministry of Education.

Apple, M. (2000). *Official Knowledge: Democratic Education in a Conservative Age (Second Edition)*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Apple, M. (2004). Creating difference. Neo-liberalism and the Politics of Educational Reform. *Educational Policy, 18*(1), 12-44.

Averill, R. (2012). Reflecting Heritage Cultures in Mathematics Learning; The Views of Teachers and Students. *Journal of Urban Mathematics Education, 5*(2), 157-181.

Bacchi, C. (1999). *Women, Policy and Politics: The Construction of Policy Problems*. London, UK: Sage.

Bacchi, C. (2000). Policy as Discourse: What does it mean? Where does it get us? *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education, 21*(1), 45-57. doi: 10.1080/01596300050005493

Ball, S. J. (1993). What is Policy? Texts, Trajectories and Toolboxes. *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education, 13*(2), 10-17. doi: 10.1080/0159630930130203

Ball, S.J., Maguire, M., & Braun, A. (2012). *How Schools Do Policy – Policy Enactments in Secondary Schools*. Oxford: Routledge.

Bassey, M. (1999). *Case Study Research in Educational Settings*. Buckingham, UK: Open University Press.

Berryman, M., & Bishop, R. (2011). The Te Kotahitanga Observation Tool: Development, use reliability and validity. *Waikato Journal of Education, 16*(3), 81-94.

Berryman, M., & Woller, P. (2013). Learning about inclusion by listening to Māori. *International Journal of Education, 17*(8), 827-838.

Biesta, G. J. J. (2015). What is Education For? On Good Education, Teacher Judgement, and Educational Professionalism. *European Journal of Education*, *50*(1), 75-87. doi: 10.1111/ejed.12109

Bishop, R. (1999). Kaupapa Māori Research: An Indigenous approach to creating knowledge. In N. Robertson (Ed.), *Māori & Psychology: Research and Practice.* (pp. 1-6). University of Waikato.

Bishop, R. (2003) Changing Power Relations in Education: Kaupapa Māori messages for 'mainstream' education in Aotearoa/New Zealand. *Comparative Education, 39*(2), 221-238.

Bishop, R. (2010). Discursive Positioning and Educational Reform In S. May and C. Sleeter (Eds.), *Critical Multiculturalism. Theory and Practice.* (pp. 61-71). Routledge.

Bishop, R. (2012). Pretty difficult: Implementing kaupapa Māori theory in English-medium secondary schools. *New Zealand Journal of Educational Studies*, *47*(2), 38-50.

Bishop, R., Berryman, M., Tiakiwai, S., & Richardson, C. (2003). *Te Kotahitanga: The Experiences of Year 9 & Year 10 Māori Students in Mainstream Classrooms.* Wellington, New Zealand: Ministry of Education.

Bishop, R., Ladwig, J., & Berryman, M. (2014). The Centrality of Relationships for Pedagogy: The Whanaungatanga Thesis, *American Education Research Journal*, *51*(1), 184-214. doi: 10.3102/0002831213510019

Bishop, R., O'Sullivan,D., & Berryman, M. (2010). *Scaling Up Education Reform: Addressing the Politics of Disparity.* Wellington, New Zealand: NZCER Press.

Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology, 3*(2), 77-101. doi: 10.1191/1478088706qp063oa

Bryman, A. (2008). *Social Science Research (3rd Edition)*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Burke Johnson, R., & Christensen, L. (2014). *Educational Research. Quantitative, Qualitative, and Mixed Approaches* (*5th Edition)*. California, CA: Sage Publications.

Caccioppoli, P. & Cullen, R. (2006). *Māori Education*. Auckland, New Zealand: Kotahi Media.

Carusi, F. T., & Niwa, T. H. (2020). Learning not to be poor: the impossible position of teachers in Aotearoa New Zealand education policy discourse. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Teacher Education, .48*(1), 30-44. doi: 10.1080/1359866X.2019.1684434

Clandinin, D. J., & Burke Johnson, R. (2014). Chapter 15: Narrative Inquiry and Case Study Research. In R. Burke Johnson & L. B. Christensen *Educational Research. Quantitative, Qualitative, and Mixed Approaches 5th Edition*. (pp. 417-441). Sage Publications.

Cohen, L., & Manion, L. (1997). *Research Methods in Education (Fourth Edition)*. New York: Routledge.

Cooper, G. (2012). Kaupapa Māori Research: Epistemic Wilderness as Freedom? *New Zealand Journal of Educational Studies*, *47(2)*, 64-73.

Creswell, J. W., & Plano Clark, V. L. (2011). *Designing and Collecting Mixed Methods Research (2nd Edition).* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Deer, F. (2013). Integrating Aboriginal Perspectives in Education: Perceptions of Pre-Service Teachers. *Canadian Journal of Education, 36*(2), 175-211.

Donaldson, M. (2012). Despairing the Disparity: What Can We Do To Help? *Kairaranga, 13*(2), 49-54.

Durie, A. E. (2002). *Whakamua Whakamuri: Māori Research*. Keynote address presented at NZARE Conference, Massey University, 7 December.

Durie, M., Hoskins, T., & Jones, A. (2012). Interview Kaupapa Māori: Shifting the social. *New Zealand Journal of Education Studies, 47*(2), 21-29.

Education Council & Ministry of Education (2011). *Tātaiako: Cultural Competencies for Teachers of Māori Learners*. Wellington, New Zealand: Author.

Education Counts (2021). School Leaver's Attainment. Retrieved 7th July, 2021 from https://www.educationcounts.govt.nz/statistics/school-leavers

Education Review Office. (2010). *Promoting Success for* Māori *Students: Schools' Progress*. Wellington, New Zealand: Author.

Education Review Office. (2012). *Māori Success: Complementary Evaluation Framework*. Wellington, New Zealand: Author.

Eketone, A. (2008). Theoretical underpinnings of Kaupapa Māori directed practice. *MAI Review,* (1)*,* 1-11. Retrieved 17th September, 2015 from http://www.review.mai.ac.nz/mrindex/MR/issue/view/9.html

Erbesole, M., Kanahale-Mossman, H., & Kawakami, A. (2016). Culturally Responsive Teaching: Examining Teachers' Understandings and Perspectives. *Journal of Education and Training Studies, 4*(2), 97-104. doi:10.11114/jets.v4i2.1136

Fitzsimons, P., & Smith, G. H. (2000). Philosophy and Indigenous Cultural Transformation. *Educational Philosophy and Theory, 32*(1), 25-41. doi: 10.1111/j.1469-5812.2000.tb00430.x

Fraenkel, J., Wallen, N., & Hyun, H. (2014). *How to Design and Evaluate Research in Education (8th Edition)*. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.

Gall, J., Gall, M., & Borg, W. (1999). *Applying Educational Research – A Practical Guide (Fourth Edition)*. New York, NY: Longman.

Gibson, R. (1986). *Critical Theory and Education*. London, UK: Hodder & Stoughton.

Gordon-Burns, D., & Campbell, L. (2014). Indigenous Rights in Aotearoa/New Zealand - Inakitia rawatia hei kakano mo apopo: Students' Encounters With Bicultural Commitment. *Childhood Education, 90*(1), 20-28. doi: 10.1080/00094056.2014.872506

Goren, P.D. (2009). *How Policy Travels: Making Sense of Ka Hikitia - Managing for Success: The Māori Education Strategy 2008-2012*. Wellington, New Zealand: Fulbright New Zealand.

Group Special Education & Ministry of Education (2008). *Te Hikoitanga: The Journey Chart*. Wellington, New Zealand: Author.

Gutschlag, A. (2007). Some Implications of the Te Kotahitanga Model of Teacher Positioning. *New Zealand Journal of Teachers' Work, 4*(1), 3-10.

Habib, A., Densmore-James, S., & Macfarlane, S. (2013). A Culture of Care: The Role of Culture in Today's Mainstream Classrooms. *Preventing School Failure*, *57*(3), 171-180. doi: 10.1080/1045988X.2013.798777

Hancock, D. R., & Algozzine, B. (2006). *Doing Case Study Research. A Practical Guide for Beginning Researchers*. New York, NY: Teachers' College Press.

Hawes, L. (2011). Te Akatea Conference 2011. *New Zealand Principals' Federation Magazine, 26*(3), 22.

Hawes, L. (2012b). Māori achievement in a mainstream school. *New Zealand Principals' Federation Magazine, 27*(4), 7-10.

Hawes, L. (2012a). Raising Māori Achievement. *New Zealand Principals' Federation Magazine, 27*(2), 8-9.

Henderson, J. Y. (2000). Challenges of Respecting Indigenous World View in Eurocentric Education. In R. Neil (Ed.), *Voice of the Drum: Indigenous Education and Culture*. (pp. 59-80). Kingfisher Publications.

Henry, E., & Pene, H. (2001). Kaupapa Māori: Locating Indigenous Ontology, Epistemology and Methodology in the Academy. *Organization, 8*(2), 234-242. doi: 10.1177/1350508401082009

Hetaraka, M. (2019). A Kaupapa Māori Analysis of Tātaiako. Considering Māori Education Policy. *MAI*, *8*(2), 159-171.

Hoskins, T. (2012). A fine risk: Ethics in Kaupapa Māori politics. *New Zealand Journal of Education Studies*, *47*(2), 85-99.

Howe, K. R. (2004). A Critique of Experimentalism. *Qualitative Inquiry, 10*(1), 42-61. doi: 10.1177/1077800403259491

Hutchings, J., Barnes, A., Taupo, K., Bright, N., Pihama, L., & Lee, P. (2012). *Kia Puawaitia Nga Tumanako: Critical Issues for Whānau in Māori Education (Research Summary*). Auckland, New Zealand: NZCER.

Hynds, A., Sleeter, C., Hindle, R., Savage, C., Penetito, W. & Meyer, L. H., (2011). Te Kotahitanga: a case study of a repositioning approach to teacher professional development for culturally responsive pedagogies. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Teacher Education, 39*(4), 339-351.

Imenda, S. N. (2014). Is there a difference between theoretical and conceptual frameworks? *Journal of Social Sciences, 38*(2), 185-195. doi: 10.1080/09718923.2014.11893249

Jackson, M.D. (2003). Literacy, Communications and Social Change. In I.H. Kawharu (Ed.), *Conflict and Compromise. Essays on the Māori Since Colonisation* (pp. 27-54). Reed Publishing.

Lee, J. (2008). *Ako: Pūrākau of Māori teachers' work in secondary scho*ols. Unpublished EdD Thesis. Auckland, New Zealand: University of Auckland.

López, G. (1999). Reflections on epistemology and standpoint theories: a response to "a Māori approach to creating knowledge". *Qualitative Studies in Education, 2*(2), 225-231.

Lourie, M., & Rata, E. (2014). A critique of the role of culture in Māori education. *British Journal of Sociology of Education, 35*(1), 19-36. doi: 10.1080/01425692.2012.736184

Macfarlane A. (2004). *Kia hiwa rā! Listen to culture: Māori students' plea to educators.* Wellington, New Zealand: NZCER Press.

Madland, D., & Bunker, N. (2011). *The Middle Class is Key to a Better-Educated Nation*. Washington, DC: Centre for America Progress Fund.

Mahuika, R. (2008). Kaupapa Māori theory is critical and anti-colonial. *MAI Review*, (3), 1-16. Retrieved 17th September, 2015 from http://www.review.mai.ac.nz/mrindex/MR/issue/view/11.html

Ma Rhea, Z. (2012). *Indigenizing Teacher Professional Development; Anticipating the Australian Professional Standards for Teachers in Australia*. Paper presented at joint AARE/APERA International Conference, Sydney, Australia.

Marie, D., Fergusson, D. M., & Boden, J. M. (2008). Educational Achievement in Māori: The roles of cultural identity and social disadvantage. *Australian Journal of Education, 52*,(2), 183-196.

McLaren, P. (1995). *Critical Pedagogy and Predatory Culture*. London, UK: Routledge.

McLeod, J., & Kenrick, P. (2013). Special Interest Group report: Tataiako: Cultural competencies for teachers of Māori learners. *Waikato Journal of Education, 18*(1), 151-153.

Meyer, L., Penetito, W., Hynds, A., Savage, C., Hindle, R., & Sleeter, C. (2010). *Evaluation of Te Kotahitanga: 2004–2008: Report to the Ministry of Education.* Retrieved 5th September, 2016 from https://www.educationcounts.govt.nz/publications/91416/english-medium-education/evaluation-of-te-kotahitanga-20042008/executivesummary

Mika, C. (2012). Overcoming 'Being' in Favour of Knowledge: The fixing effect of 'mātauranga'. *Educational Philosophy and Theory, 44*(10), 1080-1092.

Mika, C. (2014). The Enowning of Thought and Whakapapa: Heidegger's Fourfold. *Review of Contemporary Philosophy, 13*, 48-60.

Mika, C. (2015a). Counter-Colonial and Philosophical Claims: An indigenous observation of Western philosophy. *Educational Philosophy and Theory, 47*(11), 1136-1142. doi: 10.1080/00131857.2014.991498

Mika, C. (2015b). The Co-Existence of Self and Thing Through Ira. *Journal of Aesthetics and Phenomenology, 2*(1), 93-112. doi: 10.1080/20539320.2015.11428461

Mika, C. (2015c). The thing's revelation: Some thoughts on Māori philosophical research. *Waikato Journal of Education, 20*(2), 61-68. doi: 10.15663/wje.v20i2.206

Mika, C. (2015d). "Thereness". Implications of Heidegger's "presence" for Māori. *AlterNative, 11*(1), 3-13. doi: 10.1177/117718011501100101

Mika, C. (2016). Worlded Object and Its Presentation. A Māori philosophy of language. *AlterNative, 12*(2), 165-176. doi: 10.20507/AlterNative.2016.12.2.5

Mika, C. (2017). Chapter Nine: The Uncertain Kaupapa of Kaupapa Māori. In T. Hoskins & A. Jones (Eds.), *Critical Conversations in Kaupapa Māori*. (pp. 119-132). Huia Publishers.

Mika, C., & Stewart, G. (2016). Māori in the Kingdom of the Gaze: Subjects or critics? *Educational Philosophy and Theory, 48*(3), 300-312. doi: 10.1080/00131857.2015.1013017

Milne, A. (2013). *Colouring the White Spaces: Reclaiming Cultural Identity in Whitestream Schools.* Unpublished PhD Thesis. Hamilton, New Zealand: University of Waikato.

Ministry of Education (2005). *Māori Education Strategy.* Wellington, New Zealand: Author.

Ministry of Education (2008). *Ka Hikitia Managing for Success: The Māori Education Strategy 2008-2012.* Wellington, New Zealand: Author.

Ministry of Education (2009). *Ka Hikitia Managing for Success: The Māori Education Strategy 2008-2012. Updated 2009.* Wellington, New Zealand: Author.

Ministry of Education (2013a). *Ka Hikitia Accelerating Success 2013-2017*. Wellington, New Zealand: Author.

Ministry of Education (2013b). *Effective governance: Supporting education success as Māori - Information for school board of trustees*. Wellington, New Zealand: Learning Media.

Ministry of Education (2020). *Ka Hikitia Ka Hāpaitia: The Māori Education Strategy.* Wellington, New Zealand: Author.

Mugisha, V. M. (2013). Culturally Responsive Instructional Leadership: A Conceptual Exploration with Principals of Three New Zealand Mainstream Schools. *Intercultural Journal of Multicultural Education, 15*(2), 1-20.

Nash, R. (1999). Realism in the Sociology of Education: 'explaining' social differences in attainment. *British Journal of Sociology of Education, 20*(1), 107-125.

Nash, R. (2001). Models of Māori Educational Attainment: Beyond the "Class" and "Ethnicity" Debate. *Waikato Journal of Education, 7*, 23-36.

Nash, R. (2005). Professional Development and Student Achievement Gains: A Look at the Te Kōtahitanga Report. *New Zealand Journal of Teachers' Work, 2*(1), 20-27.

New Zealand School Trustees Association & Ministry of Education (2021). *Hautū: Māori Cultural Responsiveness Self Review tool for school boards*. Wellington, New Zealand: Author.

Office of the Auditor-General (2013). *Education for Maori: Implementing Ka Hikitia – Managing for Success.* (Parliamentary Paper). Wellington, New Zealand: Author.

Olssen, M., Codd, J., & O'Neill, A. (2004). *Education Policy: Globalization, Citizenship and Democracy*. London, UK :Sage. doi:10.4135/9781446221501

Onwuegbuzie, A. J., & Leech, N. L. (2006). Linking research questions to mixed methods data analysis procedures. *The Qualitative Report*, *11*(3), 474-498.

Penetito, W. (2010). *What's Māori about Māori Education.* Wellington, New Zealand: Victoria University Press.

Popkewitz, T. S., & Fendler, L. (1999). *Critical Theories in Education, Changing Terrains of Knowledge and Politics*. London, UK: Routledge.

Rata, E. (2012). Theoretical Claims and Empirical Evidence in Māori Education Discourse. *Education Philosophy and Theory, 44*(10), 1060-1072. doi: 10.1111/j.1469-5812.2011.00755.x

Rata, E. (2004). *Ethnic Ideologies in New Zealand Education: What's Wrong with Kaupapa Māori*. Paper presented at the Teacher Education Forum of Aotearoa New Zealand Conference (TEFANZ), Auckland College of Education, 5-7 July.

Riveros, A., & Viczko, M. (2015). The enactment of professional learning policies: performativity and multiple ontologies. *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education, 36*(4), 533-547. doi: 10.1080/01596306.2015.980492

Roberts, M. (2013). Ways of Seeing: Whakapapa. *Sites – A Journal of Social Anthropology and Cultural Studies, 10*(1), 93-120. doi: 10.11157/sites-vol10iss1id236

Royal, T. C. (2012). Politics and knowledge: Kaupapa Māori and mātauranga Māori. *New Zealand Journal of Educational Studies, 47*(2), 30-37.

Salmond, A. (2014). Tears of Rangi: Water, power and people in New Zealand. *HAU: Journal of Ethnographic Theory, 4*(3), 285-309. doi: 10.14318/hau4.3.017

Scott, D. (1999). Introduction. In D. Scott (Ed.), *Values and Educational Research*. (pp. 1-6). University of London.

Scott, D., & Usher, R. (1999). *Researching Education: Data, Methods and Theory in Educational Inquiry*. London, UK: Cassell.

Simon, J. (1986). *Ideology in the Schooling of Māori Children*. Palmerston North, New Zealand: Delta.

Simon, J. (1994). Historical Perspectives on Schooling. In E. Coxon, K. Jenkins & L. Massey (Eds.), *The Politics of Learning and Teaching in Aotearoa.* (pp. 37-81). Dunmore Press.

Simon, J. (1998). *Ngā Kura Māori. The Native Schools System 1867-1969.* Auckland, New Zealand: Auckland University Press.

Singh, P., Heimans, S., & Glasswell, K. (2014) Policy enactment, context and performativity: ontological politics and researching Australian National Partnership policies. *Journal of Education Policy*, *29*(6), 826-844.

Siteine, A. (2013). 'Positive in their own identities?': Social studies and identity affirmation. *New Zealand Journal of Educational Studies, 48*(2), 99-111.

Smith, G. H. (1992). *Reform and Māori Education Crisis: A Grand Illusion. Monograh No. 3.* Auckland: Research Unit for Māori Education, University of Auckland.

Smith, G. H. (1997). *The Development of Kaupapa Māori: Theory and Praxis.* Unpublished PhD Thesis. Auckland, New Zealand: University of Auckland.

Smith, G. H. (2000). Māori education. Revolution and Transformative Action. *Canadian Journal of Native Education, 24*(1), 57-72.

Smith, G. H. (2002). *Kaupapa Māori Theory: Transformative Praxis and New Formations of Colonisation.* Paper presented at Cultural Sites, Cultural Theory, Cultural Policy Conference: The Second International Conference on Cultural Policy Research, Wellington, 23rd-26th January.

Smith, L. T. (1999). *Decolonizing Methodologies. Research & Indigenous Peoples*. London, UK: Zed Books & Oxford University Press.

Smyth, H. (2013). What Does Research Say About the Effectiveness of Professional Learning and Development for Culturally Responsive Teaching at Primary School Level? *New Zealand Journal of Teachers' Work, 10*(1), 169-189.

Song, S., Perry, L. B., & McConney, A. (2014). Explaining the achievement gap between Indigenous and non-Indigenous students: an analysis of PISA 2009 results for Australia and New Zealand. *Educational Research and Evaluation, 20*(3), 178-198. doi: 10.1080/13803611.2014.892432

Stewart, G. M. (2012). Achievements, orthodoxies and science in Kaupapa Māori schooling. *New Zealand Journal of Educational Studies, 47*(2), 51-63.

Stewart, G. (2016). Indigenous Knowledge and Education Policy for Teachers of Māori Learners. *Knowledge Cultures, 4*(3), 84-98.

Taylor, S. (1997). Critical Policy Analysis: exploring contexts, texts and consequences. *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education, 18*(1), 23-35. doi: 10.1080/0159630970180102

Tillman, L. (1998). *Education, Power and Personal Biography. Dialogues with Critical Educators.* New York, NY: Routledge.

Tomlins-Jahnke, H. (2012). Beyond Limitation: A Tribal Response to Māori Education in Aotearoa New Zealand. *The Australian Journal of Indigenous Education, 41*(2), 146-155. doi: 10.1017/jie.2012.28

Viczko, M., & Riveros, A. (2015). Assemblage, enactment and agency: educational policy perspectives. *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education, 36*(4), 479-484. doi: 10.1080/01596306.2015.980488

Walshaw, M. (2012). *Getting to Grips with Doctoral Research.* London, UK : Palgrave MacMillan.

Weaver-Hightower, M. B. (2014). A Mixed Methods Approach for Identifying Influence on Public Policy. *Journal of Mixed Methods Research, 8*(2), 115-138. doi: 10.1177/1558689813490996

Webb, P.T., & Gulson, K. N. (2013). Policy Intensions and the Folds of the Self. *Educational Theory, 63*(1), 51-68.

Weir, H. (2012). Transitioning from Māori-medium to English-medium education: The experiences and perspectives of three students. *University of Sydney Papers in TESOL, 7*, 51-85.

Werts, A. B., & Brewer, C. A. (2015) Reframing the Study of Policy Implementation: Lived Experience as Politics. *Educational Policy, 29*(1), 206-229. doi: 10.1177/0895904814559247

White, C. (2001). Between Academic Theory and Folk Wisdom: Local Discourse on Differential Educational Attainment in Fiji. *Comparative Education Review, 45*(3), 303-333.

Yin, R. (2014). *Case Study Research. Design and Methods*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

This is an *Informed Consent Form* for mainstream primary and intermediate school teachers in Palmerston North and the wider Manawatū area who I am inviting to participate in the initial Phase One aspect of my doctoral research project titled, 'Mā Wai Kē?': An Exploratory Mixed-Methods Study on Teacher Enactment of the Ka Hikitia Policy.

Researcher: Timu-o-te-rangi Hirini Niwa

Organisation: Institute of Education, Massey University

Project Title: Mā Wai Kē?': An Exploratory Mixed-Methods Study on Teacher Enactment of the Ka Hikitia Policy (Phase One)

MUHEC Notification Number: 4000016233

This *Informed Consent Form* has two parts:

Part I: Information Sheet (to share information about the study with you)

Part II: Participant Consent Form (for signing if you choose to participate)

You will be given a copy of the full *Informed Consent Form*.

Part I: Information Sheet

Introduction
I am Mr. Timu Niwa, a doctoral candidate within the Institute of Education, Massey University. I am carrying out research with mainstream primary and intermediate schoolteachers on how Ka Hikitia is incorporated within their classrooms and schools. What follows is information about the project and an invitation for you to be part of this research. You do not have to decide today whether or not you will participate in the research. Before you decide, you can talk to anyone you feel comfortable with about the research. Please note that this consent form may contain words that you do not understand. Please ask me to stop as we go through the information and I will take time to explain. If you have questions later, please ask me.

Purpose of the research (Phase One)
The Ministry of Education has released a policy strategy, Ka Hikitia, to be picked up by mainstream schools and teachers. It aims to ensure that Māori students achieve education success as Māori. There are three main things that I want to find out from interviewing you in Phase One of the study. Firstly, I want to find out the ways in which you and your school incorporate the policy. Secondly, I want to know what factors impact upon what you and your school incorporate. Thirdly, I want to know the extent to which you believe that incorporating the guiding principles of Ka Hikitia addresses the issue of disproportionate Māori student achievement. In summary I want to understand what teachers, who are pressed with so many different tasks and commitments in their daily job, manage to incorporate Ka Hikitia. I want to consider the factors that impact upon what is incorporated and to ascertain whether or not teachers believe such incorporation addresses the underlying issue of Māori underachievement. This knowledge will be used to elicit themes that will directly provide input into the structure of a survey to be carried out for Phase Two of the study.

Type of Research Intervention
This phase of the research will involve your participation in a one-to-one (1-1) interview that will take approximately one hour.

Participant Selection
You have being invited to take part in this research because I feel that your experience as a mainstream primary/intermediate schoolteacher can contribute much to our understanding and knowledge of how teachers interpret and incorporate the guiding principles of Ka Hikitia. Please understand that a maximal variable sampling strategy is in place for Phase One of the research. This means that I have purposively selected participants based on a number of criteria to ensure that all my participants closely match the diverse spread of teachers across all mainstream primary and intermediate schools. Criteria that have been considered include: gender, ethnicity, decile and location (urban/rural) of the school you teach at.

Voluntary Participation
Your participation in this research is entirely voluntary. It is your choice whether to participate or not.

Procedures (Phase One)
A. Setting an interview time and place: I am asking you to help me learn more how mainstream teachers interpret and incorporate the Ka Hikitia policy into their classrooms and schools. I am inviting you to take part in this research project. If you accept, you will be asked to suggest 2-3 potential dates for your interview to take place and to have access a quiet room/space (i.e., your classroom after school) for the interview to be held. Please let me know if you are unable

to locate a suitable room/space for the interview and I will do my best to find one convenient to you.
B. Ethical Issues: The interviews will be guided by myself. As the interviewer I will make sure that you are comfortable. If you do not wish to answer any of the questions during the interview, you may say so and I will move on to the next question. No one else but myself will be present unless you would like someone else to be there. The information recorded is confidential, and no one else except my academic supervisors (Professor Howard Lee, Dr Tony Carusi, Dr Bevan Erueti and Dr Karen Ashton) and transcriber/s will have access to the information documented during your interview. The entire interview will be recorded on voice recorder, but no persons or school/institution will be identified by name. The data file will be stored in a lockable filing cabinet at Massey University. You may request your interview data not be used in any form up until the point of data analysis. The data files will be destroyed upon completion of the research.

Risks
The one-to-one interviews aim to gather your experiences and beliefs regarding the incorporation of Ka Hikitia into mainstream primary/intermediate school and classrooms settings. In general, no personal information is sought. There is a small risk that you may share some information about colleagues and/or senior management members that could make you feel uncomfortable. Please remember that you do not have to answer any question or take part in the interview if you feel that the question(s) are too personal or if talking about matters makes you feel uncomfortable.

Reimbursements
You will not be provided any incentive to take part in the research. However, you will be reimbursed for any travel expenses to attend the interview at a rate of 0.77cents per kilometre.

Confidentiality
Confidentiality of data with respect to both information about yourself and information that you share will be prioritised. There will be no information shared about you to anyone outside of the academic supervision team and the interview subscriber/s. The information that is collected from this research project will be kept private. Any information about you will have a number/code on it instead of your name. Only the researcher and academic supervisors will know what your number/code is and all information will be locked in a filing cabinet at Massey University, Manawatū campus. It will not be shared with or given to anyone else other than those outlined above.

Sharing the Results
Nothing that you say will be shared with anybody outside the academic supervision team and transcriber/s, and nothing will be attributed to you by name. The knowledge that I get from this research project will be used for the primary purpose of constructing a region-wide survey to be administered in the second phase of the research at a later date. I will publish and share the results of the project in the form of a thesis, journal publication/s and conference presentation/s so that other interested people that may learn from the research.

Right to Refuse or Withdraw
You do not have to take part in this research if you do not wish to do so. You may stop participating in the interview at any time that you wish.

Who to Contact
This project has been evaluated by peer review and judged to be low risk. Consequently, it has not been reviewed by one of the University's Human Ethics Committees. The researcher(s) named in this document are responsible for the ethical

conduct of this research. If you have any concerns about the conduct of this research that you want to raise with someone other than the researcher(s), please contact Dr Brian Finch, Director – Ethics, telephone 06 3569099 ext 86015, email humanethics@massey.ac.nz.

Part II: Participant Consent Form

'Mā Wai Kē?': An Exploratory Mixed-Methods Study on Teacher Enactment of the Ka Hikitia Policy

PARTICIPANT CONSENT FORM - INDIVIDUAL

☐I I have read the *Information Sheet* and have had the details of the study explained to me. My questions have been answered to my satisfaction, and I understand that I may ask further questions at any time.

☐I I agree to the interview being sound recorded.

☐I I agree to participate in this study under the conditions set out in the Information Sheet.

Signature: .... **Date:**

Full Name – printed

Appendix B: Phase One 1-1 Depth Interview Schedule

An Exploratory Mixed-Methods Study on how Mainstream Primary School Teachers Experience, Enact and Understand the Purpose of the Ka Hikitia Policy

- **Tell me about yourself, your teaching career and what motivates you in your role as a teacher.**

- **Describe what you know about the Ka Hikitia policy for me.** *(If a teacher doesn't know about Ka Hikitia discuss that it is the Government's strategy to rapidly change how education performs so that all Māori students gain the skills, qualifications and knowledge they need to succeed and to be proud in knowing who they are as Māori. (Five guiding principles that concern teachers: The Treaty of Waitangi, Māori potential approach, Ako – a two-way teaching and learning process, Identity, language and culture count, Productive partnerships)*

- **Talk to me about your experiences of incorporating Ka Hikitia. What do you do that demonstrates the guiding principles of Ka Hikitia?**
  (Has your experience with putting Ka Hikitia into place influenced the way you think about teaching? What are some examples? Are there any issues that you have experienced when planning for, implementing or assessing your use of Ka Hikitia? Why was that an issue?)

- **Talk to me about your school's experiences of incorporating Ka Hikitia.** *(What do you think about those experiences? Are those experiences important to you as a teacher? How do you feel about the amount of time you and your school give to putting Ka Hikitia into place? Would you like to experience more or less of Ka Hikita and why*

- **Are there others within your school that provide guidance or assistance with putting Ka Hikitia into place? Who are they and what do they do?**
- **Are there any personal factors that you feel impact upon how you put Ka Hikitia into place? What are they and how do they impact?**
- **Are there any factors within your school that you feel impact upon how you and your school put Ka Hikitia into place? What are they and how do they impact?** (Are there any other priorities within your school that you sense impact upon how you and your school put Ka Hikitia into place? (i.e., pedagogical priorities, National Standards, technology, open-plan learning).

- **Have you ever felt that anything you or your school have done in respect to things Māori has been a bit 'token'?**

- **Are there factors within your wider community that you feel impact upon how Ka Hikitia is put into place at your school? What are they and how do they impact?** (Are there other priorities from your wider community that impact upon how and your school put Ka Hikitia into place? Do you sense their priorities are on other things? What are they and how does that impact upon you?)

- **Are there any factors from the government and Ministry of Education that you feel impact upon how Ka Hikitia is put into place at your school? What are they and how do they impact?**

- **Now I want you to reflect on some of the Māori students you currently teach or have taught throughout your teaching career. I want you to bring to mind both those who achieved well and those who underachieved.**

  Focusing first on one or two Māori students who achieved. Tell me a little bit about them, their background, their family situation, their character and what they were like to teach?

What factors do you think played a critical role in their achievement? Please describe how.

- **Now focusing on one or two Māori students who underachieved. Tell me a little bit about them, their background, their family situation, their character and what they were like to teach.**

  What factors do you think played a critical role in their underachievement? Please describe how.

- **Based on your experience as a teacher, to what extent do you feel that incorporating Ka Hikitia fully addresses the issue of Māori student achievement?**
  (*Is there anything missing or omitted that needs to be a part of a strategy to raise Māori student achievement?*

- **What would achievement for a Māori student look like in your class?**
  (Does it differ from what achievement looks like for non-Māori students?

- **Given everything that you have shared, if you were given the opportunity to talk to the Minister of Education about Ka Hikitia or in regards to what should be done to address the issue of disproportionate Māori student achievement, what things would you want them to know?**

Appendix C: Phase Two Online Survey Schedule

Survey of Primary Teacher Enactment of the Ka Hikitia education policy

Survey Introduction

RESEARCH PROJECT

I am interested in understanding your experiences of enacting (putting into practise) the Ka Hikitia policy document as a mainstream primary school teacher in the Manawatū. This will involve completing a 10-15 minute survey which seeks your understandings and perspectives on your teaching practises that relate to the education of Māori students in mainstream schooling contexts. It will gauge the range of social, institutional and personal factors that impact upon your level of enactment (putting into practise) of the Ka Hikitia policy.

This research is being undertaken by Mr Timu Niwa, doctoral candidate at the Institute of Education, Massey University.

CONFIDENTIALITY

The confidentiality and anonymity of the individual completing the survey is assured. Any aspects that might identify a particular school discussed by participants when completing the survey will be omitted in any publications or presentations. It is assumed that filling in the survey implies your consent to participate. The information you provide will only be utilised for the purposes of the research, and any other publications or presentations arising from it. If you have any questions or concerns regarding the survey, please contact Mr Timu Niwa, telephone 06 323 3306 (email timu_niwa@hotmail.com).

COMPLETING THIS SURVEY

The survey should take approximately 10-15 minutes to complete. Click "Next" to get started with the survey. If you wish to navigate back and forth through your responses, please use the "Prev" and "Next" buttons provided. The survey is completed by clicking the "Done" button at the end. You won't be able to re-enter the survey once you have exited it, so please make sure you finish all your answers in one session. If you'd like to leave the survey at any time, just close your browser window.

ETHICS

This project has been evaluated by peer review and judged to be low risk. Consequently, it has not been reviewed by one of the University's Human Ethics Committees. The researcher named in this document is responsible for the ethical conduct of this research. If you have any concerns about the conduct of this research that you want to raise with someone other than the researcher, please contact Dr Brian Finch, Director (Ethics), telephone 06 3569099 ext 86015, email humanethics@massey.ac.nz.

1

THANK YOU FOR TAKING THE TIME TO COMPLETE THIS SURVEY

Demographic Information

* 1. What is your gender?

- Female
- Male
- Other/Prefer Not To Answer

* 2. What is your ethnicity? (Please select all that apply)

- NZ European/Pākehā
- NZ Māori
- Asian
- Pacific Islander
- Middle Eastern
- Latin American
- African
- Prefer Not To Answer

Other (please specify)

* 3. Are you a full-time teacher (1.0) in a primary/full primary/intermediate school in the Manawatū region?

- Yes
- No

* 4. What decile is the school you currently teach at?

- Decile 1-4
- Decile 5-7
- Decile 8-10

* 5. What year group/s do you currently teach? (Please select all that apply)

- Y0
- Y1
- Y2
- Y3
- Y4
- Y5
- Y6
- Y7
- Y8
- I teach across a range of classrooms.
- I am in a 'walking' position.

Other (please specify)

* 6. How long have you taught at the school you currently teach at?

- Less than 1 year
- Between 1-2 years
- Between 2-5 years
- Between 5-10 years
- Between 10-20 years
- Greater than 20 years

* 7. How long have you taught in primary/full primary/intermediate schools altogether?

- Less than 1 year
- Between 1-2 years
- Between 2-5 years
- Between 5-10 years
- Between 10-20 years
- Greater than 20 years

Ka Hikitia: Purpose and Enactment

This first section asks you to indicate what you know about the purposes of the Māori education policy, Ka Hikitia. It also asks you to indicate what your current school does to enact (put into practise) Ka Hikitia. It also asks you to consider what you as a teacher do/have done at your current school to enact the Ka Hikitia policy.

* 8. Indicate your level of agreement or disagreement with the following statement.

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
I am able to describe what the purposes of the Māori education policy, Ka Hikitia, are.	○	○	○	○	○

Comment on why you indicated this (optional)

* 9. What does *your current school* do to enact Ka Hikitia?

(Select 'Yes', 'No' or 'Don't Know' for the following statements)

	Yes	No	Don't Know
Our school holds regular hui specifically for whānau of Māori students.	○	○	○
Our school regularly sing waiata (Māori language songs).	○	○	○
Our school ensures that Māori students have the support necessary to achieve academically.	○	○	○
Our school has/does kapa haka.	○	○	○
Our school has a relationship with local iwi.	○	○	○
Our school ensures students regularly visit marae.	○	○	○

	Yes	No	Don't Know
All students are expected to perform or participate in karakia, tauparapara and/or ruruku.	◯	◯	◯
All students are expected to learn their pepeha or mihi.	◯	◯	◯
The school celebrates Māori student success.	◯	◯	◯
Our school holds pōwhiri to welcome visitors or guests.	◯	◯	◯
Our schools regularly observes and practises Māori tīkanga (Māori customary protocols).	◯	◯	◯
We have carried out a schoolwide review in relation to Ka Hikitia.	◯	◯	◯
Our school Board of Trustees have carried out a self-review in relation to Ka Hikitia.	◯	◯	◯
Parts of our school have been renamed to reflect a Māori worldview.	◯	◯	◯
Our school recognises and participates in Matariki/Māori New Year.	◯	◯	◯
Whakataukī (Māori proverbs) are used across the school.	◯	◯	◯
We have a bilingual class.	◯	◯	◯

Other (please specify)

* 10. Indicate whether or not the following statements relate to your current school.

(Select 'Yes', 'Somewhat', 'No' or 'Don't Know' for the following statements)

	Yes	Somewhat	No	Don't Know
Te Reo Māori is a living language at our school.	◯	◯	◯	◯
Our school actively pursues relationships with whānau of Māori students.	◯	◯	◯	◯
Māori knowledge (language, culture, identity) is integrated into other curriculum areas at our school.	◯	◯	◯	◯
Teachers at our school are expected to teach using Māori pedagogical preferences.	◯	◯	◯	◯
Our school actively promotes the values of Ka Hikitia.	◯	◯	◯	◯

Comment on why you indicated as you did here (optional)

* 11. What *do you do/have you done as a teacher* at your current school to enact Ka Hikitia?

(Select 'Yes', 'No' or 'Don't Know' for the following statements)

	Yes	No	Don't Know
I regularly teach Te Reo in my class.	◯	◯	◯
I initiate and develop warm relationships with whānau of Māori students.	◯	◯	◯
I lead or regularly assist with Kapa Haka.	◯	◯	◯
I ensure that Māori students have the support necessary to achieve academically.	◯	◯	◯
I teach or regularly assist in the teaching of waiata.	◯	◯	◯
I ensure Māori students share about their marae.	◯	◯	◯

	Yes	No	Don't Know
I regularly observe karakia, tauparapara and/or ruruku in my class.	◯	◯	◯
I ensure Māori students recite/learn their pepeha or mihi.	◯	◯	◯
I regularly celebrate Māori student success.	◯	◯	◯
I incorporate Māori legends into my class.	◯	◯	◯
I give commands in Māori in my class.	◯	◯	◯
I regularly observe and practise Māori tīkanga (Māori customary protocols) in my class.	◯	◯	◯
I use Māori symbols and approaches in the teaching of art.	◯	◯	◯
I regularly integrate Māori language/knowledge into other curriculum areas.	◯	◯	◯
I teach to Māori pedagogical preferences when required in my class.	◯	◯	◯
I have actively celebrated Matariki in my class.	◯	◯	◯
I actively use whakataukī (Māori proverbs) in my classroom.	◯	◯	◯
I actively promote the values of Ka Hikitia.	◯	◯	◯

Other (please specify)

* 12. Below is a set of statements in relation to a range of *contextual and subjective factors* that impact upon teacher enactment of the Ka Hikitia policy. Indicate your level of agreement or disagreement for each statement.

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree or Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
We have strong in-school leaders that organise professional development and support to staff for enacting (putting into practise) Ka Hikitia schoolwide.					
Although there are so many other priorities at school that I, as a teacher, have to juggle, I have sufficient time and energy to focus upon enacting (putting into practise) Ka Hikitia.					
The expectations of parents/caregivers enable me to give sufficient focus towards enacting (putting into practise) Ka Hikitia.					
All the teachers at my school value Māori language, culture and/or identity.					
As a teacher, I value Māori language, culture and identity.					
I make a genuine effort at ensuring Māori language, culture and/or identity is an integral part of my classroom.					
All the teachers at my school make genuine efforts at ensuring Māori language, culture and/or identity is an integral part of their classrooms.					
I feel supported by the Ministry of Education to enact Ka Hikitia.					
I feel supported by the Ministry of Education to ensure Māori students achieve as Māori.					

9

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree or Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Our school's parent community is supportive of Māori language, culture and identity.	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯
Involving whānau of Māori students at our school is simple and straightforward.	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯
The Ministry of Education has a high level of trust of teachers.	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯
Connecting our school with local iwi is simple and straightforward.	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯
I have been supported by Māori staff and students even if/when I make mistakes with Te Reo and aspects of Māori culture.	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯
Timetabling at our school ensures I have sufficient time in the school week to focus upon enacting (putting into practise) Ka Hikitia.	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯
I use/have used Māori students as a Te Reo and cultural resource in my classroom.	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯
The Ministry of Education is deeply interested in more than just 'box ticking' and 'target meeting'.	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯
Relationships are of prime pedagogical importance to me as a teacher.	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯
I feel confident when immersed in Māori culture.	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯
I have a strong sense of confidence in regards to my ability to speak Te Reo Māori.	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree or Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
I have a positive attitude towards Māori language and culture.	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯
I have a strong sense of confidence in regards to my ability to teach Te Reo Māori.	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯
Ka Hikitia is a valuable document for me as a teacher.	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯

* 13. Indicate your level of agreement or disagreement with the following statement.

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree or Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Incorporating Māori culture, language and identity into classrooms and schools, improves Māori student engagement.	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯

Comment on why you indicated this (optional)

* 14. Indicate your level of agreement or disagreement with the following statement.

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree or Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Incorporating Māori culture, language and identity into classrooms and schools improves Māori student achievement.	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯

Comment on why you indicated this (optional)

* 15. Indicate your level of agreement or disagreement with the following statement.

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree or Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Social factors outside of a teacher's control such as parental income, standard of living and socio-economic background impacts upon Māori student achievement to a much greater degree than incorporating Māori culture, language and identity into classrooms and schools.	○	○	○	○	○

Comment on why you indicated this (optional)

Thanks for completing the survey

Thank you for taking the time to complete this survey. Your data has been forwarded and please be assured that your participation and your school will remain anonymous.

Ngā mihi.
Kia ora.

Carusi, F. T., & Niwa, T. H. (2020). Learning not to be poor: the impossible position of teachers in Aotearoa New Zealand education policy discourse. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Teacher Education, 48*(1), 30-44. doi: 10.1080/1359866X.2019.1684434

Abstract: The relationship between poverty and education is a longstanding issue for education policy, research, and practice. Through a policy as discourse approach, this article focuses on the work policy does to define education as a solution to poverty. Recent policy discourses in Aotearoa have positioned the teacher as the most important factor in raising student achievement irrespective of socio-economic factors like poverty. However, by linking student achievement to economic success, those policy discourses also position teachers as a remedy to poverty. This article considers the ways two Aotearoa education policies, Ka Hikitia and Investing in Educational Success, impossibly position teachers between needing to ignore and remedy poverty. The analyses show how both policies impossibly position teachers by reducing education to learning and students and teachers to learners. By positioning teachers as responsible for learning, policies are able to displace structural and historical conditions of poverty through a focus on the work teachers do to improve learning, culminating in a logic where one learns not to be poor. The article concludes with a coda seeking to reverse the impossible position of teachers by describing education as weak, whereby teachers can acknowledge poverty without having to remedy it.

*This paper above was awarded APJTE Best Paper Award for 2020.

Niwa, T. H. (2016, November 22). In Need of a Fix? Reframing How Teachers are Discursively Constructed in Education Policy. In F.T Carusi & J. O'Neill (Chairs). *What is the Place of Teachers? Policy Enactments in Aotearoa New Zealand* [Symposium]. New Zealand Association for Research in Education Conference, Victoria University, Wellington, New Zealand.

This presentation engages with the work of critical policy scholars and Māori theorists to explore how teachers are discursively constructed in education policy. It is proffered that the logic of rationalist policy implementation models, as evident in the broad Māori education policy, *Ka Hikitia*, detrimentally impacts upon how teachers are discursively constructed and oversimplifies the manner in which policies are negotiated, responded to and put into action by teachers. Two critical policy theoretical tools are utilised in this presentation to rupture the implementation policy logic of *Ka Hikitia*. Firstly, policy-as-discourse theory urges for a probing of the non-innocent nature of how the problem of disproportionate Māori achievement gets framed within *Ka Hikitia* and how such framing affects 'what can be thought about and how this affects possibilities for action' (Bacchi, 2000, p. 49). Secondly, enactment theory frames teachers as actors within a complex web of situational, professional, material and external factors (Braun, Maguire & Braun, 2012) that impact upon how a policy is inevitably interpreted and enacted in classrooms and schools. Rather than being seen as mere ciphers who implement (Ball, Maguire, & Braun, 2012), drawing from Foucault's notion of force relations, enactment theory articulates that teachers are

instead agents of strategic techniques and are ‘enmeshed within a disciplinary programme of visibility and production’ (Ball, Maguire, & Braun, 2012, p. 72). The presentation will end with a brief critique of how *Ka Hikitia* replicates and reproduces a thoroughgoing knowledge of teachers via a Western metaphysics of presence. It proffers that embracing a Māori metaphysics of Being nurtures policy towards whakapapa, a ‘code of ethics’ where ‘relational responsibility’ (Hoskins, 2012, p. 92) takes precedence over the policy implementation logic of ‘fixing’ teachers.